

ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 19 September 2016 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on the Monday, 19 September 2016 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance is available at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/Px6sAw>

Audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-19sep16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thanks. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening.
Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 19th of September, 2016 at 1500 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge today please let yourself be known now.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...already did announce himself so, yes.

Michelle DeSmyter: Perfect. All right, thank you. And as a reminder please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And to please keep your phones

and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn the call back over to Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. This is Avri Doria speaking. I'm the cochair who's going to be chairing this meeting. First thing is to go through the agenda. So there's the agenda review. Then there's discussion on SOIs. I'll ask anyone if they have to update their SOI? Then we go into – then the next item on the agenda is a discussion of the letter – the GNSO Council regarding the ICANN board letter. Then we would move into continued discussion of the CC1 review tool. Then we have listed work status updates and any other business.

I missed the group leadership meeting where the agenda was set. And sent in a request for agenda change too late so I'm going to make it here. I would like to move the Number 5 item, Work Track Status Updates, into the Number 3 slot before we get into the discussions. I expect that they'll be quick especially now at the beginning but I'd like them to sort of occupy a permanent position in that.

I haven't gotten any objections from the leadership group so I'm asking if it's okay with this group for me to make that change to the agenda, so 5 becomes 3. Does anyone object to that change in the agenda? Does anyone else have any other changes they'd like to recommend to that agenda? If staff can move 5 to 3 that would be helpful.

Does anyone know of any other business at this point that they'd like to see added to any other business? Seeing no hands, seeing no objection to the agenda, let's run with this agenda.

Okay, next item is the SOIs. As always this is a request for anyone who has had a change work interests or whatever affects the SOI, has a made change, please mention it during this meeting especially if it's relevant to the work we're doing in this meeting and an update. Does anyone have such a

change to announce at this point? Seeing no hands, hearing nothing, we'll move on. Just remind people do update that when (unintelligible).

The next thing I'd like to go into is the work track status. Fortunately, we number our tracks so I can go through them numerically. So who would like to give an update for Sub Team 1?

Sara Bockey: Hi, Avri. This is Sara Bockey. I can give an update on Sub Team 1.

Avri Doria: Please go ahead.

Sara Bockey: Okay great. Thank you, Avri. This is Sara Bockey for the record. Regarding Work Track 1, we'll be meeting tomorrow at 20 UTC, our third meeting. No real update since the last meeting, we started discussing accreditation plans. And that's about all I have.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any questions on Sub Team 1? Okay, moving on to Sub Team 2, who would like to give the update on that one please?

Michael Fleming: Hi, Avri. This is Michael Fleming. I will be happy to give that update.

Avri Doria: Please. Thank you.

Michael Fleming: So last week we – sorry, last week – yes, about – sorry, our last meeting we discussed the schedule and how we wanted to proceed with that. We didn't get very far on the prioritization and the grouping so Phil and I are currently looking at taking that back ourselves and presenting something to the group that we can all agree on to move forward and start discussing issues.

We also started talking about the base agreement issue. We were able to get some good feedback in regards to that. And we're still very little progress of the considering we've only had our first – or our second meeting. But this

week we'll have a third meeting on Thursday and we hope to move forward from that. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. Any question on Sub Team 2? Hearing and seeing none, who would like to give an update for Sub Team 3?

Karen Day: Hi, Avri. This is Karen Day. I'll be glad to give an update.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Karen Day: We've had two calls now. We have our two cochairs in place. And on the last call we spent some time discussing the group priorities and which items will be tackled first. And we came to the conclusion that we needed some more information and some help from staff mapping the GNSO recommendations and principles and guidelines to the actual objections listed in the Guidebook so that we can determine whether or not the Guidebook accurately reflected the GNSO principles. And we will pick that back up on our third meeting, which will be on Tuesday the 27th.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Any comments or questions? Okay, thank you. In which case I'll move on to Work Team 4. Who would like to make a report on that one please? Rubens, I do see that Cheryl was volunteering you for it in the chat. Are you able to speak? He may – he said hope is computer audio is clear enough. At the moment it's clearly silent.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It sounds like it's not clear enough, Avri, so I will do it if you like.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl for the record.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Please, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...my partner in crime the opportunity. And he may want to add a little bit as well. We had our second call, like many of the other second calls, which we had last week. It was a – going through processes, procedures, looking at some of the material specific work we were doing. And putting a couple of plans of action into our to-do list.

We have a few action items coming out of our meeting most of which involve reaching out to other parties both within ICANN to explore and ask some information about specifics that were perhaps found during the questions and clarifying questions relating to IDNs during the process so we can start our work on the appropriateness of Applicant Guidebook questions issue and also to reach out to the universal acceptance study group.

And with that our next meeting is in a fortnight and hopefully we'll have some feedback on those and other action items we just did. Rubens, if you're on I think I covered everything but if not let me know.

Avri Doria: Okay, I'm not sure if Rubens can speak but I do see the Kavouss has his hand up so, Kavouss, please. Kavouss, I do not hear you. Are you muted? Does not look like you are muted.

Michael Fleming: Avri, this is Michael Fleming. I think he's requesting a dial-up from what he's putting in the chat.

Avri Doria: Oh okay so the hand is not to speak but is to get a dial out. Okay...

Michael Fleming: That would be my guess.

Avri Doria: Okay. Please correct me if I'm wrong, Kavouss. If I'm right, please drop your hand. Everybody knows that you are requesting that. If I'm wrong, I'll come

back to you. Are there any questions or issues on Sub Team 4? Okay, hearing none I want to go on to the next agenda in the agenda.

I think that the next item as we basically moved the status report up into the third position, just shifting everything down, I'd like to go to the discussion letter. Okay hear I'm very quiet so I'll raise my volume before I next speak. But the discussion on the GNSO Council letter that was in response to the letter from the chair of the board.

So please, Jeff is going to lead this discussion. Jeff, I turn it over to you. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. I'm just looking at the chat. Sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. Kavouss still trying to be added. So hopefully we can get him on the line shortly. He thinks he's been excluded. I can assure him that there was no decision to exclude him and hopefully we get him on the line as quickly as possible.

With that said, let's go to the letter. So this letter was submitted last week to our group. It is a request for input regarding the new gTLD subsequent procedures. I'm not going to read the whole letter into the transcript. But basically it's on August 5 the Board send a letter to the GNSO Council seeking some advice from the Council and the Council has, in turn, sent it to not only to each of the members of the Council and their respective constituencies and stakeholder groups, advisory groups, etcetera, for input but has also sent that to us for input.

And it says no later than September 25, which is coming up fairly shortly. I think it's Sunday. I'm not sure if they need final answers by them but I know that there's a call a week from Thursday of the GNSO Council so I want to say that's the 29th. And I know that this will be one of the items on their agenda.

So essentially I'll just read the middle part of the letter, which says, "The Board is interested in the GNSO's view of its current work in light of the existing policy recommendations and related review activities for example, assuming all other review activities are completed it would be helpful to understand whether the GNSO believes that the entirety of the current subsequent procedures PDP must be completed prior to advancing a new application process under the current policy recommendations."

"The Board is cognizant that it may be difficult to provide a firm answer at this stage of the process is that the reviews are still underway. And the PDP is in its initial stage of work. But if any consideration has been given in relation to whether a future application process could proceed while policy work continues, and be iteratively applied to the process for allocating new gTLDs, or that a set of critical issues could be identified to be addressed are prior to a new application process, the Board would welcome that input."

"The Board also would also welcome any elaboration on the expected timeframe outlined in the PDP work plan as well as any additional points the GNSO might wish to clarify for the Board in its effort to support the various areas of work underway in the multistakeholder community."

I will note that there was already a discussion at the Council level where a number of groups expressed or some of the groups expressed their view on this issue. And one of those groups was the Business Constituency, I believe the ALAC also gave its input during the Council meeting, the Registries may have also. So we have a couple important decisions or I should discussion points.

Number 1 is whether we respond to this at all or just keep doing our work. Number 2, if we do respond, do we have some thoughts on this issue? In other words, how do people in this group feel about in some way bifurcating the work of this group into a form of I guess it's been an analogy to the accountability process, which had sort of a Work Stream 1 and a Work

Stream 2 whereby Work Stream 1 in this instance would be all of the items that must be tackled and addressed prior to starting a new procedure, a new process, and Work Stream 2 being those items that could wait and be done iteratively – sorry, that’s a tough word to say – how about done in parallel with a new process for new gTLDs.

So I do want to open up the floor. If there’s anyone from the ALAC, from the Business Constituency, etcetera, that wants to express its views. I know the Registries have a view but I’m not sure Donna is on from the Registries to give us that view so maybe Rubens can.

Please, I see Alan – well I see Kavouss so I don’t know if that’s an old hand or on the new topic?

Avri Doria: Yeah, let’s just check with Kavouss. Kavouss, are you able to hear us and respond? Have you been connected yet? We are very concerned about your connectivity and are doing everything possible. Perhaps someone on staff can just give us an update of where we are with Kavouss? I apologize, Jeff, for this brief break in this process but give people a chance to think. And then I will also later add myself to the list with my comment on this based on NCSG understanding. So can someone just speak to what is happening to Kavouss’s connectivity?

Michelle DeSmyter: This is Michelle. The operator is still trying to connect him.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, is it not answering or is it not getting through?

Michelle DeSmyter: There is an error. I’m sending him a private message in the chat right now.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much. And I appreciate you continuing to work on it.
Okay so Alan, I'll move on to you please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. We have an echo from somewhere. Seems to be gone. I guess I'm having a hard time parsing and understanding exactly what they're asking. This PDP was chartered to set the rules and procedures for further round or whatever. And they seem to be asking can we have a further round before we actually finish our work.

So I'm not sure how – certainly to date we have not identified things that could wait until after the start of the release of a new round to actually complete. You know, the last time around we effectively did that, although not deliberately, and we know the results of that. So the only way I can parse it is – and I'll say I'm not – neither nor ALAC – or At Large are supporting this, but the only way I can parse it is if we determine that there will be significant numbers of categories and we decide that some categories should have priority and fix all the rules for those, obviously the simpler ones, the ones that have not caused a lot of problems in the past, and release those while we continue the work on the larger, you know, more complex issues.

Now if that is what indeed they're asking then I think it needs to be really clear and we need to understand how in fact we could release some types of gTLDs without releasing the other and without being inundated by the other groups to say me too.

So I really need to understand what it is they're asking before we can answer the question. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. Oh, Avri, you want to call on people, I'll let you do it.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: That's quite all right, you can do it. No, please go ahead if that's more comfortable to you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay well you were next even though your hand's not raised so you can go.

Avri Doria: Well I was going to go later but okay. This is me speaking from an NCSG position. I do hear some echo in the background. Hopefully I can be heard. We have not discussed the letter specifically. Actually we did, when it first came out we discussed the Board letter and there was a general feeling within – we didn't do a consensus call on it – but there was a general feeling that the work really needed to be completed before we moved on with further processes.

So I think that within NCSG there would be a resistance to slicing and dicing the plan. Of course understanding that that is always a Council prerogative to change the milestones and come up with some notion of an intermediate delivery. We did specifically discuss that. But the current position of the NCSG, I would say, is that we do not change the plan and that we work through to completion on this PDP as opposed to subdividing it. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Avri. I see Kavouss Number 2 has his hand raised as well. I'm not sure if – okay I can a see note says, "Operator has successfully reached Kavouss." Kavouss, are you on the call now?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I want to call good time. Please tell me, is it a decision of anybody to exclude me from the meeting consecutively meeting after meeting. Every time I am dialed up 20 minutes, 25 minutes after the meeting has started. It is an intentional? It is a willingness. It is a willful. It is what? I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...I apologize. Apologize does not really reply to that. Apologize for one time, yes, but not repeatedly. So please kindly reduce the serious and a strong

complaint and objection and please kindly ask that the operator need to kindly respectfully call me few minutes before the meetings. Please include that in the minute of this meeting in the letter with bold...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Let me jump on this...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...strong object and complained of this intentional and willful exclusion of an active member working on this issue since 2014. Do you hear me?

Avri Doria: Thank you, Kavouss. This is Avri. Back – yes I do – yes I do hear you. Can you hear me? Heard your complaint...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I can hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...or someone else decides. Who decides that?

Avri Doria: Okay please, Kavouss, I gave you the courtesy of letting you finish your discussion. So please give me that same courtesy. We have never discussed excluding anyone; not you, not any other member. There has never even been a hint of such a discussion. What has happened with you is something I cannot explain.

I do think it's a good idea for you and the people setting up this call to work on making your connection earlier. But I will reiterate that the accusation that someone is excluding you intentionally is totally unbased on fact. We are attempting to include everyone. Everyone works very hard to make sure that everyone's voice is heard. We give you full rights to speak just as everyone

else. And there has never been a single word of discussion and I am very concerned about such an accusation.

However, we have noted your protest at the top of the minutes. I don't know that we've put in bold characters, that was not part of your original request. But we are noting both your concerns, your protest and our response. Thank you.

And now we still have two Kavouss hands up. I would like to move on with the discussion we're having on the letter. And so I'll move to Jorge. Thank you.

Jorge Cancio: Hello, good afternoon. Do you hear me okay?

Avri Doria: Yes, hear you quite well, thank you.

Jorge Cancio: Hello. This is Jorge Cancio for the record speaking only or on my behalf, not one of the GAC, just to make that clear. But – on the letter I wanted to share with you the – some ideas. So the first one is similar to what has been put forward by Alan and I think also by you. And this is the idea that the letter is a bit unclear so we would need to have some sort of clarification of what is really the intent of the letter, what is the purpose of it.

And apart from this general commentary I also would like to share with you my feeling that the complexity of the whole process of reviewing the first round and now beginning to discuss a possible adjustment to include policy is really already a very complex environment. So adding complexity to it I'm not sure whether that would be very helpful. And to the GAC, again, I'm not speaking on behalf of this constituency, but as far as I know, there has been no discussion yet on the letter. But it surely will be – it will be surely considered in Hyderabad at the face to face meeting

Anyway, to the position on the review process and also the policy adjustment I think in Helsinki in the communiqué and also in our answer to the overarching questions we repeatedly made the point that first we have to do it with the review processes and then we can towards adjusting the policy.

So I'm personally a bit reluctant or a bit concerned that we add more complexity to this. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Jorge. This is Jeff Neuman again. I actually put myself in the queue for after you so I just I guess to try to give a little bit more context and I know if Donna Austin were here she would be able to provide some context too so this is just kind of channeling Donna.

Basically the Guidebook – the Applicant Guidebook initially – or said – the final Applicant Guidebook said that there would be subsequent – a subsequent round – I think – I believe it did use the word “round” after the application window – the 2012 application window closed. So in theory, a new round was supposed to have started I guess around April, May 2013. It is now 2016. The Guidebook did not predicate any new round on reviews being conducted, although the Guidebook did say that there would be reviews. It did not state that the introduction of the next round would have to wait until the reviews were completed.

So from my understanding there have been a number of registries (unintelligible) unhappiness to the Board at the last meeting in Helsinki and also at the GDD summit that they would like to get on with starting the next round in accordance with the GNSO policy and the Applicant Guidebook. And so the Board is now turning the question around to us saying hey, is there anything that we can solve for now that – or that must be solved for now before we start a new round or application window?

And are there other things that could potentially wait? So an example could be, and I'm not advocating one way or the other, but an example could be

that if you look to the PDP on rights protection mechanisms there's two phases. There's a first phase which looks at the trademark clearinghouse, the new rights protection mechanisms that were introduced in the 2012 round. That's Phase 1.

Phase 2 looks at the UDRP. Phase 2 will not begin until Phase 1 is over. And my understanding is that Phase 2 will not begin until around 2018 or so. The question could be, you know, does the – does the GNSO community believe that entire review, including the UDRP, needs to be done before there's a new application window? Or could they say that just Phase 1 needs to be completed before a new application window?

Drawing on what Alan said as well, is the question of could you, for example, say well let's look at the brands and they don't have to deal with things like sunrise and they don't have necessarily the issues dealing with vertical integration, things like that. So is it possible that we could solve for the other issues that apply to the brands, and then save things like vertical integration or subsequent phase while we're working on introducing the brands.

Again, not advocating one way or the other. And I'm not saying we are necessarily the group to and advocating one way or he save things like vertical integration or subsequent phase while we address all these questions as Paul McGrady points out importantly on the chat that the first issue I brought up could be more appropriately for the rights protection mechanisms working group, which absolutely could be the case.

But I'm just pointing out what the Board, the context the Board I believe was thinking when it drafted a letter. So with that let me go to Kavouss and then to Alan.

Kavouss Arasteh: Can you hear me, please?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Thank you very much for all your clarification. When the Guidebook was written or approved we didn't have this type of experience of the problems, difficulties, shortcomings, deficiencies, and so on so forth of the first round. This is number one.

So we could not just rely on something that consider everything might be good and put a deadline six years after the second – first round you can start second round. This issue has been discussed many times. And at least, as far as I remember, I am like Jorge, I am not representing GAC, but a member of the GAC. We have mentioned in the GAC to the Board many times that until all the difficulties, problems, are not identified or are not solved or committed to solve, we should not start the second round.

Moreover, I don't think that we can open the second round for the particular type of the strings. That's one or something and so on so forth. We have to review, we have to resolve all of the problems, difficulties, once we identified them and then we have the second round or second start. I don't think that, yes, some people they rush into the things. Other people also rush. But we don't want to do something based on some mistakes past mistakes, to repeat the past mistake.

How many requests we had, 1935? How many has been completed? Not more than 500. What about the others? What happened the others? Problems, difficulties, and so on. So please, can we consider and do we not rush. We are not dealing with the transition that everybody rush to do it 1st of September, 30 of September, 2015.

Then another year 2016 and so on so forth with the (unintelligible). We have to carefully review and once the review is finished we open the second round for everything, but not partially. So we do not agree. We have to have a consensus. This is very, very important. I'm very sorry, we cannot agree with that. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Kavouss. I have a follow up question but I'll wait until after Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. Two short points. Number one, there are some comments in the chat saying can't we do the implementation in parallel – implementation of our policy or whatever we come up with in parallel with a new round? My understanding is the implementation, as we use the term, for the last round was essentially writing the Applicant Guidebook once we have the policy.

And I don't see any way that we could write the Applicant Guidebook while having a round based on the Applicant Guidebook. The two, by its very nature, are serialized. So I – either I'm misunderstanding what the question means or the answer is, no, that's not possible.

The second thing is we really need to understand what is in our jurisdiction and what isn't. And I agree on the comments that things like the UDRP – from my perspective, you know, we lived with it as it is now. Yes, it's time to review it but I would not condition a new round on it but that's not really our decision, I don't think. That's the decision of the other group to say is it so crucial it has to be done before – and implemented before we go forward.

You know, my inclination would be to say no, but I really think we need clarity from the Board exactly what it is they would accept so we know what it is we're talking about because right now I think we're talking in circles because we don't really know what it is they would envision, or maybe they're asking us for the vision of how to miraculously finish our work before finishing our work. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. Avri, you're next.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. What I'm actually bring up now has to do with how we respond to the letter and the issue of giving some answer by the 25th. And

but I want to pause on that if there are people that want to talk of details of the issue before we talk about how to answer. So I just wanted to put myself in the queue because it was empty. I see that Kavouss is behind me and if he wants to make a substantive point on the issue as opposed to a process comment I'd like to let him jump in front of me and then get back in the queue if that's okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Avri. And I also put myself behind Kavouss on a substantive point as well. And then we'll get to you. If you could just raise your hand – there you go, thank you, you beat me to it. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I think one thing that we could decide either at this meeting or next meeting – probably this meeting – we write back to the whole thing that we need more time. We cannot answer the letter by 25th. We need more time because we are just in the middle of the discussions of the substance of the needs of otherwise to have parallel or to have one after the other and so on, so forth. Number one.

Number two, my contribution to your meeting is that this is an issue we should discuss at detail or in detail in Hyderabad in each of the SO and AC and in the meantime you can continue so we could not decide. I am not in favor of the parallel operation. That may have some input to the difficulties you start with something, you face the problem, you come back to redo that. So we don't want to back and forth redo the thing. We want to first, once again, identify the difficulties, make a list of that, agree on that by consensus and then try to find a solution.

Should we arrive at something that most of the difficulties are resolved and few are remained, that convince everybody that we could have some sort of the parallel operation, we come to that point at a later stage. So once again request for extension of reply and second, continue discussing whenever you want and do the full discussion at Hyderabad and come back to the issue. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. And on the first point about more time, I don't believe it's the Board that actually is limiting our time. I think it's the Council in their letter so we could always -- and I'll let Avri talk about the process but we could always ask the Council for more time. This is not a Board deadline but more of a Council one. But I believe that Council is going to be discussing this issue at their next meeting on the 29th. And we could always make the recommendation if the rest of the group feels that way to be given time during the ICANN 57 to discuss this issue within our own communities.

The substantive point I wanted to make was that, yes, it's been brought up a couple times and I apologize for using the UDRP issue. It's just one that was quick and easy right off the top. I know that's not for our group. If I were to bring up an issue from this group perhaps, you know, in Work Track 4 there's -- we're discussing name collision. One option could be that, yes, we don't have to resolve every possible name collision potential issue there is out there. We could go with for this next round the existing solution until and unless we come up with something better.

So there are possibilities even within our work tracks that we could come up with some items that say, yes, we know that there may be some issues but, you know, we don't have to solve for each and every one of the issues. We could do it the same way it was done in the last round for this next round while we work on a solution.

And so one of the things I would recommend -- and again I'm not taking a position one way or the other, it just seems like I'm just trying to play the other side here because I do know even though they're not speaking up I do know there is another side.

One thing I could ask each of the work tracks to do is to make it an agenda item going forward or at least on the next call to see if there are specific items within your particular work tracks that may fall into this category where it can

be bifurcated. Again, it may – you may come out as the work track and say, no, we don't think it can be bifurcated. But I think before we make that judgment on this call I do agree more time is needed and perhaps my recommendation would be to discuss this as an agenda item within each work track.

Let me go to Greg. Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. And speaking only for myself, this letter strikes me, to some extent, as one of these you don't get an answer if you don't ask type of letters or requests. And clearly, I mean, I see a certain reading at a certain enthusiasm for trying to do, you know, pull the cake out of the oven before it's baked or perhaps that betrays my thinking about whether in fact this can be done in a fashion that allows us to start the next round before we finish talking about it.

And it seems to me that the quoted part of the request asking if consideration has been given to whether an application process could proceed while policy work continues or if other critical issues could be identified while that's phrased in the past tense in a sense as to what work we have done that's probably just being diplomatic and asking that we do that. And – or at least consider doing that. So we need to keep that in mind in terms of – I think in terms of any response we give.

That said, given what we've gathered this group here to do and given the amount of time that, you know, seems to appropriately, in my mind, elapse between rounds or procedures or whatever you may call them, the idea that we would somehow do all this work and yet not do it for the – upcoming round, seems to me to be a little odd given that unless we come to some very different decisions about how to open and close opportunities we might be talking about changes for 2025 or 2026. And it seems to me that I think that's – that would not make this a particularly pertinent exercise at this time.

What's pertinent I think is to do the work that we put in front of us for the next round of procedures or whatever procedure of rounds, and then not, you know, unless we really think that fragmenting our work and trying to figure out all of the dependencies and control for them is something that we should spend our time doing, seems to me that that's actually going to delay any result of this process for quite some time. So I would be quite concerned about going down that road as, you know, if we could find maybe some highly limited alternatives, you know, maybe that makes sense. But it seems to me that that's likely to be unlikely. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. I think some good comments in there. And I think you echoed something a couple people said earlier in the chat which is that there are many items that are intertwined and, you know, to figure out how they're intertwined may take us more time than just going through the regular process.

Avri and Paul are next in the queue. So, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. Yes, so in terms of talking about the process, we have two ways of responding. And I think, from what I've heard, any response we give has to include the fact that there is no consensus in the group at this point for one way or another for making changes or for sticking with things as they are, that basically, you know, it's hard to say that we're split on it but there definitely is no consensus on it.

Now we can either respond I think through our liaison asking him or we can indeed write a note. Jeff and I could write a note to Council that tries to express the discussion we've had here. And says, you know, that there is no consensus on it. That we can continue to work on this. I think the points made that, you know, working on splitting it now does indeed make the process take longer.

With regard to Jeff's request of adding an item to all the subteams, I think that coming off the notion that, A, we don't have a consensus for splitting it at the moment, so asking them to start thinking about splitting it may be premature. B, therein (the exercise) at the moment of figuring out how long it's going to take them to do stuff and what is their ordering of the work they're doing. And that, indeed, would be a component of any subsequent splitting change in any case because they're looking at order in terms of what things need to be solved first, what's the complexity, what things feed into others, how things connect across the subteams when they do connect.

And all those things would need to be understood before anybody started talking about how they could split something. So I think that it's premature for the reason that this group has not decided we want to split therefore working on how to split is premature. And that they don't have the base of knowledge in the groups about the work they're doing. It's ordering and schedules to do so.

So what really remains – and I'll Paul this question, that's why I didn't automatically hop behind him as I've been doing with everyone else – whether he thinks it's adequate for him to bring the message or whether he would prefer to see a note from Jeff and I basically, you know, describing where we are on this. Jeff and I would have very little time to float that with the group, maybe a day, but just wanted – or indeed Paul could just pass the message on.

So I'd like to get Paul's opinion on that and then see if we can sort of close this issue for today as we have at the moment 40 minutes left of the meeting, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. Paul, did you want to just jump back to see if – on Avri's suggestion of whether you could just do this orally with the Council or whether you wanted – you thought it would be better for a note from Avri or I?

Paul McGrady: Sure. This is Paul McGrady for the record. And I lowered my hand because Avri said what I wanted to say which was I'm happy either way, either a note coming in from the two of you is fine. And I can add some commentary to that in the actual council meeting, or I can just deliver this message that, you know, essentially – and here's what I think it boils down to is that within the timeframe provided that we are not able to reach a consensus that the work should be split up in some way that would be before the next round opens versus after the next round opens. And that we essentially remain committed to our work plan.

And that's the takeaway. First of all, wanted to make sure that I understood the takeaway accurately if I'm going to convey this verbally and also just to express the willingness that if the group would prefer that it go in as a note instead that I'm happy with that direction as well. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Paul. Avri, do you want to just – that seems to me correct. I think Paul's got it. Although there was a request to discuss this issue in Hyderabad with our groups to see if perhaps anything coming out of those discussions would lead us to something – a different conclusion I think was one of the recommendations.

So I don't mean to say that it should be dropped forever, but at least like you said, no consensus at this point in time that, you know, we have a work plan. We're committed to our work plan. We'll send our work plan, at least the initial work plan, out so that the Board is aware of it. And reserve the right to just have this conversation again in Hyderabad. That sound okay, Paul?

Paul McGrady: It does...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: You have Kavouss also.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Yes.

Avri Doria: You have Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Hello?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: May I talk? Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Avri, I agree with your solution or your conclusion. We write back to the Council – this time I say correctly – Council, not Board. That there is no consensus on the matter. We could add that we continue discussing the issue including in Hyderabad with the view to have some conclusions on the matter, if any. I am not in favor of putting any alternatives nor in favor of discussing this issue at the next meeting on the subgroup. It is very important for the time being there is no consensus. Let's do the remaining part that we have to do and close up this item at this stage. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Kavouss. Paul, your hand is up again or is that an old hand? Oh, never mind. Okay, so, Avri, I think I'm going to turn it back to you and you'll, in turn, turn it back to me, so we can go to the next item.

Avri Doria: Okay. This is Avri. Thank you for the discussion on that issue. I think Paul does have the – as amended by the following conversation. I do understand Kavouss indicating that us giving Paul a note that basically says what has been discussed here would be a good idea. So I think Jeff and I should give Paul a note. We could send one to the Council chair copying Paul or Paul copy the chair basically saying it and then Paul can explain it further as needed.

So thank you for that discussion. At this point like to move into the CC1 discussion which is basically about half an hour now and then I'll break for the any other business discussion on ICANN – on the Hyderabad meeting unless staff tells me that five minutes is not enough in which case I'll break it 10 minutes early. So but in the meantime, Jeff, please go ahead with the continued discussion of the CC1 review tool and the comments. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you, Avri. This is Jeff Neuman for the record. Making sure you all can still hear me. I just see active speakers. I don't see my name so I don't know if there's anyone else...

Avri Doria: I hear you. I hear you.

Jeff Neuman: Great, okay. Cool. So, yes, going back to CC1, if everyone remember the chart and it's now on the Adobe, we had just finished up Category 1 – or sorry, general question 1 and have moved on to – on now Question Number 2. If you recall, we are going through the general comments, and who made those comments, any resources we can look at to give further information on it, our working group response, so we should, as Avri pointed out on the last call, it is our obligation to respond to each of the comments. And then if there's any recommended action based on those comments we should address those here.

So the number – Question Number 2 is basically on categorization or differentiation of gTLDs and then there's some examples that are given there of – for example, brand, geographical, community, etcetera. Initially, if you look at the gray areas, this is where in the chat these were our, quote, preliminary findings of discussions prior to the – getting the responses for CC1.

And so we talk about in here the categories were considered in the original policy development process but they were deemed to be challenging to identify, differentiate and implement so there's no existing policy

recommendations on those categories, but we will say that in the 2012 round there were some categories that came out of that, some that were mentioned in the Guidebook like communities, like geographic to some extent, nongovernmental organizations had some different provisions in the Registry Agreement, and then later added was Specification 13 for brands.

And so there already are some recognition of categories of gTLDs. And the recognition that somethings apply – that not everything applies the same to each of those categories. Different categories of TLDs may have differing levels of complexity, some of which could be taken into account for determining if certain categories could be carved out for a discrete application window. That's something we still need to talk about.

And anticipated outcomes, preliminarily the working group has agreed at a high level that there are likely benefits to establishing categories. The working group also agrees that it should create in the overarching issues process a set of candidate categories to discuss as a work track sub team such as the AGB, the Applicant Guidebook plus other de facto ones.

However, the working group has not agreed on the specifics of what those categories are, the related changes to the application process that would like be necessary and nor have we agreed upon any enforcement mechanisms that may be needed and we have not – with so many downstream effects the substantive work on developing the parameters for categories will be pushed further out in the schedule.

And so we then solicited comments from each of the groups. I will also note that we still have not – probably should have said this at the beginning, but we still have not received comments from the ALAC or the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group which has indicated in the past that we are likely to get a response.

And we have not received responses from some other groups as well, like the Business Constituency or the Registrars or the ISPs, but I'm not sure that they ever indicated that they would be sending us a response. Sorry for that diversion, I just wanted to make sure that that was on the record.

So in the – oh. Kavouss, you have a comment before I get to what the GAC has said about this? Because I was going to read that...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: No, no, if you want to continue go ahead, I listen. And after that a comment. Go ahead please.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So the GAC addressed these categories in – it advised in its communiqué from Nairobi – that was in March 2010 – it says, “Finally the GAC reiterates the importance of fully exploring the potential benefits of further categories or track differentiation that could simplify rather than add complexity to the management of the new gTLD program and in that way help to accelerate the new gTLD program in particular.”

“The GAC believes that this could create greater flexibility in the application procedures to address the needs of a diversity of categories or types of string including common nouns, example, music; cultural, linguistic communities, brand names and geographical strings would likely make application processes more predictable and create greater efficiencies for ICANN both in ASCII and IDN.”

“Number 2, taking into account the applicants and users of new TLDs of a high public interest for specific communities such as city TLDs or country region or other geographical TLDs, may expect the legal framework of the territory in which the community is located to be applicable to the TLD. ICANN should allow for ways to respect the specific legal framework under which the respective community is operating in the TLD regime. This will also help

ICANN, the applicants and national or local public authorities to avoid the risk of large-scale legal challenges.”

And the third point, “Instead of the currently proposed single fee requirement, a cost-based structure of fees appropriate to each category of TLD would, A, prevent cross-subsidization; and, B, better reflect the project scale. Logistical requirements and financial position of local community and developing country stakeholders who should not be disenfranchised from the new TLD round. And then these issues remain relevant to future new gTLD processes.”

And then in the next column it talks about the sources where this advice came from. I’ll start with that one. There are two other recommendations from – or two other responses that were received. Kavouss, do you want to add anything to the GAC response?

Kavouss Arasteh: I am not speaking for GAC but I would like to mention that categorization maybe helpful provided that it facilitates, provided that it makes the life of the people simple, and provided that our identifications of existing situations is convincing that some course – some degree of categorizations is required but not posing any difficulty. I don’t see this argument in the document.

And then you say you have not received any reply. I don’t know which timeframe you’re referring but now you’re discussing the 2010 communiqué of GAC. We are in 2016. Many things has been passed. Then we have to really look at today this is what situation. So once again categorization may be okay provided that it facilities and simplify the tasks. But we need to have the argument and example in what extent or to what extent is facilitate and it simplify. We don’t have that argument yet, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Kavouss. Anybody else have any responses to the GAC comments? Just giving a second for anyone to – okay well then I’ll jump to what the Registry have said. And the Registries have different views on this subject.

They have – “There are different views within the Registry Stakeholder Group about whether additional categories of TLDs should be defined therefore this response provides the responses for and against new categories. Despite the differences of opinion, we do reiterate that the Registry Stakeholder Group does support the continuation of the categorization of gTLDs as outlined in the Applicant Guidebook and the inclusion of brands in any ongoing mechanism.”

So the Registries are now addressing both arguments in favor and against adding even additional TLDs – or sorry, categories, additional categories. “The arguments against adding additional categories are that future application processes should be as open as possible to preserve the benefits brought by 2012 round. Limiting applications and types could have a negative effect on future application processes potential to foster innovation and broaden consumer choice; likewise, excessive segmentation of the application pool will stymie the progress of the working group by encouraging separate policy analysis for each class of registry operator or applicant. In the event that the next round does result in 10,000 applications or even 15,000, categories will result in added burden for evaluators to decide what goes where.”

“Contention resolution becomes even more complicated if a single string can fit into a number of categories. The administration of the Registry Agreement also becomes challenging. It is not clear that any claim benefits of new categories will outweigh the costs.”

Then there’s arguments in favor. “Some registries believe it’s possible that other categories beyond brand could be strongly defined and lessons learned applied to the extent that certain tailoring would be meaningful and worthwhile prior to the next application window. A one-size-fits-all approach did not work well in the latest round. Consequently, restrictions and

obligations were imposed that were not appropriate or relevant to certain types of applicants.”

“It would be careless of ICANN to disregard this given the lessons learned during this round only to repeat again. Any ongoing mechanism should be able to cater for categories that could be well defined based on the range of application types seen in the last round and where there is significant volume and where there is reasonable argument to amend or remove certain provisions obligations or processes that are not relevant to that category.”

Is there anyone from the Registries that would like to elaborate on this? Okay, I’m not seeing anyone that wants to elaborate. Perhaps if Donna listens to the recording she can give some additional feedback.

And then the comments were also submitted on this by the IPC. The Intellectual Property Constituency states that they, “do see a benefit in a streamlined process for brands since brands provide protection for consumers and do not raise many of the concerns of open gTLDs. We also believe that ICANN should consider a more substantial approach to subsidizing applications from underserved jurisdictions which would be a highly appropriate use of the auction proceeds, which ICANN is currently holding from the 2012 round.”

So that last comment is not really within our purview to determine the auction funds, but Greg or anyone from the IPC, would you like to weigh in on this or add anything to the IPC statement? Greg, thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Greg Shatan for the record. I actually think this kind of speaks for itself and it does, you know, go the points we were discussing earlier about, you know, looking at different approaches to different types of applications. And would not say that this indicates that it would be – this does not necessarily indicate, you know, a desire or strong support for a brands only round, although it’s not an objection to it either.

And with regard to the underserved I think that's, you know, nothing that has to do with brands per se, although we will note that in spite of what some people may think there are small and medium-sized enterprises that are – that, you know, live and die by their brands or their trade names and, you know, they've looked at this as a – something that's out of their league due to the, you know, the costs of entry especially from outside of kind of the usual suspect areas.

And it would be good to see, you know, way for participation to be broadened, you know, regardless of category. Just as a general good of the process sort of thing. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. Kavouss, is that a new hand or is that...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, it is new hand. I have a...

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...question if I may? I don't understand the meaning of underserved jurisdictions. This is a question. And second, I am not in favor of the proposal of IPC that they advocating generalizing or extending the auction. I don't think that. The auction currently has a specific applications when we have identical requests for the same name or the same gTLD. I don't think that we should extend that auction and the otherwise we will favor those who have more possibility and disadvantage those that do not have that one.

And you know that the auction is the last resort of the ICANN Board in particular circumstances, but we don't want. So one question to the IPC, if I may, and second one comment that we not agree with this conclusion. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Kavouss. Greg, do you want to respond to that?

Greg Shatan: Sure. Respond to the second point first. Maybe there is a lack of clarity in what we were saying. We were not suggesting any extension to the application of the auction concept, merely saying that auction proceeds, the proceeds from both the current round of auctions, which are now sitting waiting for, you know, a group to figure out what to do with them, and the proceeds of any future auctions based on whatever rules are made for auctions, could be – that that money could be used to subsidize applications from what we call underserved jurisdictions.

And I think by that if you look at the geographic distribution of the registries and the new gTLDs, it is not exactly mapping to the population of the world and could be seen as somewhat skewed. There was a process in the first round for subsidy but it did not really seem to work out all that well, did not seem to be simple enough, well publicized enough, etcetera. So, you know, what we're talking about underserved – and maybe that's not the best word, maybe under represented, but we are, you know, looking to, you know, those parts of the world which, you know, participated less heavily in the current round. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Greg. I'll go to Alan and then back to Kavouss.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Two comments. First of all, on the auction funds, there will be another CCWG that will look at the use of the auction funds from the current round. There is an intersection with our work, however, in that as Greg pointed out there was a subsidy aspect to the last round, which admittedly didn't work and perhaps was ill conceived. But we're going to have to look at whether we do something in some future rounds and there could be an intersection with auction funds, it's not at all clear how we would interact with the CCWG should – when that discussion becomes relevant.

I have a comment on the Registry comment. As I heard it, they seemed to be suggesting not only that categories are good, but that we should build provisions so that in future rounds, not necessarily the upcoming one, but ones following that, that we have a process by which new categories can be defined essentially on the fly without going back to a PDP.

It's a really intriguing idea. And I think I support in concept, although I'm not at all sure how we could implement it. So if I heard that correctly, it would be interesting to hear some comments, perhaps not now, from the Registries as to just how they think we could do that. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. Just to note for the record I think there was a split within the Registries so the registries that were arguing in favor of additional categories were making that argument but there were many registries that argued against categories so there was no consensus within the Registries of that point.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Kavouss, did you...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Thank you very much, Greg, with the explanation that you've given. It makes the issue more clearer. But I don't know whether it's possible that this paragraph from IPC or this part from IPC could be amended in a way that described by Greg, which is more clear and not confusing.

However, on the auction, in one of the public forum, I don't know which one, but it was Buenos Aires or any one, the issue was raised how the money out of the auction would be spent. And it was discussions that this is a matter to be further discussed, put into the public comments based onto some policies. Whether that policy is a PDP, whether that policy is a statement from the Board, puts in the public comment. Then I would be very much appreciated to know how these money or this money is currently spent.

If it is going to subsidize for the underserved or the under-represented area that would be good idea. But I don't know whether the ICANN Board currently use that amount of money which is not a little, for this sort of purposes or they're using differently. It would be good that if we have some reply from the ICANN at a later stage if possible. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. My understanding of the status is that there is, as I think Alan just said, there's a cross community working group that's been formed. They are working on a charter to address the auction funds. So at this point there really has not been any material progress on determining what those auction funds would be used for. But really in the preliminary stages of working on a draft charter.

Alan, did you have anything you wanted to add to that?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was just going to give the current status. I'm the vice chair of the drafting team on that CCWG. We have last week sent out to the ACs and SOs a draft charter for their comment so that we could incorporate any comments and then have it ratified we're hoping by or at Hyderabad. And at that point, assuming the charter is ratified, a CCWG will be formed and that CCWG will be charged not with allocating money but with coming up with a process.

And perhaps limiting the scope or the range of topics which could be ultimately funded by some ongoing organization after the fact. So we're making good progress. We may not have – done any substantive work but we've done an awful lot of work on drafting this charter. It was far more complex issue because there are a number of fiduciary issues that come into it case of the huge amount of money we're talking about, at least by ICANN standards. And so a lot of progress has been made and it is at this point in the hands of the ACs and SOs. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Alan. So I think where we stand, just to kind of sum it up and then I'll turn it back over to Avri, is – and I hear some typing in the background so if everyone could go on mute? That would be great. But I think where we stand now is there does seem to be agreement that at least the categories that are currently in the Applicant Guidebook are ones that we should continue forward with.

There is no consensus yet on whether additional categories would be a good idea, although the GAC seems to be in favor of it if it's – help simplify the process according to the 2010 statement. The Registries are of two different minds on this issue. Some in favor, some against. And the IPC just weighs in on the brands and so believes that that's an important category to continue going forward.

So next time we'll talk about the rest of the questions in 2 including are there any additional categories that we could agree on if we did agree on additional categories. But with that we have 10 minutes left so, Avri, let me turn it back over to you to address Hyderabad.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. This is Avri speaking again. And I thank the person that muted the typing. I know people think it may not be as bad as the echo and it may not, but each keystroke that's pounded there feels like something is being pounded on my ear in the headphones. And it may be the case for other people. It really is quite painful so I would ask people to really pay attention to their muteness.

Okay, I'd like to turn to the any other business. First I wanted ask, did any other any other business come up during the meeting that should be discussed? I see no hands on that. So Steve, I guess this is your item. And I know that a basic schedule just came out either yesterday or today. I have not had a chance to look at it. I don't know if other people have. But, Steve, I'd like to turn the floor over to you if you're the right person to turn it over to. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks, Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. And I didn't have a whole lot to discuss on this topic but I did want to make sure that it's on people's radars. But I would note that this working group has an allocated four-hours as a working session on the first day of ICANN 57, which is actually the 3rd of November.

So some of the things that the working group might want to consider is how they want to allocate that time. A logical way if there's four hours is to allocate one hour to each work track, for instance. But I don't know if that's determined necessarily but that's one way that we could do it.

So what the work tracks should – I guess the working group and work tracks should also consider is if there are certain milestones that they want to reach before ICANN 57 which may facilitate discussions there. And hopefully achieve better outcomes during the discussions there as well.

So those are just a couple thoughts on that. And like I said I just wanted to make sure it's on people's radars. If there are comments on that now I'd love to hear them, but otherwise I think the plan would be to work with staff and the cochairs of the full working group as well as the leadership of all of the work tracks to really plan the path forward to ICANN 57 and then plan for the actual working session there.

So I just wanted to give an update and make sure it's on people's radars, like I said, and then also if there are comments that people wanted to share I'd love to hear them as well. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. This is Avri. And I've put myself in the queue. So thank you very much. First I wanted to ask a question. So it's a single session we're having and are there any other sessions that apply to this group?

One thing I'd like to say that will probably also need to get into those four hours, and I think we can split it up without having to necessarily slip it up on the hour, is also a – giving an update on where we are with response to the CC1 comments and to devote a little bit of time to that so that hopefully by then we can have a first draft of how we changed our views and such before then and would be able to, you know, sort of present that and have some discussion on that. So I think that's one thing we should consider.

The other thing that I'd like to sort of put on the table for the work teams is CC1 was only asking questions on those overviews. I think that if it's possible it would be really good to have each of the work teams have come up with one, two and not that many more, unless they really have that many more, questions that we could have put out by Hyderabad and whether we put them together and are doing our CC2 or not is something we can look at a little later.

I don't know that we necessarily have to though I do think it might be a good idea to do so especially if we can frame questions already. And my listening to the work teams doesn't have me there yet but I could see how it might be possible.

So that is one thing that I'd like to sort of put on the table for people to consider in terms of work to be done before Hyderabad and the possibility of actually getting the CC2 out either right before Hyderabad or shortly after in terms of any – and it doesn't need to be many questions. It really is are there questions that the work teams are talking about where you'd really like to have the SOs, ACs, stakeholder groups and constituencies give further input, further specific input.

So – and I'll take my hand down and I see Kavouss behind me. I'll note we have four minutes left. Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, just a question. Do you think or consider to have any physical meeting of the group during the ICANN 57? Thank you.

Avri Doria: Well the sessions that – I believe is the afternoon of the Monday is a meeting of the group. It's a working group work session. It's not a dog and pony. It's not a presentation. It's a working group work group with the community included.

Kavouss Arasteh: Is it open to everybody case I attended...

Avri Doria: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...to one of these meetings and I was told that this is a private meeting, please leave us. They didn't tell me but they said that those people who are not involved could kindly requested to get out of the room. That was clearly mentioned in one of the GNSO meetings. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, I do not know what meeting you're speaking of. But all I really worry about it was not a meeting of this group I assume. My assumption and my – the principle I follow is that all meetings are open to everyone, members, as well as nonmembers, participants, observers. It's the one place where observers actually do get to participate more fully because it is an open meeting. So I see absolutely no issues to you participating.

We have not had closed meetings scheduled in this group, I do not believe. There may be times that the GNSO – I know they have one meeting that is closed which is their wrap up meeting as a council afterwards. I don't know of other GNSO closed meetings but I may be missing one. But I certainly do not believe that we had one. And I don't see any way possible that we would. So the meeting will be open.

Yes, please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Avri. I just want to clarify. You had said something about the meeting behind on Monday; it's actually on Thursday, Day 3 is...

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...Day 1 is actually Thursday is this meeting so it's Thursday, November 3. I believe at two o'clock in the afternoon is when it starts so it's the afternoon session on the very first day of the official meeting. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you for the correction, Jeff. I have not gotten my head wrapped around the midweek start yet so I apologize for the error. Day 1 equals Thursday. Okay so anyone else have anything else to say in this last minute before I close the meeting? I don't see any hands. I don't hear anyone. I thank the staff, I thank all of you for this very productive and discussion-full meeting. And I'll talk to you all in the sub teams, on the list and in future meetings. So thank you all. Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Avri. Thanks, Jeff. Bye everybody.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great day, everyone.

END