
BARCELONA – GAC: New gTLDs Work Tracks 1 - 4
Sunday, October 21, 2018 – 09:30 to 10:15 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

MANAL ISMAIL:

Good morning, everyone. And welcome to the GAC session on new gTLD subsequent procedures; this is agenda item 9 if you would like to check your GAC briefs. And the session is scheduled for 45 minutes. We have Jeff Neumann with us here, co-chair of the subsequent procedure PDP working group, so thank you Jeff for being here with us. I hope you had the time to look into the briefs and if not, Tom please, if you can take us quickly through the report of the subsequent procedures have been put for public comments. There were GAC submission for this basically based on previous GAC advice, so nothing really surprising I hope. And Tom, please over to you.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Manal. Good morning, everybody. The GAC has two sessions today dealing with work on new gTLD policies. This session deals with the PDP working group which is looking at what they have termed work tracks 1 to 4, and we will go through some of the issues in a moment. Later today there is also a session for the GAC dealing with geographic names which is in another work track, Work Track 5, and that's running at the moment on a separate track, but it is still part of the overall policy development process working group. So this is not about geographic names, that's later today. This is about everything else.

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.

And as you may have noticed from the substantial briefing material that's been circulated to the GAC on these issues since the meeting in Panama city, there is quite a bit of work here which has significant public policy implications. Just three points quickly before handing over to Jeff Neumann, who's one of the co-chairs of the PDP working group. The first point is that, as Manal said, there was a GAC import, a GAC submission to the public comment process on the initial report that the PDP work tracks 1 to 4 had posted and that GAC submission were a small number of comments we received from GAC members, but there were no major objections and there was also some input from the GAC public safety working group on relevant issues and that input is contained verbatim in the briefing document that you have.

It covered 13 issues, and provided a GAC view on those, some of them relating to previous GAC advice and inputs going back some time. Very quickly those issues were further releases of new gTLDs at all. Predictability, different types of TLD's, global public interest including safeguards that the GAC has previously been involved in developing applicant freedom of expression, applicant support, particularly for developing countries and regions. Auctions for names and strings of reserve names, closed, generic names and competition issues, string similarity that is plurals, and potential confusion, ways of a program of applicant reviews and accreditation particularly from a security point of view, the role of the GAC including GAC early warnings, and other objections that the GAC may wish to or has previously used in the application process, and finally community based applications. So those are all covered in the document and you've seen those.

The GAC's draft response has found a response several times over the last 6 weeks. The report of the ICANN review of competition consumer trust and consumer choice has recently been released and is also out for public comment. There is clearly some common ground between that review, which is an ICANN review provided for in the bylaws, and this PDP which is a GNSO process. Sorry to start talking ICANN speak, but it's important in this area. The CCT review report on which the GAC was represented has not yet been substantively discussed by the GAC but we have provided you with some very basic briefing on what it says.

And finally, we have flagged for this morning's session the question once again because we have discussed this with the PDP before of future GAC engagement with this work, how best to do it, and specifically the GAC's response to a request from the co-chairs of that group for a nominee liaison for the next phase of their work, and in that respect there are still really I guess some outstanding issues for the GAC to consider because we don't have any specific proposal on the table for a liaison or group of specific individuals yet. So those are the issues that we had flagged to be covered. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Tom. So, basically this is where we currently stand, so the initial report is out. The GAC, again, initial comments have been posted. I understand the report already has so many questions, so it's more of a consultation thing if I may say, so now if there are any specific questions from GAC members to Jeff or any questions from Jeff to us regarding the submission, but also how the different tracks are

going to ultimately merge? I mean we have tracks 1 to 4 now. There is also Work Track 5 on geographic names, the CCT review teams final report is also out. So it may be also good to see how things are going to proceed forward. So Jeff, yes please.

JEFF NEUMANN:

Thank you. Again, I'm Jeff Neumann, one of the two co-chairs, overall co-chairs for the subsequent procedures policy development process working group. If Cheryl Langdon Orr is in the room, she may be presiding over some ALAC meetings that are in conflict, but if she's in the room, I'm just looking around to see. Okay, well, so I will try to take all these for the both of us.

Maybe I'll start with just an update of where we are, and the plans as Manal, you had mentioned, as to how we go forward with all of this. So, as was mentioned, the initial report was released in July, and the comment period lasted through the end of September. We received somewhere around 70 comments, which is generally a lot of comments for a policy development process, but the real striking difference between the comments that we saw for this PDP and others was, all the comments were very comprehensive, including the GAC submission, so it's not just the number of comments that we got, but really the quality and the depth of issues that were covered with all of the comments. So we really appreciate all the comments that we received, and so the next step for the working group -- and I know everyone just got used to the work track 1 through 4 and Work Track 5 terminology -- we've now done

away with that, at least with work tracks 1 through 4. And we are creating three sub groups to review the comments that have come in.

So sub group A will be looking at the comments that relate to the overall issues, things as the secretariat had mentioned, predictability, should there be new gTLDs, all of the foundational issues as well as issues that involve what we call preapplication process, so applicant support, outreach, those comments that relate to those topics will now be through something called sub group A.

Sub group B will be looking at all the comments related to the application itself, so submitting the application, the evaluation of applications. We will look at the contract for the applications that come in.

And then finally the sub group C will look at everything that happens after the application and evaluation submissions; so objections, disputes, it will look at how the accountability mechanisms interact with the new gTLD process.

So those are the three sub groups that for the next several months will be looking at all the comments to try to analyze them, really with the goal of trying to see which elements the community has agreed with, so which recommendations or options that were presented were agreed with, which recommendations require some additional work, and other recommendations or topics that we need to do some significant amount of work to get agreement on. So that's what's happening for the review of the initial report.

So, in addition to the comments from the initial report, we realized that as we were drafting that initial report there were some issues that we felt were not covered adequately in the initial report itself, but needed to have some additional work done, and so for the past several months while each of the groups were working on their public comments, we realized that there were five issues that we wanted to discuss, and ultimately came to the conclusion that we are going to release shortly what we're calling a supplemental initial report on these five issues.

And the five issues are what are called the mechanism of last resort, which some also think of as the -- at the very end of the day, if there's contention amongst candidates or applicants for a particular string, at the very end of the day as we know in the 2012 round there were ICANN auctions, and in your comments you do make a few comments on the fact of ICANN auctions, but we felt like we needed to go into some more detail about different options that may exist other than doing auctions or even different types of auctions. So the first area of the supplemental initial report will cover those different options for the mechanism of last resort.

A second area which is related to that is in the guide book, in the applicant guide book for 2012 what it said was that before it even got to an ICANN auction, parties or applicants were encouraged to try to work out contention sets amongst themselves. And it didn't really provide any kind of guidance as to how parties could work out differences amongst themselves or what they could do, and there were some significant rules that maybe got in the way of trying to resolve contention sets privately.

So while there was this provision in the guide book that said you should try to resolve issues of contention amongst yourselves, it also said that you weren't allowed to change your applications significantly, you weren't allowed to change your strings for example. So there's an example of the top level domain .SAS and I'm able to talk about this because the person who was representing that applicant came forward to the group, so we can share this.

There were two applicants for .SAS. One was the airlines, SAS Airlines, and the second one was a company in the United States called SAS, but they do software and analytics, and so both applications were submitted and when they realized that there were two competing applications for the same string, they got together, they negotiated an agreement, which that part is private and confidential and we don't know the details of that agreement, but at the end of the day one of the applicants, the airlines, ended up withdrawing their application and the software analytics company ended up keeping their application in.

So there is some arrangement between those two entities. We don't know what that arrangement is, but we know that they were able to negotiate some sort of arrangement. What was not available as a choice to these two applicants was the potential or possibility of either merging their applications together to either jointly run a .SAS top level domain. That was not an option that was available under the guide book. Nor was there an option for the two parties to get together and say, "Well okay, why doesn't the airline take .SAS air or something like that, and why doesn't the analytics company take .SAS software or .SAS analytics," because you are not allowed to change your strings.

So this topic talks in the supplemental report about that, plus the notion of private auctions, and one of the concerns that came through in the comments to the initial report from several parties, including the ICANN Board who submitted a comment, was that they were concerned that in the next round there may be applicants that submit applications for the sole purpose of losing their contention sets through a private auction, but still making money because in a private auction what happened was -- and this is not the ICANN auction, but in the private auctions that were done without ICANN involvement, a number of those auctions involved the losing parties getting paid the fee that ultimately the winning party had bid, and so there were some applicants that significantly benefited financially from losing a contention set.

So this second part of the supplemental report deals with that subject and potential options, including everything from allowing those private auctions to continue on one side of the spectrum, to you know, let's ban private auctions completely because we doesn't think that that's in the public interest. So there's lots of discussions going on about that.

And then the last three areas which are important but not as controversial deal with providing a little bit more detail about the role of public comments and how that impacts evaluations, and objections, and everything else in the new gTLD process, what changes are allowed to be made to applications. So in the section on private resolution, I talked about major changes like changing a string or merging applications, but because of the length of time it took to evaluate the applications and go through the process, there were key personnel

from these applicants, directors or officers that left, new officers coming in, there were other types of changes that ICANN had to deal with throughout this process. And so to put some sort of formal process around how an applicant makes changes, when the community is provided an opportunity to comment on those changes and when they're not, when it's more administrative and it doesn't necessarily have to go out for public comment.

And then finally the last subject is one that was a more difficult subject to talk about because it was one that generally is not policy related but more of a commercial or -- well, commercial impact in the sense that there were some registries that because they were smaller, maybe involved a smaller community, were not intended to be large top level domains that didn't have as much success in attracting registrars either because of geography or again because it was a small TLD, they weren't able to attract registrars to distribute their domains and therefore it was difficult for those registries to market and distribute their names. And so this last section goes into possibilities or potential options for assistance or help that ICANN or the community could give for those smaller top level domains.

Again, it's a tougher area because it doesn't necessarily involve policy, and it gets more into the operations of a registry as opposed to what we normally deal with day to day.

So that supplemental initial report will hopefully come out next week, so after the ICANN meeting, and there will be a 40 -- basically, a 6 week comment period; 42 days to comment on those, and I realize it's a very

busy time and there will be lots of other things that are out for comment but we would love if you all could submit any comments, and I understand it's a fairly short amount of time, and some of the materials are covered by comments you made during the initial report, so you don't have to submit those again because we are keeping track of those and will make sure that those get considered, but if there are additional thoughts that any one has, whether individually as governments or collectively as the GAC, on those issues, certainly we would love to get that input, and consider that. So that's another item we're working on.

And finally, we will talk more about Work Track 5 and geographic names later this afternoon, but they are on a timeline to release an initial report somewhere towards the mid to late part of November for public comment that will likely go into the beginning of next year, and the hope is that when comments come back for that, that we'll join together as far as our timelines to be able to produce a final report by the end of the second calendar quarter, so hopefully by the June ICANN meeting, in Marrakech I believe is the June meeting.

So that's the goal, is to get a final report to the council by that period of time, and then the council will take that report, will then approve that report hopefully, and then it will go to the Board for consideration, and then like all GNSO policy development processes, the Board will do its own comment period and then implementation work will or could start at that point. So that's the goal.

One of the other subjects you mentioned was that we have noticed that the CCT review team, the consumer choice competition trust report has

come out. As was noted, some of those recommendations are integral into our work, so as the GAC noted in its comments, we as a policy development process, our group did not look into the success or failure of top level domains. We were relying on the CCT review team to do that. They have come out with their report, they have made some finding, we'll incorporate those findings after the Board -- technically, the Board has to take that report and it has, put it out for comment, which it's out for comment now. We'll discuss that and then approve that, and once the Board approves that, our assumption is that the Board will follow what the review team has recommended, which is to refer some of those issues to our group, and at that point we will incorporate the findings and any additional work into the final report or at the time that we issue our final report, we will issue our final report and then say additional work needs to be done on certain areas, if we haven't done that already.

So I know I've taken up some time but I just wanted to give a breakdown of everything that we're working on so that there is some understanding of timeline, and on timeline, if it follows what we have said, just to get everyone thinking several steps ahead, if everything goes according to plan, then an implementation work starts towards the third quarter of next year, 2019, again calendar quarter. So July, Summer in the northern hemisphere, winter in the southern hemispheres. Then implementation work generally takes or could take up to a year, so you're looking at 2020, 2021 for a launch.

So if everyone could pretty much have that -- to some people it sounds very far away, to others it sounds very close, but to put it into

perspective of the whole program you're talking nearly a decade between the launch of the last round and the launch of this one, so thank you. Happy to take questions.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Jeff, for the informative update, for the very interesting examples and also for sharing with us the planned way forward. So, I have a couple of questions, but give a chance for the floor first. Netherlands please, and then Iran.

NETHERLANDS:

Thank you, Jeff, and thank you others for this presentation. I have a question which is probably opportune to have it now on the table. You talked about the things you were discussing, what I wonder is how these are structured in your report or what is going to come out in this let's say initial working group or working group on the new TLDs because I think there are a couple of things which apart from geographic names are important for the GAC.

And what I would like to advise is that these things get their own topic heading in your work, and I hope not being somewhere hidden in text something. And I think just following from the GAC principles on new gTLDs to the last comments we made, I think there are like a couple of things, but maybe it's good to have them as a heading, very much explicitly there, and I'm talking about for example the safeguards and how they are being implemented in contracts and [inaudible] etc.

The second thing would be the question of categories, new categories. I think the early warning system is something we worked very hard on in the initial periods and I think the colleagues will I think echo that this is an important part of the new gTLD process. And finally the community based applications, so maybe we are now still in time, maybe this is a good moment to have them in somehow separated and somehow more let's say dedicated in your reporting. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Netherlands. Would you like to respond first, or we can take Iran and then -- okay, Iran please go ahead.

IRAN:

Thank you, Manal. Thank you, Jeff. You are the architect of this process devotedly and enthusiastically and tirelessly working on this for at least as far as I remember, two and a half years. What I could say, complex. Very complex. Very complex to grasp and very complex to analyze and to react. You have work tracks 1 to 4, except 5, which is another animal. Working almost every week, one hour, one hour 45 minutes, we cannot follow.

Public comment, 175 pages, I don't know how many pages you have, even if it's difficult to have one reading, even difficult; we have requested of you in our previous meeting, please provide an executive summary but not background nor introduction. Executive summary to draw to the attention of the main point that you expect or require some feedback in order to enable us to do that.

I said in a previous meeting, I do not have any problem to say it again. GAC is only almost active when in session. Between the session, people are in many many other engagements. Some of them they do, some of them they don't do, but all of them are together in session. So we have to have some opportunity, which are the areas that we have; auctions put it aside because they are other things we don't really understand, in favor of those who have money. You have more money than you can buy [inaudible]. One of the last 130 million dollars for that so on and so forth.

So we don't want to go too much to [inaudible]. But the other one is important, like safeguard, like the community based, and many others and so on and so forth, so please we would like to know which areas are really critical, at least for government or advisory committee, to comment.

And my last question is that -- I forgot, please refresh me how many public comments you have? If it is one, it is not sufficient. Usually, usually you have two, usually. Sometimes maybe three. Usually you have two. For such a thing is very very important since 2012 and the start of the next year at the third quarter, which makes it very difficult for people, particularly for those countries like Africa and others that are behind the scene in the first round. They should really understand and so on and so forth, we need to have more opportunity for public comments. You should not rush. We have been 2012. This is one year after. We are six years after. Doesn't matter if there will be another 4 months or another 3 months. Please kindly consider that.

And the last thing I would say. Unfortunately, unfortunately, you have the work track, very good. And then you have a general meeting. At the general meeting we try to comment. We were not allowed to comment. They said that no, we can't take any comment. We just want to see whether the activities of the work track are properly reflected. And they told us, including me, "If you have comment, public." Why? If I am not given the opportunity when you have the general meeting to comment when it is fresh, and I have some comment, and my comment was rejected, what is the usefulness of the general meeting? You just give the report to the chief or head of that track saying that please, consider whether everything you said is reflected.

Why you have this formality to having the general meeting to not allow the people to talk? I asked and on three times I was interrupted by the chair of the group. No, Mr. Arasteh, no Kavouss. No time for that. If you have any comment, public comments. This is some sort of deficiency. You should allow the people. They spend the time. Three o'clock in the morning, Jeff, in Europe. Three o'clock in the morning you have the meeting sometimes and we are wake up and we go but we are not allowed to talk. What does that mean? Please kindly reconsider the matter. Allow a general meeting for those people who will not have the opportunity to go on this specific work track. At least let the document; I come at your general meeting, allow them to comment. You want to improve the situation. This is a big deficiency. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Iran. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMANN:

Thank you, Kavouss, and to the Netherlands. Let me just respond to those. On the comments from the Netherlands, we've covered those. It wasn't our intention to hide those areas, so we will do a better job with headings, and make sure that they stand out a little bit more. I think in our final report we can certainly do that and structure it so it's much easier to find those areas, and we certainly recognize that due to the complexity of the new gTLD program and how everything was covered under this one policy development process, we tried to take different topics and do only you know between at most 5 or 6 pages on those topics, but when you take you know 40 to 50 topics and each one is 5 to 6 pages, now you have a full report of hundreds of pages.

And kind of related to the other comments, we did have an appendix to that report that only had the recommendations and the questions that we were seeking input. We were hoping that that was helpful in order to provide feedback, but we can certainly go back and take a look at that and see what we can do better for the next round. And related to that on the comment periods, we've already had three comment periods for this policy development process. We are having another one with respect to the supplemental report, so at least one more. And so that will be four comments for this one policy development process. And you know, depending on our review, so I can't really predict how the review will go of the comments, but there may be additional opportunities for comment on specific areas. So I will certainly or we will certainly keep the GAC up to date on any comment periods or things that we believe will go out for public comment.

On the comments on the kind of, I'll call them rules of engagement for the initial report, we had been meeting as subteams or work tracks for about a year and a half, and so those issues were for the most part discussed thoroughly at those work track level, and for the initial report -- and I'll talk about the final report in a minute -- but for the initial report, we brought everyone back together in the full group to just combine all the work of the work tracks because we weren't taking a consensus call on the recommendations. We were just providing a comprehensive report, and so that's why it may have seemed like we weren't taking comments and asking people to comment during the comment period.

However, going forward, these subteams that we've created for analyzing the comments, are really just doing that. They're analyzing the comments that were received trying to indicate to the full group where patterns may have emerged. So let's say you know everyone that's submitted comments agreed with this particular recommendation. So we recommend to the full group that you consider adopting that recommendation. Or nobody agreed of the comments submitted; maybe two comments agreed with it, but 68 of them disagreed. So we recommend not moving forward with that.

At the point when the sub groups then merged back into the final group, every recommendation will be discussed by the full working group, consensus calls will be taken by the full working group, and so we hope that for the full calls going forward, that certainly all input will be accepted, but also we would encourage anyone that -- and I know it takes up a lot of time, as Kavouss had mentioned, and I'm on all of these

calls, so you know, we do use the email lists and we do take comments from the email lists extensively, so if you can participate during the sub group, that's great. If you can't, that's fine too. Because at the end of the day all the recommendations, everything will go to the full group to discuss comprehensively.

And on that note, as was mentioned by the secretariat, there is a call for a liaison, or one or more liaisons from each of the groups, including the GAC, not to serve in any kind of formal capacity but more so that if the working group or the sub groups have a particular question on a comment that may have been made from the GAC or to just see if perhaps that liaison could take back a proposed recommendation, to see if there's any informal feedback, it's really just to have one or several people to turn to, to run ideas by or to ask questions of so that they can come back and get answers to the PDP working group.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Jeff. I have Switzerland, and Belgium next. So Switzerland please, and EBU, thank you.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you so much, Manal, and good morning, Jeff. Hello, nice to see you here again. I'll be very brief. You will have seen that although after the deadline, the GAC has made an input with 13 points, and so I think that it's important to stress that those points are perhaps not unanimous but it's gone through a consensus procedure in the GAC, so

I think it's very important not to look at them quantitatively like one other of the 79 inputs but the government input. I know you know it.

And I think this liaison function, although I personally, I'm not available for that because of resource issues, I would be available to help in that, but I think it's a very good idea to get this feedback loop working, which we have commented so many times in these kind of bilateral meetings, so I think that is a good idea we should work on.

And finally this is a plea to you, to our leadership, and also to ICANN staff who are listening to us, please make sure that the PDP working group sessions are not conflicting with GAC meetings because it's really impossible to be in two places at the same time. With Work Track 5, I think that we have a meaningful way of doing things, but of course the other work tracks are also very important, but you cannot be in the opening of the GAC and in the work track 1 to 4, or whatever they are called now. So those are my inputs, and thanks again very much.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Jorge. So I have Belgium, I have EBU, and I have Iran again. Canada. And we have one minute. Som let's try to be efficient. Belgium, please.

BELGIUM:

Thank you, Manal. So very briefly. Of course, all of us know how difficult some of the discussions were at the beginning of this process for new delegations, so we are trying to avoid future conflicts. These are my two questions for Jeff. Are you considering fees? Are you looking at the

more regulated sectors? There were a lot of discussions about .bank, .game, sectors that are highly regulated where consumers have to be protected or children have to be protected. And I would also like to second the Netherlands' comments regarding the community based applications. Those are very difficult to deal with. What I'm concerned about is the auctions. I think that leave in the delegation of a TLD to many issue goes against the public interest. Thank you.

EBU:

Thank you, I'll try to be brief. The first is, I already asked in the past but has not been taken over. We are discussing policy matters in absence of data. We don't know exactly on the previous gTLD round what worked well, what failed, what didn't work. So whenever we discuss public policy in any other field, first we know all this essential data as a matter for taking policy decision, while here this data are not provided as an element for discussion.

Second point is, after the initial report has been closed down, the Board has taken a certain number of decisions on conflict resolution that established some principles that contradict the initial guidelines of 2012, or at least given an evolution of the interpretation of those rules. Are you trying in the next steps of this reflection to take lessons from the jurisprudence that ICANN has been set up? Because I think it's very important to take into account and in the current draft I don't see this. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, EBU. I have Canada and Iran. Canada, please.

CANADA: Thank you, chair. Just a very short question following up on the previous intervention. I'm wondering how the results of the final report of the CCT review are going to be taken into consideration because this was intended to be a review of the previous round in lessons learned to help guide the future round and just wondered how this is going to be taken into account. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Canada. And final question from Iran, please.

IRAN: [Speaking in French] [Interpreter Speaking] Iran speaking. Manal, this is a proposal. I suggest that the GAC should set up a working group between ICANN63 and 64 that will focus on preparing suggestions for the next GAC meeting in order to know what are the recommendations that we agree on, which recommendations pose some difficulties for us and which these difficulties are, and in the meantime if possible the comments on the recommendations we have problems with should be handled through a group that can be in contact with Jeff. Without this group, we won't be able to analyze or discuss all the recommendations, and it is dangerous to say that we agree or we disagree.

We need to provide details. We need to show our rationale to explain why we don't agree with certain recommendations and what the

difficulties are. That is my proposal. Otherwise we won't have enough time to deal with all of them. As my friend Jorge said, I don't have time to be a liaison to this group. I hold many meetings every week, so I don't have the time available to be in that function, but I agree to be part of a GAC group that could have this kind of discussion, so please consider this possibility of setting up a working group within GAC. I think that is the only useful thing that we could do. Thank you, Jeff, for your presentation. I compliment you for that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

If we can have quick answers to -- Jeff please, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMANN:

Okay, very quickly; hopefully I don't talk too quickly because I know we're over. I will go backwards I guess in the order of questions. So I endorse Kavouss's suggestion for a working group. And to the extent you need or would like for Cheryl -- I'll volunteer Cheryl and I to help you the with anything, certainly we would do whatever we can to assist that group, if you need it. I think that's a great suggestion.

The comment on the CCT review team, I think we've been in communication with the CCT review team pretty much throughout their work, and so we've pretty much have known the recommendations that were coming or have paid attention to it because it was a public archive, and transparent anyway.

So we've been taking them into consideration already, but there are a few that have been referred to us that we now are going to dive into

more detail, so while we think we've addressed some of them or are in the process of addressing some of them, we recognize that we need to now do some work on some additional ones and whether they can wait until after our final report on the other subjects or not, is something we are discussing now internally because I think we got the report in the last week or so. So we'll give you an update on how we are going to do that in the next couple of weeks.

On data, so as the CCT review teams noted and other groups have noted, in a lot of cases there just is not that data out there, so some of our recommendations are to make sure that contracts in the future allow for the collection of certain types of data.

For other areas, we do believe we have enough data, but to the extent that you think or anyone thinks that there's additional data that we should be collecting, we ask during every working group call whether individuals or members or participants can think of other sources of data that we could try to get or at least look into. That's certainly always a running topic, and certainly to the extent there's any additional data we could collect, I think that's great.

Just inherent in the question that you asked I think it was, how do we judge success of the program? The CCT review team did conclude that they think it helped competition. They think in some other areas it was difficult to tell, so we're relying on some of that to an extent and we are hoping that for future rounds we can get additional types of data to do much more of an objective assessment of some of those factors.

Finally, on some of the other questions, certainly we got comments on the regulated industries, on sensitive strings; the comments from .pharmacy or national association boards of pharmacy and verified or validated TLD's, we're taking it into consideration.

And I agree wholeheartedly with the comments from Switzerland. I would love to have no conflicts and to be able to do a deep dive on all of these issues. I have no control over that, but I endorse those recommendations fully and hopefully we can do that. And intersessionally, I mean I'll again volunteer Cheryl and I, and I'm sure I'll hear it from Cheryl afterward, but certainly to the extent you want to do any kind of intersessional calls or webinars or anything else you want to do, we are happy to make ourselves available.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Perfect. Thank you very much, Jeff, and thank you everyone for making this interactive. The following session should start at half past, so let's take 10 minutes break and come at 10:35 so that we can start our internal GDPR discussion before we receive IPCN -- NCSG, I'm sorry. So, thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]