
ICANN80 | PF – GNSO: NCSG Policy Committee Work Session
Tuesday, June 11, 2024 – 15:30 to 17:00 KGL

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello and welcome to the NCSG Policy Committee session. My name is Andrea, and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand and zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute and zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now turn the floor over to Tomslin. You may begin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Andrea. And just before I begin, Andrea, is it possible to bring the agenda up? Thanks. And while that's coming up, thanks everyone for coming to the session today. We usually have this before the council meeting every month and we do have a council meeting coming up tomorrow, so we thought we should have it today, despite it being the last one for the day. So, pardon me if you're too tired to listen to what we're going to discuss today.

We have a packed agenda, so we'll jump straight into it. We'll start with some discussion items before we actually go to review the council agenda. If you can see on the agenda that's on the screen, the council

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.

agenda comes around agenda item five, but there are some items that we might move forward quickly on, like agenda four, because we've had updates to that yesterday. But I'll jump to item number two, which is related to a letter from the board to the GNSO regarding one of the recommendations on the subsequent proceed final report, recommendation number 18, and this specifically deals with a separate timeline for the resolution of urgent requests that may pose an imminent threat to life or infrastructure or child exploitation request to registrars and registries to the contracted parties.

Now this letter, I sent it to the mailing list, and the request that the letter informs the council that the recommendation is not feasible to be implemented, and is asking the council to consider what can be done, considering that the board has already adopted this recommendation, and the IRT, that is the implementation review team, has sort of decided that it cannot be implemented.

The board is seeking thoughts from the council, so I thought, because the councilors will be discussing this tomorrow, I thought I'll hear from NCSG what they think about it. But before I open the floor for comments, I just wanted to add two things or two additional context items to this. Now one is the fact that the recommendation as written does not say that this recommendation must be implemented. It does say it should be considered, which means that if, and the things to be considered are timeline and criteria for urgent requests, and the IRT has considered these two things already. So, which means that there are some things that the IRT has addressed the recommendation as written.

So, it doesn't need to be removed per se, or rejected. And the other thing is that coming from another council informal session, we've just been talking about how the board also has the ability to call for an EPDP. So, that could have been a mechanism that could be used to address this. So, the board could initiate that as well. So, which would not require council input to this as they've requested for our comments. So, the council will deliberate this tomorrow and send a letter back to respond to the letter, but I'll open it now to NCSG, to you guys and see if anyone has comments or questions.

ANDREA GLANDON: Tomslin, Rafik has his hand up in Zoom too, just so you know.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Rafik?

RAFIK DAMAK: Hi, this is Rafik speaking, can you hear me?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, we can hear you.

RAFIK DAMAK: Yeah, thanks Tomslin for the summary. So, the situation that we have in the approved recommendation by the board that it cannot be implemented according to the IRT and we don't have an existing

mechanism on how to deal with that because that was approved already. So, it's not at that stage that we can be sent back to the council or asking for guidance and so on.

As I proposed in the main English, I do believe the right approach here is EPDP because the scope is quite clear, you don't need an issue report because you have a clear question that you need to answer and I think it's always the right approach to start from the beginning here in terms of making a recommendation. So, avoid any small group or whatever that can give that sense of false efficiency and go with EPDP because I think the charter, the scope, everything will be quite limited, narrow, that it can, I believe, finish within a few months. If just we'd focus on those specific questions that cannot be implemented.

Another point and something maybe really, we do need to be discussed in the future, kind of long term, is that we have to review the kind of the life cycle here and to think how we can do all the kind of impact assessment, feasibility study or like what we have the EPDP at early stage or during the discussion of the working group to avoid such situation as much as possible. Of course, there is always risk that at the implementation level and so on, we can find some problem, but it's better to take more preventive action and try at early stage to have those kinds of question after we get the policy recommendation and that open the door of all kind of ad hoc approach and so on.

So, again, I just advise going with EPDP and if that's also what the board think about, I believe that would be the right way and just it's more discussing about the kind of parameters and start from there.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Tomslin. Manju speaking. So, I think at the constituency level, first we really have to consider if we think the board's request or their proposal to walk back from the decision is acceptable because I think during the EPDP phase one, we were with registries and registrars of this recommendation that it should be several days instead of hours and I don't think we have walked back from that position either. And we heard from the informal session too that the registries and registrar, they didn't think it's necessary to walk back from these recommendations.

So, if we join force with them, we don't really have to walk back from this decision and EPDP. Well, shouldn't be happening because there's no walking back from this decision. So, I think we have to first discuss within our constituencies whether we think it's necessary to walk back. If it's not, then we can join registries and registrar to tell the council that no, we don't think this is a walk backable recommendation. We think it should be implemented as it was written in the recommendations. We know your concerns, but we have our concerns too and we think balancing these concerns, your concerns are like manageable. That could be our response too. So, within NCSG, we have to decide first whether--, yeah, thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks Manju. And I absolutely agree. NCSG has to decide whether they support the walking back step to start with. I just know that we have some board members in the room. And I think if Becky doesn't mind, she could--, I think she has some comments too.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. And I'm sorry for interrupting your meeting, but I just want to make sure we all are on the same page here. As you know, the GAC asked the board to hold the urgent request provision in the registry data, registrant data policy. Because the recommendation that came out of EPDP phase one was actually to consider establishing a different timeline for urgent requests. And urgent requests were defined as imminent threats to life, critical infrastructure, and an imminent threat of child trafficking. So, really serious problems.

There was a debate in the public comment. It came out as a respond within, insert the day, number of days, bracket. That's what the draft language that was put out for consultation said. And there was massive disagreement among the parties about what the number of days should be with the GAC saying 24 hours and the contracted parties saying three, or most of the registrar saying three business days. And there was what we thought was a compromise that was generally within 24 hours, but, if necessary, two additional business days and one additional business day. The GAC said that's just not okay.

When we went back and looked at this, I am not sure even that three business days is an implementable number. Because if you get a request for personal information from law enforcement that you don't

know, it's not in your jurisdiction, you have to, in most cases, certainly most places where there are data protection laws, and absolutely under any kind of fair information practices, you have an obligation to ensure that you know that you are actually being asked for data from the law enforcement agency that says they're requesting it.

That takes time, especially because it's almost always going to be in a foreign jurisdiction. So, what the board was really saying was, we don't see how there can be a policy that is fit for purpose, absent some system for authenticating law enforcement. Now, to be clear, even if you can authenticate law enforcement, there are going to be plenty of times when you say, no, we're not going to give you the data because it's against the law where you live to do that, or because you are concerned about human rights or any number of reasons. But in order to respond, you simply have to know whether you're dealing with somebody who is a law enforcement agent that they've told you.

So, actually, in this case, it would be possible for the council just to say to the board, thank you very much. We asked you to consider this timeline, and you've considered it, and you've said that we can't do that. We don't think that's what's going to happen, nor do we think that's what should happen, because we do think this is a serious issue. It comes up rarely, but it does come up occasionally.

The council has several options. It could say, thank you very much, we're done. It could say, we agree that new policy needs to be drafted. And Manju, it might come out in exactly the same place that I'm just saying, although the board wouldn't be very happy with that. But it

can't be done until we have some way of authenticating law enforcement, because the only policy you guys could come up with right now, is a policy that says within X time period, after you've authenticated the requester, you will provide the information.

So, Manju, I haven't heard from the registrars that they don't think the policy needed to be walked back. So, I'm a little surprised by that. But I just want to make sure you guys know all of the facts that are swirling around here. I mean, the other thing that the council could do is say, yes, we think this policy should be revisited, but not until we know what the authentication methodology is. I think those are sort of the choices. But there was never a discussion about the board calling for a PDP, because we don't actually think that the information that's necessary, which can only come from law enforcement, that is the only source of this, is available at this time. So, I just want to make sure we're all on the same page.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Becky, for that context. That helps a lot.

BECKY BURR: I just don't want to be really rude when I walk out at 4 o'clock, which is in like 11 minutes.

KATHY KLEIMAN: So, Tomslin if I might, with Becky and Danko sharing some of their precious time with us at this meeting, I'd like to propose a change to the agenda.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay, but after this topic?

KATHY KLEIMAN: After this talk.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah. Okay. So, are there any other comments or input to this topic that you'll want to let the councilors take to the meeting tomorrow? Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin, for the record, and I apologize for being a broken record on this. Since I got here in 2013, I have been saying that the most valuable thing that ICANN could do when it comes to this service would be to authenticate law enforcement, because it is a non-trivial matter to authenticate law enforcement requests, particularly if they're coming from a foreign government. And if you aren't dealing with a law enforcement officer, then you are absolutely dealing with the criminal element, because it's a crime to impersonate a law enforcement officer.

So, the matter is quite serious. And yet we have gone through all the machinations that we have gone through without coming up with any assistance to registrars and registries to authenticate law enforcement, nor has law enforcement done anything but demand that they get their data immediately without proposing a scheme of authentication. I mean, this isn't impossible. You could have trusted law enforcement touch points. And so, I think that we should, as NCSG, I'm not saying we should force this down the throat of the council, but I think as NCSG, we should make this point, at least I hope you will back me up on this.

That's what we should be asking for. Ask law enforcement to come up with a system that they will run to verify their own people. When I was on the EWG, we couldn't even get Interpol to dip its hand in here and help us out. So, it's a problem.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Could I just-- two fingers introduction. I just want to, you probably guys didn't hear this, but the GAC had a session on this urgent request issue today. Gabe Andrews from the FBI, who's the co-chair of the PSWG, said for all to hear that he heard the board's concerns loud and clear in San Juan and they were working on something. That's not a guarantee, and that doesn't prevent you guys from saying they should do something. But I just want to make sure, Stephanie, that you know they actually have acknowledged and engaged on this.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I did attend that. I think I'm on the same session. This was the GAC/GNSO council meeting, where they said that?

BECKY BURR: No, it was a separate session.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Oh, well, good. Then I missed it. That is reassuring, but the proof of the pudding is in them pulling something out and showing it to us, I have to say. But what the heck, it's only been 13 years. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. Kathy, did you have something here or we--?

KATHY KLEIMAN: We have Becky for about six more minutes. So, I wanted--.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Please, go ahead with the proposal.

KATHY KLEIMAN: First of all, thank you, Tomslin. And for everyone who was in the NCSG membership meeting yesterday morning, first thing, Becky was kind enough to join us then. And we started a discussion on singulars and plurals. Actually, it didn't start because Paul McGrady, who is the chair

of the, let's see if I get it right, GNSO council SubPro small team plus is, we've got to come up with better names. We've been talking about singulars and plurals, and there are different proposals in progress.

We have an incredible presentation that's going to come from Frank and Emanuel. But in the interest of time, and because we only have Becky for a few more minutes, I would ask the chair's indulgence that we continue the discussion that started on Monday morning.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. It's the next item on the agenda anyway. So, please proceed.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And so, I would actually turn to Becky if we might. We started a discussion, but I also clue in again our experts, Emanuel, Ana, and Frank. Do you have an idea how we might continue the discussion we started on Monday? Because you're deeply involved in this issue, as everyone who was there on Monday knows.

BECKY BURR: So, I think I said pretty clearly, it's important to understand where this is in process. And there is a process that's laid out in the bylaws and the PDP process manual that says what the board does when it receives a recommendation. And we have been following that in the council with respect to the SubPro recommendations. We've accepted a lot of recommendations. We've rejected some recommendations. And we've

told the council that we were likely to reject some recommendations as they were drafted. That included the recommendation regarding singulars and plurals from the SubPro.

There were two parts to that recommendation. One was essentially no singulars or plurals except where context suggests that they're not confusing. And it gave an example of spring and springs. And the board looked at that. And it basically no singulars, plurals, or words in the same language based on a dictionary. And we had a whole bunch of problems with that, including the fact that the work on ICANN to get that done was viewed as unimplementable and we thought that the spring and springs, spring flowers and springy objects was just also unimplementable. The board just didn't like that.

So, we pushed back on that. The GNSO council created a small team that was working on these issues. The small team accepted the pushback on the spring and springs, but did not accept the pushback on singulars and plurals. And they were drafting a supplemental recommendation to bring to us on that. And we took a look at it and said, we just want to let you know in advance, we're still going to reject it in this current way.

If you like, we're happy to think about ways that we could make it workable. The small team said, yes, please. And so, org provided to the small team an approach that might work with respect to handling singulars and plurals, which doesn't put them into a contention set automatically, but allows either an existing registrant, an existing registry operator or an applicant to put another applicant into a

contention set. And the small team has been discussing that. Paul is a much better expert on what the small team is thinking about. They are thinking about some tweaks to it. But this issue lives right now in the GNSO council and the small team, not the board. I've read all of the stuff that Kathy has provided about it. I understand the concerns. Where we are right now and the next steps for you involve discussion with the council.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

I might throw out the first question. It actually is a board question. Which has to do with the rejection of 24.3, SubPro 24.3. Sorry, everybody. You're going to see it in just a few minutes. And one of the things the board said, I mean, we actually had singulars and plurals in the first round. One of the things the board said was the difficulty of the RVC and I think content. And so, I'm wondering, can we go back, we've decided, I mean, you've decided, we've done a lot of discussion on RVCs in the last year.

And my understanding is the board has decided RVCs recently will not have content, which is terrific. Can we go back to the original 24.3 with the board and sit down and look at it again in light of our understanding of RVCs? And I'd like to ask you to take a second to think about it. Because intended uses, intended users may not involve content. But we are desperately concerned that if you create a much bigger contention set and you put singulars and plurals together, we will lose hundreds, maybe thousands of future non-commercial new gTLDs. And if you can say a little, you're going to see some examples.

We're going out for applicant support. We're going out around the world, encouraging non-commercial organizations to come into a very long and difficult and financially expensive process. And yet, we may put them in a contention set they're never going to get out of and maybe shouldn't be in at all. Because the words are very different. The users are very different.

BECKY BURR:

I have three minutes, and I have to be on another call. You are right that applicant classes, permitted applicants is a standard that if it can be implemented, would not fall afoul of the no content. I understand how you can do that with highly regulated industries with licenses. I understand how you can do that with banks. I understand how you can do that with lawyers. I understand how you can do that with medical doctors or dentists. I don't understand how you can do it with spring sellers other than looking at the content on the website. So, in order to get, yeah, there's no license for spring sellers.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

There are associations for people, for manufacturers of springs. And they could give it to all their members, just like that mobile. You could give it to all the mobile wireless providers.

BECKY BURR:

Okay. I literally have to go. I think that we have a great deal of dubiousness that this can be meaningfully enforced without pulling us into content. The other thing is, frankly, there is just a consumer

confusion issue that there are a lot of words in the world, but there is a consumer confusion issue that we are concerned about and that's a singular and plural thing. But I'm sorry. I really have to go.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I would like to call for a round of applause for Becky for coming and joining us. And thank you to Danko also and to Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Kathy, we will resume the slides, aren't we? So, we have Frank present.

EMMANUEL VITUS: Thank you very much, Tomslin. I think Becky's intervention brought some light. So, the presentation, basically is to help the policy committee to understand the problem and the current situation and our approach to address it. So, I will be presenting with my colleague Ana and Frank for you to understand all this whole singular plural. So, I will give a bit of background so that those who are not aware of the subject have an idea of it.

So, in 2012, when ICANN launched its first round for generic top level domain names, ICANN was expecting 500 applications and they received close to 2000 applications. So, the ICANN community met for a decade to review and refine the rules for the new gTLD. So, overall, an applicant must show that they have the operational ability, the technical ability, and the financial ability to become a registry and run a new gTLD in a safe and secure manner.

So, the point development process for that, two working groups met for years, each to review the new gTLD applicant guidebook and all the rules that apply to the new gTLDs. So, the right protection mechanism PDP working group, in short, LPM working group, for short, developed policy for domain name disputes at the second level. So, the subsequent procedure PDP working group, in short, SubPro, because you'll be hearing it much, look at the rules for filling the new generic top level domain name application, how it will be evaluated by ICANN, and how it could challenge by others such as the community who think that an applicant is registering a special name of their community or another gTLD registry or applicant who think that a new application is too close to theirs. So, the problem, now we get into the problem.

So, in 2012, Singular and Plural were like a big mess during that round. And there was no really, I mean, no one knows how to handle them or how to go about it. So, stakeholders have asked for more consistency and clearer rules and put some proposals on the table. So, I will allow my colleague, Ana, to take you through the proposal that we have on the table and what we have prepared for the policy committee as food of thought to think about it, so that we know how to address this issue for the interests of the non-commercial. So, Ana, please go ahead.

ANA [KAKALASHVILI]:

I'm Ana, and I'm going to be discussing the SubPro recommendation in relation to Singulars and Plurals first, before I go to what we have currently. So, under recommendation 24.3, an application for a Singular or Plural variation of an existing TLD or reserved name will not

be permitted if the intended use of the applied for string is the Singular Plural version of the existing TLD or the reserved name. So, the idea being, of course, that something that has the same meaning in the Singular and Plural will not have both Singular and Plural existing within the same space.

It also says, applications will not be automatically placed in the same contention set, because they appear visually to be a Singular and Plural of one another, but have different intended users and uses. And so perhaps one of the examples that Becky was referring to was spring and springs, spring being the season, springs being the elastic sort of part that you find in many uses today. Applications will not automatically be placed in the same contention set, because they appear visually to be a Single and Plural of one another, but have different intended uses. And now, as Becky had mentioned, this was a recommendation that was rejected by the board. And for all of the reasons that she had mentioned, perhaps, the board has come up now with what's called the Stroman proposal for Singulars and Plurals in the new gTLD program.

What this effectively says is that there should be a mechanism established during the next and any subsequent rounds of the new gTLD program that will prevent Singulars and Plural forms of the same word in the same language from both being delegated as top-level domains, if and only if so, requested by an end user, applicant, or other community member. What clearly has changed from the SubPro proposal to now is the fact that you don't have intent of use, the context. The context is completely missing within this proposal. When a request is made, the requester must inform ICANN of the applicable

strings, including the language in which, according to the requester, the two strings are Singular and Plural forms of.

In case they're found to be Singulars and Plurals of the same word in the same language, they will place them in a contention set, or reject in case one of the strings was delegated in a previous application round, or will be held in case one of the strings is under process from the previous round until it is processed.

Now, Becky was referring to some of the intended effects. This was obviously to prevent string similarities, ensuring that all stakeholders have a voice to protect their interests, which means they're only going to be placed in contention sets when a request is made by somebody who thinks their interest is being violated by a similar string in a Singular or Plural. And of course, there were other things that Becky mentioned, which perhaps we should have included in these slides, which includes the possibility that this might need to delve into content. But yeah, so those were the intended effects.

Now, the Strawman proposal is a deviation from the board. This is new. They're introducing their policy proposal in response to what they're thinking will be rejected if it passes up towards the board. There is no detailed research or evidence supporting its stance. And this is obviously a deviation from the existing SubPro recommendation, which was approved by the GNSO Council. All right, and I think I'll leave it to Frank to discuss the unintended effects.

FRANK ANATI:

Okay, thank you, Ana. So, I would like to look at the unintended effects. So, some words have different meanings. So, when you look at the spelling, a cricket is an insect, but to play is a game. You can spin a top, you can go for a spin, you can spin a yarn, yet every spin differs and you can clearly see what it is. Different words have different meanings. Singular and plural have different meanings. So, we have spring as in season and springs as in elastic metal objects. Word as in word of God or words as in block or anything like that.

Then we have comments or in French it will be commo, how. Those comments could be comments or requests for comments or anything like that. There's also the capacity of non-commercial stakeholders when it comes to resolution and contention sets. So, there's a broad nature of requesters and they might not have the same capacity as to financial strength or technical or legal strength.

Here are some of the examples that currently exist. We have .docs, which is technical documentation owned by Google as registry. Then we have .doc for medical professionals. Then there's also fun, which could refer to fun sites, current events, gossip sites, sports blogs, forums. Then .fans that is currently being owned by ZDNS International. So, you can see in my illustration, there's a screenshot of the fun and fans that's currently in operation. So, we had one, the agreements for fun, was ceased March 2024. Then for fans was 7th November 2024, the same year.

So, let's look at the covers by Jeff Neuman. The first just states in plain language, they want an exception to the .brand TLD. Then also, the

second has to do with not placing any content that has the .brand TLD into other contention sets that are not .brand TLD. So, they want to segregate them from being placed in the same contention sets. So, our concerns, we are looking at dispute resolution when it comes to the strings being placed in contention sets.

So, I think there's option as a resolution mechanism. And we do not want thousands of non-commercial new gTLD applications to be forced unnecessarily into contention sets where the richest would win. We will also lose after all the time we've spent to get the non-commercial organization to apply for the new gTLDs, including the application applicant support program that we are currently running. Then also, we want to promote a fair and equitable and just contention resolution process.

The last is to maintain a level playing field without exceptions. Therefore, I would like to propose the rejection of Neuman's proposal. So, this is our options as a community. So, we either reject Strawman's proposal, retain Strawman's proposal, but suggest modifications, or suggest SubPro 24.3 be revisited. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks so much, Frank, Emmanuel, and Ann for that presentation. These options, I do have a question to what you're proposing, and Kathy, you might need to help with the answer. And this surrounds one of Becky's concerns regarding the ability to implement without looking at content, where looking at context only for the Spring and Springs example. If there were no associations for Springs, do we have a

proposal for strings that might not have associations or groups that might require to be a registrant in that string, for example? I'm just trying to work out how our proposal will cover both situations.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Please, remember the chorus that we've been saying, Tomslin, throughout this whole meeting and throughout our existence, we don't have anybody paid to be here. So, this is all happening quickly. The board, Strawman, came down on May 4th. It became aware to us in the middle of May. So, the idea that we would have a counter-proposal--. We're still just trying to understand what's going on and what the implications are. The marvelous proposal you just heard is three people who spent much of this past weekend trying to sit down and understand where things are and convey them.

This is complicated stuff with a complicated history. But to your question, we could. We could do it. But there's also so much that we can already see just in the top level of examples where someone... It's going to look to someone like a plural and it is actually different words. So, .spring and .springs is not a plural of each other. One is for use for seasons, maybe for writers writing about seasons. And one is for use with elastic objects. That's not a singular plural.

So, it would be great to just be able to know that we can throw that out. That we're not going to--. Even if someone raises their hand and says, well, to me, it looks plural. .love and .loves was talked about in the SubPro small team. .love, which was delegated in the first round, is a noun. You can do it as a noun. But .loves can be a verb, not singular

and plural of each other, even though they look like it. And Emmanuel is going to give you one in French.

EMMANUEL VITUS:

Yes. So, we have some words, for example, if you take .Cour as a court of justice in French, you take Cour as a verb, running, which somebody can run as a sports site and another person can run it as a legal professional. So, we have thousands of examples like that. And we believe that the non-commercials will go for things that close to what they believe in. For example, if you take--. Okay, Kathy, well done.

So, the whole objective is, if you see when he was doing the presentation, he put Jeff Neumann proposal, for example. They are saying that, okay, we want to go with the Strawman proposal. It's really good, but do everything without .brand. So, what we are thinking of is like, it will create a lot of mess because everybody or every group will come out and say, okay, do it, but not for what is in interest for us. And overall, we just don't want to go into a contention set because the richest will win. And somebody in indigenous community, I don't know, in Kenya or in Brazil or somewhere else will now go to a contention set with a business and win. So, that is what we're trying to avoid. And I hope that with this whole background, the policy committee can come out with something that is workable, that we can propose to the board and the other parties.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Emmanuel. I'm concerned that it's being thrown to the policy committee, but Peter?

PETER TAIWO: Thank you, Tomslin. This is a great conversation to have. And thanks to the Esper that spent the time looking at this and making us to understand this. So, I'm still trying to wrap my head around preventing this to go to contention set, right? Have you looked at this also from the implementation angle? When like .love and .loves, at the implementation level, in case we both have both of the string approved. So, is there not going to be a technical issue during implementation? Just wanted to like whether you looked at that, just to give us a background on that as well.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So, I understand that they've not had time to go into details of the proposals that they're looking at. So, I don't believe them, but I think Frank has something to say.

FRANK ANATI: So, you can look at my example. That's in the existence. We have .fans and .fun. That's currently in existence, and it was approved. Yeah.

KATHY KLEIMAN: If I might.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Sorry. Mind you had her hand up earlier. Is it okay?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Very quick, which is that we're calling on everyone to help us with this. Please don't ask us for implementation answers of proposals that are brand new, where we're still not sure. I mean, we're just raising the problems. Our job is to raise the flag and say, this is an issue. We haven't gotten much. It wouldn't be fair to ask us to go much farther.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Manju?

MANJU CHEN: So, I'm not sure. This is Manju speaking, by the way. I thought Small Team Plus is discussing this proposal currently, like right now, right? And who are our representatives on the Small Team Plus?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. So, we do have Bruna, Stephanie as the councilors, but the subject matter experts are Cathy and the alternate is Electronic Frontier Foundation.

MANJU CHEN: And I hate to say this, but should it be the president, our reps on the Small Team Plus feeding this back into the Small Team Plus?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

The Small Team Plus isn't going to listen. I'm just telling you that now. They are very interested in the .brand. They're very interested in a .brand exception. And as Emmanuel so brilliantly said, that's it. That may not be what comes out, but that's where it's headed. And plus, and Danko, please correct me if I'm wrong. Sebastien, I'll look over your head. The board put out the Strawman and somebody asked for community consultation. And I may have misunderstood. I thought the board was asking that we share the straw man. And so, it's gotten confusing at all levels, I should say, that the board issues something, someone called for community consultation. When the board asks for something like that, it gets a lot more attention.

So, I think for the first time, the world is kind of hearing what's going on. And I think that's going to lead to some interesting, you know, it's important that the world kind of look at this, the singular plural. So, I think the small team may be where it goes back to, but I think we're going to see a lot more discussion in the rest of the world, outside of a narrow ICANN community into the broader internet community. And I hope that's what the board wanted. And I don't know if you want to comment on that, but I hope it's what they wanted, because that's what you're about to get.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

So, thank you for putting me on the stand. To add to the confusion, I don't know all the details, because for the last month, I was more involved in the part that you heard yesterday in the announcement, and not directly in the next round SubPro. So, obviously, the board always

wants more consultation and feedback from the community. But if I may add, I know we are not trying to find the end game here. I'm here mostly to understand your concerns and not to give you the answers. But obviously, on the question of plurals, there are obviously also languages and all these words that are happening around.

So, what, if I can kind of openly brainstorm a little bit here, what will be the end solution that you will think would be ideal for the non-commercial parties? Not to have the consensual status at all. So, not to have discussion about singular plurals around them separately. Spring and springs, just have these applications to be separate and not to put them in contention. So, any plurals, we don't care. Is that the solution you like?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

If I might. So, there is a string similarity objection, is that right? String confusion objection, which exists. So, just off the cuff, and this is my personal opinion, but I am the small team plus person, where the word, a lot of this is coming down to, first, we need to do some studies. We really should look at this more systematically. But when I hear somebody who says all singulars and plurals should go together into one contention set, it's almost always because the example they're using, the word is the same in singular and plural.

It's the same meaning. And so, that would probably create confusion. All the times when I hear people say singulars and plurals probably should not automatically be placed in the contention set, it's because the singular and plural mean very different things or completely

different words. But .mouse and .mice, that's not a visual similarity thing. And I could definitely see someone having, Barry selling electronic mice devices, and Ana is raising cute little fuzzy, furry things. So, I could see inconsistent with .doc and .docs.

So, our worry is that a whole bunch of--, so right now, my understanding is, and Sebastien, correct me if I'm wrong, since you're in the line of view, that right now, all singulars of the same string, so, .comment, everyone who would apply for .comment will go into a contention set. And we're not discounting, I mean, that's the way the process works, but all .comments would go into a different contention set. That's my understanding of 24.3. And that here, what we're doing is creating one contention set where they're all going to go into. And as the presentation said, I don't think anyone has thought through the enormous ramifications of that. Thank you for the opportunity to explain.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Kathy. And thanks, everyone, for the contribution to this topic. Unfortunately, we can get to the bottom of it here, because we are. I think, about 10 minutes late now into our agenda. So, I'll have to draw the line there for that topic, and we move on to the next. Thanks. We are overseas. Kathy, if you don't mind, I'll just mention that--, maybe five minutes, you had a slice of five minutes?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

How can I not show up without a quick slideshow? Okay. So, everyone, how many people in this room were in the issues forum this morning? Okay. So, you heard the whole history of private public interest commitments, registry voluntary commitments. I have shortened this. So, for anyone who's new in the room on this issue, NCSG members have been working on private public interest commitments, otherwise now for private PICs for a long time, since the end of the first round. Private PICs, and we'll just do one slide, were not created as part of the new gTLD policy development process.

They were designed to accommodate GAC requests for sensitive strings. We talked about it this morning. If you have .doctor, you want doctors. Germany was very clear that hotels are heavily regulated industries, and they only want regulated hotels, certified hotels. .charity, you really want to know you're donating to the right place. But then the ICANN CEO, who I named this morning, will not name now, let anything in, anything in that anyone wanted as a private PIC, no guidelines, no conditions. I talked to them. They didn't even look at them, guys, and they put it in the contract. Sad face, because that's not what lawyers should do.

So, when we went through the SubPro, that now you know what SubPro means, the SubPro group, we renamed them because so many private picks had nothing to do with anything public interest. We renamed them registry voluntary commitments. So, now our work, many RVCs in the next round and future rounds, according to some applicants, would involve content, and here I'm going. ICANN does not deal in content.

We, NCSG, talked about this problem for over a dozen years, for a long time then and now, and particularly at ICANN77, 78, and 79, and we learned yesterday that the board believes that registries can work out their own regimes to enforce content restrictions, but they cannot be in the ICANN agreement. So, join me in thanking our board member who is here, and we have fireworks because this is great, and it's a really, really positive step forward, and we feel we've been listened to on this issue, and as have registries and registrars who commented also about their concerns with the ICANN bylaws on this. So, we go to more fireworks.

Nonetheless, we still have six principles for review and acceptance of RVCs that we would like to suggest in future rounds of new gTLDs to make sure they're all consistent with ICANN's fundamental bylaws, core values, and commitments. One, they must be submitted, and I'm not going to read these exactly, within the scope and mission of ICANN. We went a great deal towards that over the weekend.

All RVCs must be legal under their jurisdictions. That will help you throw out things that are just discriminatory on their face, you being ICANN Board. Three, all RVCs should have a clear nexus between the proposed RVC and the specific gTLD string applied for. In the first round, we saw people redoing and recreating ICANN consensus policy, including on intellectual property issues. If you're doing .tax, don't rewrite the UDRP. Talk about tax preparers and tax certification, but don't try to rewrite underlying consensus policy.

Sorry, addressing myself, not to the people I'm looking at, but to future new gTLD registry applicants. Four, don't contradict the scope and output of a completed GNSO PDP. We would like to see all RVCs enforced by ICANN's PICDRP, and not necessarily by a third party, because we think with these narrowly tailored RVCs, it goes through the existing ICANN process much more easily. Six, and I won't read it, there's a procedure for public review. We think ICANN legal should review. We think the council should review, because these could be substitutes for policy, and we don't want that, and we think the board should review. I am done. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Kathy. Thank you. I will go straight to the council agenda, and for that, I'll pass it on to Peter.

PETER TAIWO: Hi, everyone. My name is Peter. So, let me quickly walk you through the council agenda that will be discussed tomorrow. Okay, so you can see that on the screen. We can start from the update, because I just don't want to read the item three. Okay, so let me start from item four, that's three, GNSO. Oh, okay, great. Okay, great. I didn't see that. Okay, so on the agenda is GNSO council aspiration statement. So, I will give the floor to Manju to talk about that a bit

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Peter. This is Manju speaking. First of all, an enlightening from all of our members that this item has been taken out of the

consent agenda, so it's going to be a discussion. And I think, and this request was kind of made considering the discussions we saw on the NCSG mailing list, but I kind of like to give more context of why this inspirational statement was there in the first place.

So, this actually came out of our council strategy planning sessions last year in DC. And we were discussing this because as all of you remember last year, we had this council committee of improvement, continuous improvement implementation thing going on where we talked about the statement of interest, SOI. And we actually recommended kind of micro improvements to the SOI, but it was voted down in the council because the contrary parties didn't like the micro-ness of the improvement.

They thought if we want to improve it, it should be overall improvement, it should be complete transparency. And I think we all feel quite frustrated about this outcome because we have been spending a lot of time trying to get a result of this. And we try to also leave a path to move on in our voting action items, but it was also voted on. So, there was not even a path for the council to move on.

So that's why during the SPS, which is the strategy planning session, the council discussed how we kind of avoid situations like this in the future where the working group has spent a lot of time working on very difficult and complicated issues and they struggle and they difficultly reach a result, which is hard consensus, hardly consensus, but it's a consensus, but still voted down in the council because they don't like the content of whatever conventions it is. And also, according to the

council operating procedures, we saw in the mailing list, Rafik has shared, council is the manager of PDP. We shouldn't delve into content of PDP.

If you guys all remember during the EPDP for the registration data policy, if it's one and two, we were frustrated too, because the IPC and VC, they were voting against the policy recommendation, not because it wasn't consensus recommendations, but because they didn't like it. And we didn't think it's a healthy way to discuss issues in council or as a PDP manager, we shouldn't be taking that as our right to do that. And that's why we came up with this aspirational statement. And why is it aspirational? It is because as probably all of us know, but within NCSG, the NCSG councilors, we are able to vote based on our free will. We don't abide to any kind of rules. We don't take orders from the NCSGs.

They don't get to order us how to vote, but it's not the same across all constituencies within the GNSO registry, registrar, the Business Constituency, the IPC, which is the Intellectual Property Constituency. I don't know about the IPC, but all of the constituencies and SO groups I've listed above, they take orders from their SO groups or constituencies to vote. They don't have a personal will. So even though they are like, we actually think this is workable. If their constituencies or SO groups say, no, you have to vote against, they have to vote against. So that's why this is aspirational, because we aspire that we can do this, but it's not possible.

So, the strong kind of fight back during the mailing list was kind of a shock to me because we all know this is only aspirational. I don't think

it's a bad thing to have this aspiration where we work together collaboratively, to approve policies that has been worked out by the working group. So, I will urge people who, after this context, reconsider if we can join force in the council vote for this aspirational statement. Thank you.

PETER TAIWO:

Thank you so much, Manju. Now I have to spin the spin because the time is gone. Okay, great. So, item number four talks about the policy status report. Here is on the council agenda to look at two important policy talks about the aspiration, aspire registration recovery policy, as well as the aspire domain name deletion policy. So, this is on the council agenda to see whether the policy needs to be revised.

So, there was an update from the ICANN org and the registrar, but they were concerned in that. And so, this has been pushed to ICANN. Okay, during the GNSO council. So, we'll be looking at it. We'll be voting, councilor will be voting as well that the ICANN org needs to deliver this within a year to review and deliver this within a year because policy reviewing of this is given to the ICANN org either to vote or either for the councilors to consent to the ICANN org should deliver on this within a year. So, it's on the ICANN org queue for them to deliver on this. So, we'll be voting or considering this to activity.

Item number five. Can we move? Okay, great. So, this talks about the accuracy checking. Oh, sorry, before going here, I don't know if anyone wants to add anything. Two seconds, if you want to jump in. Okay, great. Okay. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I can just add that it will be it will go into the staff queue only after it's voted successfully.

PETER TAIWO: Okay, great. Thank you for that. Okay, so accuracy. So, these also will, I can, Janice will be discussing the status accuracy discussion and we'll be considering ICANN org proposed next step on addressing the shelter topics. But here will be introduced by Greg DeBiase. I don't know if any of the councilor wants to chip in on this accuracy. I guess we've talked about this. Manju, Bruna, if you want to touch on this, I'm calling councilor or anyone that wants to touch on that. Okay.

MANJU CHEN: So, I guess our position has been we don't think this is viable. We don't think requiring accuracy like the level of accuracy GAC or other people are asking for registration information is valuable. And also, I think ICANN org has come back with us for with reports that saying they don't get the data that can check the accuracy of registration data. So, I think there's a regular checking that we promised the GAC and IPC that we will do. But I guess we will say the same and say, this is not viable. And there's some there's simply no data to check accuracy for that reason. And ICANN has no authority over the registration data that they can force the checking of accuracy. Thank you.

PETER TAIWO: Yeah. Thank you so much. Yes, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

This is a discussion item, right? Not a voting item in council. Okay. And I'm not putting any of our visitors on the spot, but I am asking our councilors, if you would, too, I would love to know where the registries and registrars are on this. We do check accuracy according to the different registrars choose, but they check the accuracy of either the email address or the telephone number. And when that was implemented, as two counts told us, hospitals went down.

They're not used to getting the accuracy. Hospitals went down, schools went down because they didn't know to check it. Whoever got the email didn't get it or went to spam and real things were lost. We go any further on that checking accuracy. I don't know. So, I would love to know if you guys could create your own summary of what you hear so that we could know where others are and other stakeholder groups are. I would be very interested. Thank you. And thank you for having a position for us, too.

MANJU CHEN:

So, if I may quickly respond. So yes, like Kathy said, they check accuracy, but the GAC is asking more. For example, they send yearly reminder to be like, hey, can you see if your registration is still, correct? If not, please come to us. But the GAC will be like, you have to make sure it's correct and you have to contact them with all the methods you can so you can check it yourself. You don't ask them. And if they don't respond, you have to check until they do. Those kinds of aggressive and unnecessary accuracy checking are what the registries and registrars

say they can do. And I think we definitely agree with that. So, sorry for missing a little bit of context. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I'll put myself in the queue. I think there are two things that in this discussion item tomorrow that is important is the first thing is that this was an accuracy scoping team that was paused. And we've been discussing whether to restart it. And the question was, is there data available for them to do the work? And one thing we need to note is that why this is again on the council agenda is because two additional information has come forth from ICANN org.

One is that ICANN says, we could potentially use historical data from ICANN compliance existing audit program, which they hadn't told us before that such a data existed. And I think the other was--, I forgot what the second source of data is. But yeah, so that's the additional information that has come forward and we'll be discussing whether that's worth or enough to restart the scoping team.

PETER TAIWO: I hope that that was helpful. Okay, great. Please, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, I didn't want to intervene, but there's something that needs to be said here in terms of GNSO. Oh, sorry. I'm Sebastian Ducos. I'm coming here in my own capacity and curious, but I happen to have been a council for a number of years throughout this debacle. The scoping

team is there as a preparatory group in order to prepare a PDP and scope a PDP. The scoping team, like anything that we do at ICANN, works with a charter. Before starting, before doing anything about this, the main problem with this, particularly scoping teams, is that people didn't even agree on what accurate data means. Any time spent on it will be a waste until we agree on what that means. End of story.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Very glad. Would you mind telling us who your employer is, just so everyone knows?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, my employer is GoDaddy. I happen to work for the registry part of GoDaddy, so GoDaddy Registry, and I work as a back end, mainly, yes.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And thank you so much for sharing your views and background and history. And great discussion point.

PETER TAIWO: Thank you so much, Sebastien, for that interview. So, the next on the agenda, it's about standing predictability implementation review team. It's called SPIRT, right? Okay, great. I don't know how that came about. So, here, also, the council will be discussing and will receive updates on the draft shelter. And here was convened by the GNSO Council to draft a shelter based on the new gTLD, the subsequent procedure. The GNSO Council will provide an oversight on this team. So, this team will be

providing updates on where they are, concerning their compositions and what they've done so far. So, we'll be receiving updates on this. I'm sure that Bolutife is on that team. Do you want to provide updates now on this, or you want to talk about it later?

BOLUTIFE ADISA: It's on the agenda?

PETER TAIWO: Yeah, it's on the agenda. Well, that would be great. Go ahead.

BOLUTIFE ADISA: Okay, thank you. Bolutife, for the record. I am a representative on the SPIRT. It's called SPIRT, but it's the standing SPIRT. Yeah, that's the pronunciation. It's the standing predictability implementation review team. So, because I have five minutes, I will try to break this into three parts. First would be to explain the objective and progress of the SPIRT charter, because we are the SPIRT charter drafting team, basically. And the other part would be to talk about the proposed charter, the changes compared to the Annex E, and then also our next steps.

So, just as a background for the standing predictability implementation review team, which we are drafting the charter for, the charter which is being drafted is developed for the proper functioning of the SPIRT team. And this came out from two different documents that had been produced before. First is the predictability framework. So, the predictability framework basically describes operational processes to

receive and process applications for the next round of the new gTLD program. And the purpose is to ensure that there's a transparent procedure for ICANN to manage this process, especially to manage unanticipated issues and changes within the gTLD program.

So, this is managed by both ICANN org and also the SPIRT team. So, we are not the SPIRT team. We are the charter drafting team, basically. So, I just wanted to clarify that. Yeah. So, basically, we built this charter based on the Annex E of the SubPro final report, which already is existing, but this is like an output from it. And it's more defined in a proper charter sense. And we had a few disagreements and agreements with it, which I'll quickly highlight a couple of them.

So, this is in line with both Annex E and also the predictability framework itself. Yes. So, one of the major things that I will note, I'll just run through them very quickly. The structure of the charter basically contains the standing committee identification, the mission, purpose, and deliverables, the formation, staffing, and organization, the rules of engagement, and the decision-making methodologies. And lastly, the charter document history. So, one of the differences, I think, in the Annex E, it isn't mentioned.

There's a disagreement, basically, because SPIRT is not involved in the minor changes according to Annex E. But the team, the drafting team, agreed that SPIRT should subscribe to the change log and also monitor minor changes for the predictability framework and for the process, basically, for the gTLD next round. And another one that also, I'm just trying to run through it quickly, is that the Annex E agrees that

forwarding parties should submit issues to SPIRT to determine the path forward. Meanwhile, the predictability framework suggested that the issues goes to ICANN org, then goes to the SPIRT team. And the drafting team decided that ICANN org would take on the role of triaging the issues and forward either to the SPIRT team or not. So, this was what we went with, with the charter. Another one was that the SPIRT disagreements with ICANN org on the type of change designation.

So, either it's a minor change or a major change in a case where there's a disagreement. It's not mentioned in the Annex E, actually. But according to the team, the team decided to provide ICANN org feedback within a short time frame in case of any disagreements. And we have like a post-mortem approach to the changes. Also, according to Annex E, the time frame for SPIRT's guidance is implied through the GNSO Council's role. But according to the predictability framework, if no agreement is reached within 30 days, ICANN org and SPIRT will continue to collaborate on a permanent solution.

So, these are two conflicting statements, basically. I mean, they are described in two different ways. But the team's decision is to set a time of 30 to 60 calendar days' time frame. And this is for the charter. And also, there's no mention for a call for volunteers for the Annex E. But the team decided to keep track of membership for wide and active participation.

I think there's still like two, three more, if I can just quickly bridge through them. There's also no mention of the vice chair and the chair's role in consensus call for participation. And the team decided that the

leadership team should also contribute to the SPIRT's deliberation and participate in the consensus call. So, yeah, and maybe I'll just keep through it. I think tomorrow, the Council will get a further presentation on it. But the next step would be consultation with the Council. I don't know if the meeting is tomorrow or June sometime. But after this, the next step would be the team agrees. And then we have a final review and presentation of the charter itself. So, thank you. Sorry for going over time, but I yield the floor back to the chair.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So, thanks, Bulu. I just, we don't have time, but if you could just send on the mailing list areas where you think there are concerns for NCSG, that might be helpful. Thanks.

PETER TAIWO: I'm sure that you don't want to receive a lot of comments here. Okay, great. So, let's move to, okay. That's hi, Jill. Here also, the Council will be discussing the estimated timeline that ICANN org has provided to the Council on the implementation of the GNSO recommendations. So, we'll be looking at a timeline on this and discuss about that. So, I don't know if Tomslin wants to provide further details on this because of time. I'm sure that he's busy. Okay.

So, here we'll be discussing that the draft, this is still a draft. So, of how to implement the IGO recommendations as the policy recommendations that the community actually develop concern IGO. So, I don't know if there is any comment on these before we move to

the next agenda. I'm sure that the person that will be introducing these will be Tomslin tomorrow. Okay, great.

So, updates on the Internet Governance Forum Support Association. We received these, I guess, yesterday also. These also will be discussed tomorrow on the Council. So, a presentation and update on the work of IGFSa will be provided. So, I'm sure that we're familiar with that. And if you're not a member, please go and join. Okay.

So, update work from SPSS. So, here is just, we'll be receiving conversations on how to proceed on SPSS discussion. So, here, among the topic that will be discussed are related to catalog resources on roles concerning the council liaison to the GNSO working group. So, staff, also we give update on information about liaison to working group, their roles and descriptions, whether it is up to date or not, because we've had conversation around that. Also, council to discuss whether there are any gaps that exists from there, because we want councilors to be effective or the liaison to working group to be effective. So, we'll be reviewing that tomorrow as well. Okay. Can you just go up? Okay.

Recommendation. So, we'll be discussing the recommendations that staff have for the council tomorrow. Okay. Let's move to the next agenda. So, any other business tomorrow? We'll be discussing also, there'll be a call for volunteer for PPSAI tomorrow. I'm sure that people that are interested on the council will join that. And we have one of our own that is very active on this topic, which is Stephanie. So, on this, I don't know if she will volunteer to be on this thing, but there will be a call for PPSAI tomorrow. Okay. You want ask?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Quick question. The call for volunteers is a call for council volunteers or a call for all volunteers?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: The call for all volunteers is already out. This is specifically for a council liaison. Yeah. And Stephanie's already in there as to the IRT review team liaison. Well, both Stephanie and Paul are council appointees to work with staff to start this conversation to start up the IRT basically. And now the IRT is being volunteers to the IRT are being called.

KATHY KLEIMAN: So, Stephanie would be a wonderful liaison from the council too. I don't know when her term, but also, I just wanted to note in case you haven't seen it, we've had a lot of emails lately on the list. There are several other volunteers. So, this is a good situation. We've got several.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I'm not sure about several, because we allowed one REB and one alternative say for each of the constituencies, we have really only two. So, we don't have enough still.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Could we ask that you put together a list so that we know where the blanks are? Where we're, is it MPOC? Is it NCUC that needs to provide? Cause this is constituencies, not stakeholder groups. You don't have to

answer now. Just throw it on the list and we'll try to fill in the blanks for you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, I'll do that. I think the agenda is over anyway, I believe. All right. Thanks for that. So, priority one, I understand we have three minutes left, but I think getting an update from the IRT is necessary.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Sorry. I will try to do this quick because it's kind of, of course, this is a report for us, of course. There are three important things right now in this, in this presentation, these slides, it's like another one. Yes. It's we have the SubPro open public comments. So, the last month close it. And I take the checking about what comments we did as NCSG and how that changed or not. So, it's just quick. The main comment it was, we were suggesting use plain language in some comments. So, this is one of the examples that we used on that comment and the old text is on the left and the draft text, the correction is on the right.

I can send this part of the, of the presentation to the mailing list in case if you want to check, detail it. So, it's another two months or because the text. Okay. This is important. The financial stability section was changed to financial viability. Yeah, that's it. And the old text says that, if an applicant cannot support the demonstrate his financial viability change to the shorter one that is opposite. So, that's it. That's the main changes that we can show you in this draft, clean version of the handbook. So, another topic, the next one is this one.

This one is so very important because tomorrow, we have a session in the SubPro and this is one of the hot topics right now, and they are asking us if we have so many questions about this. Quickly, this is about the evaluation fields for applicants per program. And this was my personal take notes about this, is about the new gTLDs applicants will subsidize a part of each applicant of a program application. There will exist or does community priority evaluation is called CEP or CPA, I'm sorry, maybe I put it wrong.

This includes in the independent objector is some objection from GAC and ALAC. The cost also, are included in the evaluation fees, the community priority evaluation in and brand exception will be charged separately. And these evaluation fee does not include the name collision analysis fees in NCAP, and they did the presentation yesterday, the day before, and they are putting on a scenario about what could be the best scenario to these a range into the into the cost.

The range is between the 208k and to 293k, but they are a having to account that this could be a viability, they have a point actually that it's good for not having a lost it or have a deficit, if the program has at least 1000 applications. If it has a lot of less could be a big deficit. And, and there is a point of equity. So, equity. So, there is a big panorama but if there is so many a granularity thing that I can do right now, but maybe if you can so many questions that I can add or to put tomorrow in the session, it will be great. So, that's it.

The next topics is predictability framework that it was a volatile talking. And then another one is the registrar protection, it's a is called

background screening. That is exactly what says. It's a mechanism to facilitate a registrar protection in good standing apply for a new gTLD. That's it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Juan. All right, that brings us to the end of our session. I'm going to send to the mailing list some open comments, public comments that are open so that you could volunteer for them as well. We've run out of time but I'll send that on the mailing list. Thanks everyone.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]