

Transcription ICANN Helsinki
GNSO-New gTLDSubsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Part 2
Wednesday, 29 June 2016

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at

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

Jeff Neuman: Please take your seats so we can get this started. Okay. Could we get the recording started? I'm looking over but I - thank you. Okay the recording has started. If everyone could sit down please.

We are starting the second session of the Policy Development Process Working Group on subsequent procedures for new GTLDs which I've actually started abbreviating as Supro.

Woman: As Supro. Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Supro. I'm getting these - it is awkward. It sounds like Cipro.

Woman: Well that's a drug.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So I'm going to turn it over. The agenda for this one is to finish up in the first few minutes on some of the overarching questions and then to go into the work tracks, talk about some administrative matters on that and then really to make sure we understand which items are in which track and whether that's the appropriate area for them or not. Avri, take it away.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. So if we can move off of - oh no, is this when we were at the rounds? Yes we were.

So we've been talking about rounds. Again the assumption I'm still getting from people -- and this one is less clear to me where we're heading than some of the others -- in that there's certainly a prejudice against rounds, especially the aspect of rounds that means after a rounds you do a review then you wait a long time and then you talk about doing another round.

That seems to irritate a lot of people. There's another trend. It's one that I've liked to speak of. It would really be nice if we could get to a steady state of there being applications but that seems to have problems.

So we've been talking more in terms of is there some kind of windowing that can be done that doesn't have the negative aspects of a round but also doesn't have some of the problems we see in going to steady state and is a window any different than a round. You know, is it just a semantic difference?

So this one is still - I - with the first two I kind of had an assumption, yes we're going to do GTLDs, yes there are types but we got to get specific.

In terms of rounds I'd like to hear - I'd like to spend no more than, you know, five to ten minutes on any of these because we really do have to get to the others. But does anyone have a clear view?

Yes? You had just raised your hand, right Jeff? Remember to give your name and all that stuff.

Jon Nevett: Jon Nevett. It - I would suggest a hybrid approach where you do both, a round and then a steady state where you have a 60-day window where we could accept applications and then if there's any pent up demand for the - over the past X number of months or years or whatever it is and then we have a contention resolution for that. But then move to a steady state day 61.

So you have 60 days of taking applications and then day 61 you start accepting applications first come, first serve. So there shouldn't be any rush to the courthouse which is the worry that we had last time and will probably have again this time.

So you deal with that in the first 60 days and then again right after that you move to a steady state like - just like the registrar accreditation process happens now. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I've got Jeff. Do I have other hands and - okay, thanks Jon.

Jeff Neuman: So I've been actually thinking about this question, again not as chair, just as personal thought. I don't think we could ever go truly to a first come, first serve. I think with the different - with objection procedures and evaluations and all the other time to take public comments and things, I don't ever see a purely first come, first serve.

What I do see is a hybrid but a little bit differently in the sense of you maybe say, again, I'll work on a 12-month calendar year, perhaps months. You know, January through March let's say you accept applications. A 90-day window I think is what the past one was.

Quarter two, which would be - sorry April through June, that's when you take in comments and - or you have a period for objections and all that fun stuff. And then potentially for the first year you then might want to look at tweaking some things, not a review period but if there's tweaks.

But then starting up on year two you do a constant three months accepting applications, three months of comments and disputes or objections and things and then start up again another 90-day window. So you're having basically two windows a year.

I just don't - because you're talking about a unique resource, I don't see it quite as simple as just a registrar accreditation because you're not just accrediting the entity as you do with the registrar. You're actually giving away a public resource in a sense. So - but I do see it as a steady state type of activity.

Avri Doria: Jonathan. Please.

Jonathan Zuck: Jonathan Zuck for the record. I - this conversation's come up a little bit in the CCT review as well and came up yesterday in your session when Jordyn suggested we just get started tomorrow with a steady state. And that got some applause in the room but wasn't widely accepted.

But I wonder if there's also a difference between, you know, our situation right now and what the ongoing situation might be. In other words, are they necessarily the same?

And I guess where that seems most acute is with the brands. In other words, is there a segmentation issue that might allow an accelerated effort on the part of this group to make a brand round available in the near term because there's fewer issues at play?

And that could be done as a round but it's not necessarily indicative of what the future would hold which might be more like the program that you have laid out Jeff. That's just one of the things that comes to the mind.

I mean other people have brought up communities which to me feels more problematic as needing their own round.

And then some people have talked about underserved communities but I think that - the effort associated with serving them and getting to that market is going to be substantial enough that it's not immediate.

So brands feels like the exception to the rule in some ways. I thought I'd raise it.

Avri Doria: Thanks. So you've added complexity to it in terms of mixing the topics of typing and rounds and going on a round as being...

Jonathan Zuck: You're welcome.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Thank you. Okay we got Brett and then we got Jordyn.

Brett Fausett: Yes, I didn't know if you're just looking for new ideas or trying to get a sense of the room but to the extent you're getting a sense of the room -- sorry, Brett Fausett for the record -- I'd like to support what Jon said about having a round and then a steady state where we move to first come, first serve.

And think about all the problems that first come, first serve is going to solve when we get there. There are huge inefficiencies when ten people apply for the same string. You know, 90% of that effort was wasted for all the time and effort that went into putting the application together.

So the sooner we can get to first come, first serve, all that contention around who gets the string that two people want takes care of itself.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes thanks. Yes just to -- this is Jordyn Buchanan with Google -- just to build on what Brett said, it's not just the inefficiency from the perspective of the applicant -- although that certainly exists -- but there's - if you just look at the guidebook -- Stephanie knows this better than me -- I think something like a third of the guidebook is dedicated to de-contention process.

And if you look at the number of like reconsideration requests and the amount of time to like staff and the board would have to spend minding the program, almost all of that relates to this contention process, the de-contention process.

And so it is - it would make this process so much more straightforward I think. It would increase the predictability for applicants which I think is one of the principles embodied in the existing policy and hopefully that will carry through to any existing policy changes and, you know, just vastly reduce the amount of sort of fighting that goes on over these names.

Now Jeff is right obviously that we can't just say it's first come, first serve and if you apply, you just get it no matter what. Like obviously there's - these are important resources and we need to make sure that they're allocated wisely.

But certainly you could allow someone to apply at any moment and then have a window of time after the application was lodged in which objections could be filed. It would just be that you would have the right to that name assuming that you were to make it fully through the evaluation process and the objection process without running into a stumbling block.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I don't want to get into it now but I'll be interested to find out how we understand who got there first. I have (Dick) and then I have Jeff.

(Dick Fresenovsky): (Dick Fresenovsky) from .Berlin. I would echo Jonathan and adding this complexity not only to - with brands but also with geo top-level domain names which didn't create any problems in that round. And having something in front of the round and decreasing the pressure of that round having brands and geos and maybe another tier cup category which is not in conflict with generic terms could help.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff and then I think maybe one or two more. But I think also that we've got a fairly open issue. What - we'll have to see what comments we get and then go back to it. But Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. And I appreciate - again as a personal comment appreciate the inefficiencies in looking at it from the applicants' side, point of view, but I think there's other points of view you need to look at the process from as well.

And, you know, when you're dealing with a public resource or a resource, handing it out first come, first serve does not always result in the... While it's certainly a fair way to allocate, it doesn't always result in the right party getting the resource.

It doesn't always result in - I mean look what we saw in dotcom and others. You know, the first person to get there isn't always - it could be for speculation or other purposes.

o I fully understand the notion of making it easy for applicants but also I think we need to look at other sides and other communities.

I also think that for - from other stakeholders that I've heard, if you establish a predictable process -- there will be applications during this period -- it would make it easier for others who - to follow what's going on and to be able to have a predictable time period in which they would file objections and other things.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay, I'll give you the last word and then we'll move on or is there any other hands that I'm missing? Susan, you had a hand?

Jordyn Buchanan: I was trying to respond to Jeff.

Avri Doria: And then there was Susan, okay. And then Susan will have the last word for this pass at the topic.

Jordyn Buchanan: So Jeff I agree with you that first come, first serve does not result in optimal allocation but neither does any round basis that - as long as we do a sequence of rounds, some rounds are earlier than others and the people that get into the early rounds have - are going to be the people that get the names, not the people that apply later in the process.

And once there's some process to revoke a TLD from an existing operator and allocate to someone who we think would be better at the job -- which I don't think anyone's contemplating -- you always have that same problem of someone else got there first even if someone more qualified would come along later on.

First come, first serve I don't think really has a material effect on that especially in a model like you're talking about with three-months rounds twice a year. If you're three months too late, then you've still missed it - missed the boat just as you would've if they - if you were doing a first come, first serve.

Avri Doria: Jordyn, as a quick aside, I have noticed that whenever somebody brings up an - a *dadum certum*, somebody does eventually contemplate it.

Susan Payne: Yes Susan Payne for the record. Just a quick one really. I guess we shouldn't have any session here without mentioning this lottery. You know, if we do a first come, first serve and it opens on the 1st of January 2018 or 2019 or whenever, 10,000 applicants could be trying to get their application in before everyone else. I mean, it's unrealistic.

Avri Doria: That is sort of what I was alluding to by how do we define first.

Okay. Can we move on to the next one please, next slide? Predictability. The first principle was predictability. And we've heard a fair amount about how predictable it was.

But then again the notion that we didn't talk about when we were doing the previous set of policies was flexibility for dealing with issues that either hadn't been dealt with, hadn't been discussed or the fact that the world changes and there are new issues that hadn't been foreseen.

So this time we're starting to look at the balance between predictability and flexibility and how we sort of make policy, what kind of statements we make about finding that balance.

And suggestions have come up about, you know, there's - the - for a certain amount of time but over time things get a little less flexible until finally things are frozen or other suggestions.

So at this point I'd like to take a couple people that may want to comment on this issue but like all the issues, we're not going to solve it here now and we still do need to see the comments. But does anybody? I don't have any hands on screen. Does anybody want to talk about the sort of conundrum of the relationship of things being both totally predictable and sufficiently flexible?

Nobody's got a solution for that one. Thank you. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here. Well it's predictably unpredictable, right? That's the whole nature of the beast. But I think to go down this path we really need to think about what we want predictable.

And there's always going to be uncertainties in certain times because there's going to be appeals, there's going to be... Because these are important resources, as long as they continue to be important resources, there will be disputes, there will be appeals, the times would vary.

So I think what is - what needs to be predictable is the principles applied for every, you know, action taken from - I guess from the staff and from the board. And that seems to be more useful to make sure that we're holding on to certain principles and those continue to be predictable as we go through the rounds or the process or however we process the TLDs.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Would anyone else like to comment? Seems like a decent approach to see how it works out and whether we can define those principles. Okay. I think we'll work on that one more when we get the comments out, okay. Please. Oh you put your hand up. I didn't see that. Please, Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Just that I don't think we need to go all the way and say, "Well, you know, let's see what happens," right?

We got to - if we know something is likely to happen or we bake in a comment period for example or this or that, I think it would be very helpful to clarify dates, certain times when things are due so that we don't end up with people coming in late on things in this process that change the outcomes.

And so I think we've got to -- to the extent that we can make it predictable, right, without harming flexibility -- and I think we need to put some guideposts around flexibility, not flexibility for its own sake but flexibility for some really, really important reason -- safety, security whatever -- that we didn't anticipate before.

I suppose that's fine but we also should not fail to rise to the challenge to make it as predictable as possible so that everybody can read it, understand

it. And if you - for example, maybe I missed my application window. Should it be so flexible that I can turn mine in three days late? Probably not, right?

And so we can - let's try to be as predictable as we can. And when we're flexible, let's be flexible for principles.

Avri Doria: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I agree with that then. And I agree there are certain things that will need to be rigid and like certain time frames and other things.

I also think we need to avoid the situation where we change - some people say it's like changing the goalpost after someone's already applied.

So what we had happen here is we had a base contract and, yes, little things could change here and there to have some sort of flexibility.

But I think in this case, we had a base contract and then after everybody applied, one of Fadi Chehade's first initiatives was to ensure that ICANN can unilaterally change the contract. So I mean that is a massive material change.

So we can set - we can have flexibility but also set guidelines and say that there cannot be any material changes that - or changes that have a material impact on the process going forward or on those that have submitted applications in the past. I mean, there can be guidelines but also flexibility.

Avri Doria: So we're saying that that kind of flexibility -- the Fadi flexibility of changing a contract -- is something that we would look at undoing in this process?

Jeff Neuman: It would be something more akin to the process we have now to change a contract which is you have to go through the stakeholder. There are ways to amend a contract right now.

And just because you have new entities coming in that don't already have a contract, you still follow that process as if it were someone who was under an existing contract.

Avri Doria: Last words on this one before I move on to the next one?

As I say, all of these - we still got to get the comments though I am going to ask at the end of this -- and I'll telegraph that to the staff folks -- to see whether they think that they've started to get enough to start building our first set of discussion points so that when we get the comments, we've got something to compare them against as opposed to a blank sheet. But I'll ask them that question later. I'm just letting them know now that I plan to ask them that question.

Okay. Can I go to the next one? Community Engagement in New GTLD Process. So are there circumstances when the application should be frozen while unforeseen policy issues are considered and resolved?

If so, should there be a threshold or standard that must be reached before considering freezing an application window?

If the board is faced with questions that cannot be addressed in a policy recommendation they were sent, must the board bring the issue back to the GNSO and PDP process, the expedited PDP and GNSO guidance process?

We do have processes now that we didn't have when this first - when this last round was put together. So, you know, some of the conditions that existed then for there being no way or no known way of changing a policy now are different. There is Implementation Review Teams, etcetera.

Should a standard be established to discriminate between issues that must be solved during an open application window and those that can be postponed and such?

So comments on this? I don't have an idea of even a guess of where we're at on this one yet. I couldn't posit a guess on where we stand on this one yet as a group. So I'm wondering, does anybody else have a guess as to where we stand on these particular questions?

Okay Paul McGrady. Oh I see your hand was up again. I keep forgetting to look at the hand thingy. Please.

Paul McGrady: Sorry. I apologize if I'm talking too much. But I would say that this past week (Namie) wanted to rethink 5A, the question itself, and add: Are there circumstances in which the application window should be frozen while unforeseen or operational issues are considered and resolved?

For example wild fluctuations in currency, right? What if we set an application window with a currency denominator, everybody pays their fees and then that currency tanks? And then fulfilling that round would bankrupt ICANN, right, because the dollars or pounds or euros or whatever currency is used, right, dramatically loses its value.

And so I would say that I know we've only asked the policy question to the community but maybe we should think ourselves about operational issues that might also lead to freezing a round.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Any other hands or comments on this one? I think it's rather frightening that the currency would tank and people would have to pay more on their application. I could just see that. Yes, Susan and then Edmon.

Susan Payne: I think it's just a comment on (unintelligible) as well. I mean, I think maybe yes, maybe there are circumstances where you should be freezing it while some unforeseen issues are considered and resolved.

But if so, I think that consideration and resolution needs to happen with some kind of a time scale because we can see, you know, in other places around this building that some, you know, some topics are being supposedly considered and there's no actual process for working on them happening at all.

So I think, you know, if we were to go down that route, I think we need to be considering how you could manage that process and ensure that there is a resolution.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Edmon, please.

Edmon Chung: Yes it's Edmon here. So is this just the submission of the application period or are we talking about the evaluation period as well?

If it's the evaluation period, then it's definitely much more complicated. I mean, there has been calls from ALAC, from GAC to FRUHEEF, certain subsets as well. When we talk about freezing an application window, it could be a subset of a - of what has been applied for as well.

So I don't have any answers to it but definitely this goes - this ties into the predictability part where goalposts are, you know, moved all sorts of ways. And so I think the question perhaps is, yes, so under what circumstances could this be evoked?

And to say that, to stay - actually to stay silent on the issue is probably bringing more uncertainty into the process. And, you know, let's take this and say something about, you know, these type of situations.

Avri Doria: So this is something you would apply your notion of there are principles that would be applied to figure out what to do. As you equated it to flexibility so I'm assuming that it would have a similar treatment.

Anyone else want to comment on this one before we move on? Okay, thank you.

Can we go to six please. Limiting Applications. This one has a lot of write-up but basically this one is limiting in two different dimensions.

One is limiting the number -- if we do a traditional round -- the number that could be applied for within a round. Last time it was not bounded or it was bounded per period.

Or whether there's a limit to the number that any individual applicant could apply for since there were certainly a lot of conversations about that at the time of the last application.

But then of course there's questions of how would one limit it, how would one enforce it and such as that.

So as opposed to my reading all of this, I'll sort of throw the floor open and see if we've got initial views, comments. Yes please (Brett).

Brett Fauset: I'd appreciate some background on why this question is even asked. I don't think there's any purpose in limiting applications but clearly someone raised it. So what's the background here?

Jeff Neuman: Didn't you chair the group in which this question was raised? The background is, I mean, I'm - I shouldn't...

Brett Fauset: Given my - the issue spotting thing we did, any issue anyone raised went into this process without analysis.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Brett Fausett: If you had an issue, it went on the board. So people didn't have to justify it or explain it. Now they do.

Jeff Neuman: Correct. So the reason it's in our purview or our scope is because it was raised during that discussion group.

But I will say my comment was going to be that when we discussed this issue a few weeks back when we were looking at some of these topics, it did not seem that anyone on the calls or in the e-mails were - even talked about limiting.

It seemed like the nature of the - or the -- what do you call it -- the tone of the group or whatever it was was leaning towards not imposing any limits subject to if there are any technical limits on putting a certain number into the root if that comes out again but not on limiting the number of applications.

But I would also add that this isn't necessarily only a round issue. It could be a first come, first serve issue if within a certain time period, you know, within, you know, five days they get 10,000 applications. In theory, if you have limits, the limits could apply.

But that said, it seemed like the tone of the group was not to go down the path of limiting.

Avri Doria: Please.

Freida Tallon: This has been in relation to...

Avri Doria: Name please.

Freida Tallon: Sorry. Freida Tallon for the record. Could the limits have been in relation to the root zone delegation?

Jeff Neuman: So when this issue came up, it was not in terms of how many to delegate. It was in terms of how many could apply.

I think initially there were some comments when - I remember at the time when people saw that Donuts for example had applied for 308. There were some comments that were raised by individuals in the community that they thought that that was too many from one organization. That kind of died down and that was only raised at the beginning.

But again like I said, during our discussions on this topic, it did not seem that people were leaning towards limits.

Avri Doria: I have Edmon and then...

Edmon Chung: Yes I don't think limiting numbers makes any sense. But the root study is interesting. I think, you know, that - I don't know whether that's one of those five boxes that was identified.

But that certainly should be redone, you know, given the... Okay so given what the now - what they experience now, that could be redone. And, you know, we might be looking at a bigger number per year -- at least that's my feeling -- or it might go down. I don't know why it might go down. But anyway.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Edmon. Actually that study is being done and they are almost I think all the way through it. They had some preliminary findings but that study should be done fairly soon I would think. But they are publishing their - the results of that.

(Enn Unashaf): (Enn Unashaf) from CORE. Limiting numbers is - in it - a fact at some point when the staff and the resources are overwhelmed with the number of applications that came in. So it limits itself.

And here of course we might actually apply some traffic management, you know, smarter maybe than typically happens -- which is red lights -- you know, as it happens in many cities.

And in many cities there's also something like a congestion charge depending on the time of the day at which you want to get into the city. So we might use a mechanism by - you know, if there is a clogged queue, too many people in the queue, just for the processing, then we say, "Look if you take this subsequent round there's going to be rebates, be cheaper."

So this might be smarter than a hard limit or other, you know, lotteries or other kind of ways. It was also a comment that was made by somebody else, let people choose and maybe nudge a little bit to avoid the congestion.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I don't have any names for that so I think we'll leave that one for now. Again we'll come back to it once we've gotten the comments from the community comment. Did we have another slide left in this section of odds and ends.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Open Questions. So we asked if there were further overarching issues. If there are, I don't know if anyone here has any but hopefully they'll come through in the comments. And I think I'd suggest that we wait for the comments to go into what other overarching issues there might be.

And then are there any additional steps we have to take to better enable community engagement. Again, unless someone has a burning contribution on that one at the moment, I'd say let's wait until we get the comments on that.

So I think that that brings us the - I guess there'll be comments from some of the cross-communities that come on that.

I'd like to - and so now I'm going to turn to staff support and sort of ask whether there's been enough of an impression to start building an early, very rough draft of what sort of has been talked about as being the first impression. I won't even call it a consensus yet but the first, you know, general impression of where we're going on some of these things so that when we get the comments, we have something to compare against and to change.

Julie Hedlund: This Julie Hedlund, (unintelligible). We also had a comment that was put into the track if that's all right. I'll read that first.

This is a comment from (Michael Fleming). He says, "I think it's very difficult to limit the number of applications a single applicant can make. An example to what a few companies did the 2012 round - did in the 2012 round is to create child companies for each applied-for TLD. In this sense, one would seek to limit the number of applications. Would one limit the number of applications to the parent company?"

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. So I guess I'm trying to get a little clarity on what you're asking. Are you looking for perhaps an outcome that would be reached per subject or just a summary of findings to date or whether or not it's going to result in policy recommendations or? I guess a little more clarity would be - what you're looking for.

Avri Doria: Basically we have a set of overarching issues that we will need to answer. And some of those answers may be no issue here. Some of those answers may be we need to do more work and come up with some fundamental principles for how to answer them.

And I'm just wondering whether there's been enough discussion in - today to start getting that collection of what the first set of answers as opposed to just waiting for the comments to take us there.

Steve Chan: Thanks for the clarity Avri. This is Steve Chan again from staff. And I think the answer would be it varies for each of the subjects. For some as you've pointed out, it's more clear than others whether or not there's going to be additional new detail to these is clearer than whether or not the mechanism will be to accept applications is around. So I think we'll probably take this back.

And I think for the most part we can probably accomplish what you're saying and then maybe tweak as additional comments come on - in from the communities. But in general I think what you're asking is doable at this point.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And certainly I'm willing to, you know, help insofar as we can help and come back with questions. But thanks. Okay. So that's this part.

And now are you...

Man: The next slide.

Avri Doria: The next slide. Oh, okay thanks.

Man: You're welcome.

Avri Doria: That one we did. Right. So now we're catching up to the second one. We could skip that one. We've talked about that one. It was just to remind us of... Oh no, now we're at track one, yes.

Jeff Neuman: So before we do that, I did want to bring up a discussion that's something that we might have to consider. So there is ongoing work right now from the - and it was actually the first one is that - country and territory names.

And it's something that we're going to have to - we may at some point have to get the recommendations from that group and then do something with those, just like we'll have to with the other review teams.

And I had a meeting with the co-chairs of that group whatever day that was, a couple days ago, Steve was there, and basically it seems like the way that they're coming out is that a lot of their issues, there will be no clear recommendations, that they've basically...

This is a group - the Cross-Community Working Group is a group of GNSO - or members of the GNSO and well as members of the CCNSO. It's not comprised of I don't believe ALAC and GAC members. Oh they are in there, okay.

So the meeting I had with them was -- I'll get to Susan in a sec...

Susan Payne: I just wanted to clarify.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, okay, clarify. Sorry.

Susan Payne: Yes just - I mean, it is open to all but for a long period of time it had I think only one GAC member notionally involved. There are now about three or so GAC members. There's a few people from the ALAC, a couple, two or three, a lot of CCNSO and the CGNSO.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so then what their - what they all believe, the co-chairs believe, will be the outcomes of that group is that they may have a recommendation with respect to -- and they're working only at the top level just to clarify again -- what they are likely - what's likely to happen is that they may come out with a recommendation for two characters at the top level but have a definite split in the view - in views between the CCTLDs and the - or CCSNO and the GNSO on how to treat three letters at the top level.

So it is very - so it is likely that we may get -- not that I want to redo the work -
- but we are going to have to do something with that. We can't just ignore it
and we would have to find some way of incorporating their recommendations
or lack thereof into our work.

So I just wanted to point that out as another outcome of this week and
something to think about. And we'll have to inject that into the appropriate
work track which I think is the one that deals with... Probably work track two
which deals with the reserve names I think is where that might fit in.

So I - on that note, what I would like to do for the rest of the time period here -
- and also we likely have to do this on the next call that we have as well -- is
to talk about the process going forward of this group which includes breaking
out into different work tracks -- as we talked about at the very, very beginning
-- each work track having a specified set of topics, minimizing to the greatest
extent the overlap of subject matters.

And so what we have here are I think four or five work tracks at this point. I
can't remember if we combined two of them.

Steve Chan: (Unintelligible) for a second?

Jeff Neuman: Oh yes. Go ahead, please.

Steve Chan: This is Steve from staff. So there are five work tracks now. Why it's
complicated I guess is because there were five originally. Four and five got
combined and then we added a fifth possible work track for discussion during
the session. And Jeff will speak about it a little bit later. But so for clarity there
are five with complications.

Jeff Neuman: Glad our clarity has complications.

Steve Chan: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So what we did essentially is tried to take all of the issues that were in the discussion group - that came out of the discussion group and that were in the issue - final issue report and ultimately the charter and put them into discrete work tracks again with as minimizing to the greatest extent any overlap.

And what we'd like to do is to have - I don't know if we'll call them rappers or leaders or whatever we're going to call it. Avri, you've got a (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes. I basically have come to the conclusion that borrowing the CCWG methodology of sign up lists for volunteers and rappers is an excellent way to proceed. It's a methodology that collects people and finds people that want to take responsibility. I love it.

Jeff Neuman: Well sure. Yes. So yes, we want sign up lists for each of these. I was just referring to we call them a rapper, a leader or whatever we want to call them.

Each work track then will have hopefully a good amount of volunteers to work on the items, will select its own leader, rapper and meet on its own timeframes whenever that group can.

And we envision the full group only meeting - needing to meet every couple weeks for the most part. With the exception of after the public comments are received for the overarching issues, we might have to meet a little more often to kind of resolve all of that.

So we think that this is a good way forward. It's also consistent with what we talked about at the beginning. We did have a number of people that wanted to volunteer for leading these efforts. And I think this is a good opportunity for those same people or anybody new to come forward and work on these items.

So what I'd like to do for the rest of the time is to go through the different work tracks and the different items within each work track and also then talk about whether any of these should be moved around or whether we're missing any and if we're missing anywhere they would appropriately fit in.

As we talked about in the last session, part of this could be going through the existing guidebook with - on these topics and then using that as a baseline. But I think we'll leave that to each group to figure out where they want to start as a base but also keeping in mind that we do not want to reinvent the wheel and start all over.

So that said, the first work track I think is one of the ones that like the overarching issues are - have the most - aren't the most heavily bound. But what we have in here is our process questions, support questions and outreach questions.

Keeping in mind that outreach and/or support for - from developing countries - for applicants from developing countries is also work that's ongoing with the CCTRT.

So topics we have here are looking at things like applicant guidebooks. Is that actually the best way to implement this program? And also should we have - is there a way to take everything that's in one guidebook and break it down into separate sections; one that would be just for the registry - the front end registry operators. That's all they had to pay attention to.

A separate section that's for registry service providers, a separate one for (escrow) providers so that maybe that makes it more manageable; maybe not; maybe that complicates things too much.

Things like clarity of the application process. How do we, you know, how can the application process avoid developing processes on an as needed basis?

So the clarifying question process was on that I think was very difficult for applicants.

It was also very difficult for the evaluators because I don't think they understood what necessarily they were looking for. And I don't think the criteria in the guidebook necessarily provided the appropriate amount of guidance for them to do the evaluations.

And then there were issues of well if we send out clarifying questions to a back end operator, we have to send them clarifying questions to every single application for which that back end operator supported.

Things like application processing. We talked about the overarching questions. If we come up with a solution as to how we want to do that whether it's (around) first come first serve then this work track would be the one to then operationalize that if there are any policy questions with respect to that.

Accreditation program. So one thing I've heard - mostly heard support for, although at the GDD Summit there were some comments that were not necessarily in full support of accrediting back end providers, was accreditation programs for those back end providers.

If that is the case and from a policy perspective we want to do that, this track then would - could kick it out to a technical committee to look at the implementation issues and so. So this - that accreditation program is in this work track.

Systems. This is a question of - and something we need to really look at the ICANN self-evaluation or the self-evaluation of the implementation review that they did but on the systems. I think they called it (CAS) was the initial one, the application system. And then there's the portal and then there's the centralized zone data file service. All of that are in this work track.

Application fees are also in this work track that - not to determine the actual cost of what we think the fee should be but the policy behind how do we set the cost. And then, as I said, support for applicants from developing countries.

I want to go on to like the second work track because this one's a harder one to figure out if there's anything missing without knowing what's in the other work tracks.

Work Track 2 is called the legal regulatory track. This one has everything in it from the base registry agreement to reserved names and the mechanism for releasing reserved names; (picks), which is also something that the CCTRT is looking at.

So this group will take the findings on safeguards and (picks) from CCTRT. It will look at registrant protections that are built into the - (if) open to the registry agreement, contractual compliance; difficult issue, registry, registrar separation or integration. I guess there are two sides of the same coin.

Looking at registrar non-discrimination. The - I can't remember TLD rollout what that was - what that referred to. I'll have to go back to the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Oh. Okay. So it's how long someone has to actually go live to get delegated, what that actually means. The second level rights protection - it should be RPMs. I don't know why it's Cs.

Again, that is actually really for the most part incorporating the findings and the recommendations of the Rights Protection Mechanism PDP Working Group. It could also look at some of the implementation issues.

So during their session for example, a couple of days ago it was brought up that, you know, who's going to look at the registry and registrar implementation issues.

And, you know, even if the policy - we all find that the policy behind the clearinghouse isn't - let's say didn't need any changes, did the implementation of those from a registry/registrar perspective meet the policy objectives?

So having a centralized Trademark Clearinghouse, have only one of those clearinghouses, did that achieve its objective? So that's something that will be in this group.

IGO/INGO protections. That's also being worked on by other groups so it's basically incorporating those findings. I missed the global public interest GAC advice safeguards, how that plays into the process.

And the final issue on here that we're - during the brainstorm was the closed generic issues. That was one that was after the fact. So you had registries applying for what some considered were generic terms that were ultimately decided had to - could not be closed. That if it meant the definition in Spec 11 that it was a generic type word, then that had to be opened up.

Well that was not from a policy development process that that came about. That was from an ICANN Board decision based on comments. Well we have the opportunity now to do the appropriate policy development. And we can if we choose revisit that issue and provide other advice to the Board either to maintain what they started or to make changes to that. So that I think is an important issue. Paul, you have a question.

Paul McGrady: Just a comment that -- Paul McGrady -- that that's an example of flexibility that I think was not based upon a safety or security principle. It was in fact I

think driven by somebody somewhere who had an agenda perhaps economic, perhaps political. I don't know.

But that's the kind of thing that I'm glad we're going to address this and let's brainstorm around that and also other things that maybe we should be able to predict in the next round so that we're not surprising people because that was a surprise and it wasn't pleasant.

Jeff Neuman: Just to clarify, which part was the surprise that people applied for closed generics or the reaction?

Paul McGrady: That people applied for closed generics using an applicant guidebook that did not prohibit closed generics and then on a surprise basis that they were prohibited. Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Paul. Any other comments? (Jordyn).

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes. Jordyn Buchanan with Google. I'm going to try to do this in a way that I don't sound like a broken record. So I totally agree with what Paul just said. I think it was surprising and I think it was a pretty good example of a strange version of flexibility being used.

But I also certainly, you know, we've expressed that I certainly agree that, you know, really - we really don't agree with the concerns around closed generics. Having said that, I think it's a really excellent example of something you don't need to fix before you can allow how (unintelligible) more TLDs because we have status quo in place for the moment and then work through this issue and say okay, right now we haven't worked it out.

It's still not allowed. And people can go ahead and apply. You know they're not allowed right now. And then later on if we work on that we think they're okay, then that's cool and we'll change the policy at that point. But we don't

need to get to it as a threshold matter in order to proceed before allocating any TLDs.

So I think somehow as you're going through these issues it's really important to triage them into ones that out to be sort of blockers versus ones that you can get to eventually.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Jordyn. I have Avri and then Susan.

Avri Doria: Yes. Quickly on - and this is a personal point of view. I join people having been totally shocked that it became an issue because I had always presumed that, you know, it was totally a thing that people would be doing. If they wanted to they would. And so it was very shocking that it became an issue.

I'm not sure that I agree that that's one that can be allowed to go on because if someone truly wants one, which some of us think from the (rgen) point that should have been allowed, they can't. And if they apply for anything now, they have to get it as an open.

And so it actually causes a gap in the ability of someone to apply for what they want as a closed generic when they're not allowed. So I'm not sure that I agree with your - that one - I tend to see it as one that really needs to be solved.

Jordyn Buchanan: I mean you're basically saying - if that's the mindset you take on, you're basically saying until everyone can have all the TLDs they want, no one can have any TLDs. Because you're saying there's this class of things that we haven't worked through and some people might want them and therefore no one can have any TLDs.

And there's always going to be some class of thing that we haven't worked out. And it's just going to lead to endless delay. And I would certainly say if

we really care about like the developing world and communities getting access to their TLDs, there's no good reason why we should care whether some big company like Google is allowed to have some generic term as a closed TLD or not.

And I just think it's incredibly damaging to the opportunities of the program to hold it up behind some of these sort of (edge cases), which is a relatively small number of applications for.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Jordyn and all good discussions to have inside this work track. Susan.

Susan Payne: Yes. I guess this is a discussion for (unintelligible). Susan Payne for the record. Completely agree. I don't think it was prohibited in the applicant guidebook so I completely agree with Jordyn and Paul on that. I strongly disagree with what Jordyn's saying about this is when you can park.

I think as far as I can recall that we've actually got a direction from the Board to address this. And I haven't been tracking whether they've all given up and opened up but there was some applicants who are hold outs who wanted to be closed generics and one of their options was to have to go on hold until the next round.

So I just don't think we can go oh well, tough guys, park it. We'll go with this some point when we've got more time.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Susan. Anyone else on this? (John).

(John): Just quickly. I absolutely agree with Susan on that. You know, it wasn't only the applicant of those TLDs that were held up, it was the applicant - other applicants that applied for the same TLDs that were held up when that was being worked through. So just as an issue of expediency we should deal with it now and not wait.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Any other comments on this one? Are there any items that are of a legal regulatory nature that you can conceive being included in this one? Or actually, before I ask that question, let me go through the other tracks and then perhaps there's additional items that we can then move around and - so that you see them all.

For Work Track 3 even though there's only a few bullet points, they are actually fairly large. Large items. So the first item was freed versus - freedom of expression versus GAC advice, community processes and reserved names. So I'm trying to remember because (I had) a short form for what was in the issue report. Do you remember everything behind all three of those?

I'm looking at Steve Chan. I guess I should stop looking at Steve is what he said. So we can go into more actual - what we'll do is one of the action items we should take away is actually provide more background on these bullet points when we break down these tracks.

Avri Doria: Yes. The first one had a lot to do with the sensitive name issue that came up in the cross community discussion yesterday. So - and such. So those were the whole basket of issues of names that were community names, names that were reserved because they were sensitive names, et cetera.

Jeff Neuman: And also in this is the fact that right now communities were only used as a prioritization mechanism. But if you were at the discussions yesterday as well, Mark Carvell from the U.K. - the U.K. GAC representative had brought up other aspects of looking at communities, which didn't just involve prioritization but it involved, you know, are there certain terms that should be reserved for a community and other rules that would apply to that.

Not just we use it as a prioritization mechanism. And if no one applies for it, we don't even look at the community factors, which is the way it was now.

Avri Doria: well and we also did have the community objections to the use of a community name. So we did look at it somewhat that any community was allowed to object to its name being used in a generic...

Man: (Right).

Avri Doria: ...TLD. So it wasn't that it was totally ignored. It wasn't necessarily reserved but they could object. And I don't know if any managed to knock down a thing for it but they certainly could be. Oh yes, okay. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry (John). A few of yours were knocked down. So that's the first item. Do you want to comment on that (John) or...

(John): Yes. Just on the reserved names. I think you got to be more explicit of - you're talking top-level reserved names here, right? So in the last one you talked about IGO/NGO names and that's more on the second level protection whereas you didn't talk about other geographic terms. You might want to add that.

So you're looking at Spec 5 in the last work stream and you're looking at what names are reserved on top level and this work stream it sounds like.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Yes. That's a good way - better way to describe it. Yes. Also in this one to the extent it's not first come first serve and to the extent that we - I'm sorry. I skipped a couple things.

String similarity evaluations. So this was both - was it - the standard was it confusingly similar to an existing string and now there's going to be a lot more existing strings than there were in the round for 2012 looking prior to that? Or was it similar to another application? You know, was that process fair, effective, predictable, efficient?

I think that there are a lot of comments on this. This also includes things like the plural versus singular issue. That was never truly resolved from a policy perspective. The Board did make certain - the Board relied on certain determinations that were made.

And there were certainly groups that were not exactly happy with how those came out. But there were others that were satisfied. So I think that's something that needs to be worked on and that's in this track.

Objections. So this is - involved all the different types of objections that there were. There were legal rights objections. There was also - well that's the next item. The independent objector. Community based objections. And I'm probably missing a few that were in the guidebook as well. But those – the public morality and order, whatever, it ended up being called – those types of objections.

So again, we need to review the rules around those, the standing – standing became an issue in some of the disputes, whether the parties – the right parties had standing. How much they cost. I know that a lot of people were surprised at the fees they had to pay especially with community-based objections. And in some of those they ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. So is there a better way to do it that maybe wouldn't cost that much?

Appeals, so in the past round in 2012 there were no appeal mechanisms – appeals mechanisms built in. Should that continue? Or should we have different types of appeals? Are the existing accountability or to the new accountability measures enough or should we have something else built in?

The role of the independent objectors, so we had an independent objector that was paid for by ICANN, file I think it was around 20 objections, and maybe succeeded in one or two, a few of them. We also had ALAC objections where there was one ALAC objection that was filed that was not

successful. Should that continue? If not, should it be replaced with something else?

Avri Doria: We could have also had GAC objections but I don't think they filed any but I think they could have if I remember correctly.

Jeff Neuman: Well there were, there was – yeah, there was GAC advice with respect to a couple of them. And then there's the community applications, community priority evaluations. That we can go on forever to talk about. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: A couple things that I don't see on here, and I'm not sure if they belong in here. I guess one belongs here and then maybe one is in Work Track 2. Perhaps in connection with objections, I know that there are a lot of questions raised about the training providing to panelists, which brings me to the broader point, which I think perhaps the ones in Work Track 2 and that is the extent to which it – we think it's appropriate to give guidance to ICANN in the selection of the providers.

I know that there was a lot of questions raised particularly in IRPs and requests for reconsideration about the process that was used for selecting the providers. You know, to what extent there may have been conflicts of interest inherent in the provider selection. That type of – and how those are addressed. So again, that might be better for Work Track 2 because I think it's broader than just objections. But it does seem like something that we would want to take a look at.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kristina. And I would add you said guidance on the selection of providers and maybe also the instructions that are given to providers on how to resolve in this case disputes, objections, etcetera. I think that's a good add. And I would initially park that in this work track when we revise these charts.

Anything else for this one? Okay, Work Track 4 is the one that was I guess combined – that was 4 and 5 if we – if you look back a few months ago. Oh I'm sorry, (Werner), sorry about that. I just see you now.

(Werner): I just wanted to add about the accountability mechanism, that those are accountability mechanisms for ICANN that were used essentially as litigation – they should have been between the parties. DotAfrica is one of the cases in point. And the delegation was stopped, you know, other cases as well, not because it would have been a reason specifically, the party that had won the proceedings could not proceed to delegation because of an accountability mechanism.

So I think we should link those mechanisms to the other subject that was never addressed and should be somewhere here, which is what about re delegating a delegated TLD, including possibly, because an earlier process, an earlier piece of litigation would actually come to conclusion shouldn't have been allocated in the way it was.

But it could also be because the community was affected by the party that operates the TLDs and the community has been disenfranchised and should be able to get redress from ICANN. This is something we have not addressed in this 2012 round but it should have been at some point, it will have to be because as it happened in ccTLDs, it might be a good idea to put in provisions for that in the new allocations of gTLDs.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, (Werner). Any other comments? Okay, for Work Track 4, this one is IDNs and technical and operational – or operations, it's cut off there. This one includes obviously, IDNs in universal acceptance is in here. Here, this group is not going to have to recreate the wheel. There are other PDPs in other working groups that are looking at IDN issues. There is a universal acceptance steering group, I think is what UASG stands for, that are working on the technical solutions for a universal acceptance. So there is other work that this work track can rely upon.

Security and stability issues, were the proper questions asked in the – this is referring to the questions that were asked of applicants. Were the proper questions asked to minimize the risk to DNS and ensure that applicants will be able to meet their obligations in the Registry Agreement?

This refers to, like I said, the questions in the technical and operational sections of the – I think it was an appendix to Chapter 2 of the Guidebook. So there are a number of technical questions that were asked but were these actually the appropriate questions? Are there other questions that should have been asked to the registries?

Should there be nonscored questions? This refers to the infamous Question 18. If so, how should they be presented? Should they have actually been evaluated in some capacity? I guess when it was initially – when applicants initially responded to Question 18 I don't think any of them envisioned Question 18 being used for anything other than for third parties to submit public comments but actually Question 18 was used for issues like the closed generic issue and other (unintelligible).

The use of that information be used in the evaluation? Should those actually be incorporated into a Registry Agreement? Right now anything an applicant said in Question 18 they're not held to any of that. Should they be held to all of it, some of it? If so, how?

Were the appropriate – proper criteria established to avoid technical instability? I guess that's sort of similar to the – a couple bullets above. Applicant reviews, technical, operational and financial, were the financial and technical criteria designed properly to allow applicants to demonstrate their capabilities while allowing evaluators to validate their capabilities?

So here you had, for those that went through the process, there were a lot of questions that if you asked applicants now they just kind of made up

numbers. There was no basis by which they put those numbers into the applications, including, you know, how many applications they would have, how much they'd be paying for each application, how much money they would – if they were offering, domains for sale, how much they would bring in so all that were kind of made up at the time but we do have data – some data now that we can use to perhaps much more narrowly tailor those questions.

And then here we also have name collision. So what measures may be needed to manage risks for the 2012 and – round beyond their two-year anniversary, is an issue for here as well as any other gTLDs. So this is the track that would look at the name collision issue, wouldn't start from scratch. There is a report out there on it. And so what do we do with the findings of that report?

And then the last track is actually not yet a track really, it's just are there subjects that do not require policy development but we could just kick off into some implementation guidance. So the extent that we say in Track 1 that accreditation programs are a good idea, perhaps if the answer is yes then we kick it to this Work Track 5 and they work on implementing that.

So are there any subjects that we've seen in – or that are not included in one of these tracks? Are there any subjects that should be moved around between tracks? I have Kristina first.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon registry. I'm not really quite sure whether they belong in 5 or somewhere else, but the three that I have thought of are the role of public comment in the application process because it wasn't very clear and I think it wasn't clear not only to people who operate within the community but to people external to it in terms of how they could comment, what would happen with the comments, you know, just kind of that whole universe.

A second area would be the application change process which I found really obtuse and difficult to follow. And I think there does need to be additional clarity on that.

And then the last one, which I actually think should go in this proposed Work Track 5, is that if the COI requirement is going to be maintained I think there – the whole letter of credit, I think was such a debacle. The amount of time that people spent trying to get letters of credit from their banks that ICANN considered to be acceptable, I mean, when you consider what the dollar value was of those letters of credit, I mean, just the amount of effort was just ridiculous.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kristina, I think those are three good areas that we did not mention so it's possible that it was in the issue report or the charter, we just didn't put it on the slides. If not, we will capture those areas and suggest a place that we think they fit in. Unless you want to suggest any places. But and then I'll let Kristina finish and then I'll go to Edmon.

Kristina Rosette: I don't have any strong feelings one way or the other. I mean, it seems that, you know, the letter of credit issue could go in 4 or 5 depending upon how you wanted to look at it. The public comment and the application change process, again, no strong feelings on those two.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I was just writing. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here. I thought the COI was included in 4 because it talks about the financial evaluation so I thought so but it probably didn't mean it but that might be a natural place to put it.

One thing about the implementation guidance, we spent a lot of time on the Policy and Implementation Working Group and created a report that was given to the Board. Has it been adopted? It has.

And then doesn't that framework satisfy what we want to do in terms of implementation guidance or do we need something, you know, additional to that? I guess is the question.

Jeff Neuman: So I'll let Avri address that and then I'll go to Donna.

Avri Doria: I think, for the most part, that's after we've done the policy, so that's basically you've got a policy and you've sent it forward. I think in this case we're looking about whether, as there was in the previous one, there's a bunch of implementation guidance that you want to give as part of the PDP recommendations. So I think they're sort of temporally different. One comes with the recommendations and one is once they've been approved and going forward.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. I have Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin. So, Kristina, the letter of credit thing was another issue that was discussed by staff in that efficiency – I can't remember the name of the report but the report they did. I think the change request process was also discussed. And I think, you know, staff have the same issue with the letter of credit that most of the applicants had so maybe there's some guidance in that too. So it's – if we do that review of that report then this is one of the issues that will probably fall out if it.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Donna. And what I had recommended, and again I'm taking comments, it was just a suggestion, was that each of – rather than having everybody review – I mean, everyone should read that report, I think it's actually well done and it's valuable. But I think each of the work tracks then should find the appropriate areas within that report and analyze those or use that to help you analyze your individual work tracks.

We have 10 minutes. Does anybody else have comments?

Christa Taylor: Christa Taylor. I think we might want to consider moving the rollout in Work Track 2 in the application processing in Work Track 1 together because if we decide that we – they're going to be either on a round or a continuous roll out one could have implications on the other. So tying the two together might make a lot more sense.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I was just making sure that Steve was capturing all this. Yes, thank you. Okay. Is there – okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. So is there anybody else with any other items? Okay so what we will then do is we will put in some of the revisions, make sure we'll also try to put in some clarifications as to what some of these subjects actually were because it's abbreviated here. And then what I'd like to do is start – is start opening up just expressions of interest or just to get people to sign up for the different areas.

And then once we, you know, look at the groups, hopefully we have a good breakout in each group, look at any groups that need other help and look at the breakout and distribution and then try to have people in those – within those groups volunteer for a leadership role in there. And then they'll decide, I think, how often the subgroup meetings should be in order to get their work done and help develop work plans within those individual tracks to make sure that we progress in a timely manner.

I don't know if anyone – Avri, you want to...

Avri Doria: Yeah, so all of that and also though we have, for example, set a sort of block sample schedule for all of these, but we would want to ask the groups to then look at the work before them and sort of figure out. The other thing I want to point out is, wow, there may be a strong desire to participate in many of these, try and divide it among yourselves if there's many of you in a company

because otherwise scheduling becomes totally impossible, especially if we add it to the scheduling, everybody else is already in in other groups, so try to spread the wealth.

And the last thing is these groups will only be making recommendations to the full PDP working group so it's not like if you're not in the group you've lost all chance to comment on it, it will all come back to the group so I just wanted to get those three things said.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. And one thing we could also do if – because I know that there are a lot of people that like to pay attention and at least see what every other group is doing, we could look at a notion of creating observers for these groups just to be on the mailing list. But have a differentiation between those that are going to actively participate and those that just want to be included on the emails.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that's part of the whole thing of stealing wholesale from CCWG in terms of how they're doing stuff. Because it really looks like it's working on a massive project and a way of doing things. It seems like it's a working scheme and I love stealing process.

Jeff Neuman: Any questions?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: We skipped the Question 5? The proposed question so did we – I think we already asked them.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So are there any we missed in here? So I think that once we break out into the work tracks, to the extent that that was raised like Christa raised a point of one may be dependent on another, they're may be things within work tracks

or between work tracks that maybe dependent on each other and so we'll obviously want to make sure that the work track leaders are communicating with each other on any of those dependencies to the extent that those exist.

And let me look at the last one. Is there any value in attempting to determine which topics are most important to resolve, assign a level of importance? I think that's – we can do once we break into the work tracks. So as far as the next meeting, I think it's not going to be this next – what are we Mondays – not this next Monday, you have that week off, but we will try to meet on the following Monday, which I believe is the 11th of July? So you have a week off to enjoy or two weeks off – almost two weeks. And thank you for coming and participating.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. Thank you.

END