JONATHAN ZUCK:	Hello and welcome to call number 47 of the CCT Review Team. I see that roll call's been taken from the Adobe Connect. Is there anybody that's on the phone but not present and accounted for in Adobe Connect? All right. Is there anybody with an update to the Statement of Interest? All right.
	Hearing none. Let's launch in to discussion of the INTA Study.
	I got some musical background [inaudible].
	Who wants to start things off in terms of how this affects our draft and reaction to the study? Jordyn, do you think that it has an impact on the parking analysis? Waudo, go ahead.
WAUDO SIGANGA:	Yeah, I hope there isn't too much background noise. I only managed to look at the slides. Hello? Can you hear me?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	We can hear you.
WAUDO SIGANGA:	Yeah, I only managed to look at the slides and I can see that we have to at least change a little bit of conclusions regarding choice. I have a copy of our reports here, I don't know if it's the same page numbering but on page 16, we had a conclusion which we say the initial indications that the New gTLD Program have led to a dramatically increasing consumer

---

choice. I think we'll have to edit that to take into consideration what this INTA Study say about choice actually being [very helpful] for the [inaudible] community.

And I think there's also another part, part 7. I think it's page 36 part 7 where we are talking more about consumer choice. I think we also have to edit that. I don't know exactly what things are used but those are the two [that can show] which are impacted by this INTA Study.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Waudo. Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. I think there's a couple – I think Waudo's right. It generally makes sense to incorporate some of the information from the INTA Study into the consumer choice portion of the report. I think it's clear that for the trademark callers who responded that… they view the program largely as an obligation as opposed to choice. I think that's probably not surprising. I wouldn't say necessarily inconsistent with our previous findings, but we can have some data and some clarity of language around that.

We do have a slightly better quantification for these larger… It tends be larger brands, what the sort of total cost to them of the defensive registration looks like. It's little hard. So one thing of interesting that we can probably roll up is that whereas our previous look at defensive registration, the trademark holds look on a per domain registration basis. The INTA Study looks at a per entity basis and it also concluded

that most of the defensive activities actually happened by those that have any – I can't remember what the word is, something like a large amount of trademark activity. So in particular like a consumer goods company that has hundreds or thousands of brands, this program – it's generally much higher, that's our registration cost than companies looking to a lot of trademark branding activity.

If you only have one brand, for example, and you weren't as active using it online, then the cost probably sounds it wouldn't be as high. This is slightly different angle that we're looking on per domain basis, so it might be to say individual entity is only registering each trademark, it's a relatively small number of times. But then you have thousand domains, so you need to register that can still end up being expensive. Probably worth reflecting that in our report as well.

So one alteration that I did make or that's worth taking a look at is this also helps us we understand whether or not the defensive registrations are really driving the total volume of domains in new gTLDs. I think there's been some speculations in the past that or even raised on the last call like if all the registrations of the new gTLDs, our defensive registration per brand that's really not very good for the program, it doesn't really indicate competition.

I think actually the data that we have is helpful in confirming that that's not the case. If you look at the faction of spend by these brands, it's lower – it's only about 7% of the total – than in the new gTLDs and the total sort of registration volume in new gTLDs globally which is, I guess, depending on which set of data we use. I remember the number 12% or something like that. Brands actually seemed to be – were not quite

carrying apples to apples, it's dollars versus dollars versus the number of registrations. But still it doesn't seem like based on that data, the brands are actually underrepresented, having to go through registration, underrepresented the total pool of the registered populations. Probably it gives us some comfort that sort of the worst case hypothesis isn't true. Although we also have some data indicating that's there's some costs or there's some way of thinking about cost at least didn't reflect in our original report that we probably should is what [inaudible] lot of sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jordyn. I guess the other question to the degree to which we're able to see – I mean it's tough with 33 respondents to be definitive about this. It's going to bias the results probably toward the higher trademark volume companies. But there's notion of the changing distribution of the defensive cost. In other words, it's not all about defensive registrations but the impact generally and using the [assist] letters and rapid suspensions and things like that but are now alternative but might be in higher use because of the high volume of… because of the sort of the expensive nature of engaging purely on defensive registration strategy. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I was just wondering and I think… this is to Jordyn. Do we have information about the total cost spent by the brand owners? Because I think you just mentioned that as a percentage, you thought the data showed that they are underrepresented in new gTLD registrations. But I'm wondering from a dollar perspective if we have that information.

EN

And you may have just said that we didn't, but I just wanted to clarify that because it seems to me that the money spent might be even more telling in the question of what role defensive registrations have played in the new gTLD purchasing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, Laureen. I don't think I agree like so we have some sort of apples to oranges comparisons which is great obviously. Because we know on the one hand we know the new gTLDs for across the global populations are – I don't remember. I think it keeps coming like the 12%, actually it goes higher than that now. But upwards of 10% of the total number of registrations, but that's not dollars.

And we know from the INTRA Study at least it's about 7% of the dollars that are being spent. So if you assumed everything cost in price, then they would definitely be underrepresented but as we should say we don't actually have transactional data. We don't know the total number of dollars being spent on new gTLDs versus legacy gTLDs outside of a survey.

So we have a little bit of an apples-to-oranges comparison. Having said that, the fact that the percentage is lower than we see in the registration volumes, I think at least should give us some comfort that – it's clearly not the case that the overwhelming majority of the activity in the new gTLDs are being driven by defensive registration by brands in particular. Because that 10% like too small of a fraction in order for that to possibly be true.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Right, and that's reassuring.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Yeah, that's right.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Definitely. Waudo, go ahead. Waudo is that you? You have your hand up? Is that noise coming from Waudo's line? Looks like it. Waudo? Okay. Carlton, do you wanted to just come on and discuss things verbally, so we're [inaudible] the test? Okay. So Carlton was saying that the defensive [inaudible] with parking as something significant. Jordyn, is that a new hand to respond to Carlton?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Yeah, I mean a little bit of respond to Carlton. I think my point to Carlton's [inaudible] with Laureen which is I do think we need to add in to the report, it is clear that for trademark holders at least of the new gTLDs largely represents the defensive cost, not consumer choice that drive the language to that effect. On the same – I don't think it's consistent what we had previously found regarding the fact that this probably isn't sort of the dominating factor in registrations [that] there's other classes. But for non-trademark holders, I think our previous conclusion probably still hold and it seems that we can conclude that there's a large of inactivity [like] in front of people, per volume by the trademark holders. [inaudible] the dominant portion. I was going to say just in terms of thinking about next step perhaps give us something stronger to react to, I certainly try to take a stab at incorporating this

into the consumer choice section of the document. I think there's the section on RPM protection.

It actually looks mostly positive. I think especially it's very consistent with what we had already written, the work that David had already done on RPM. [URS] is helpful. For some people are helpful, for others [inaudible]. Sunrise and UDRP were generally positive. And some qualification of the other types of [enforcement] activities. [David] incorporated all of the data into his section in RPM. That would give us some concrete tech to respond to as opposed to the sort of more [inaudible] discussion although if people have additional inputs, they want to make sure gets in to those section where they probably got the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, definitely. I guess the other thing that isn't really extrapolatable is any kind of total cost. It's pretty much it's a small sample size, it doesn't even feel like there's an [actual] extrapolation to be made. David, do you have a sense of how the study's being received in the IT community?

DAVID TAYLOR: Hi, Jonathan. Can you hear me okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, a little bit but we can hear you.

DAVID TAYLOR: Can anybody hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: We can hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, we can hear you.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay. Sorry no one's replying so I assumed no one could hear me. I don't know yet there's quite a bit of discussion I'm looking online but we head off to the INTA meeting itself on [big stuff] on Saturday of this week. So we'll be discussing it there so a lot more to add mostly we've gone through a couple of sessions we'll be looking and I'll discuss with people a minute. Of course I have to read it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that would be good. Can we make a homework assignment for you to kind of provide IT-centric reaction to it in terms of distribution or defensive products and their sense of indication in the IT community or [inaudible] probably expensive.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, I'll try and get that, but the meeting is on Saturday to Thursday, so I'm not sure if can I make the call next Wednesday because [inaudible] actually with other things as well. It's certainly, when I'm back to my

INTA definitely I can send an e-mail around summarizing some of the discussions, probably make a call next week which is [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Great, David. That's great. We just want to make sure that we're not putting something out there unless this comes to [inaudible] we can comment. I think the key is to participate as much [inaudible] that.

DAVID TAYLOR: Absolutely. That's good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Other thoughts on the study? Jordyn, you're going to take a… [SWAT] said updating choice. I guess, Laureen, I feel like it's very anecdotal but is there anything about the trust etc. that you feel was affected that the study reveals. I don't really see it. But want to make sure that we're looking in terms of the kind of anecdotal complaints that people had about – how Sunrise Periods were handled and [inaudible] and things like that. I don't think it really came out in the study.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, that is a more outside of the study at least my general impression. But I'll take a look at it through that lens and report back.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Laureen. And Carlton's forwarding something from [NCUCC] as well, it looks like. Okay, any other thoughts or comments on the INTRA Study? All right. Thanks, folks. We will revisit with David and Laureen and Jordyn's updates to choice section of the report. Without further ado, I'll hand the mic to Jordyn to do the discussion on parking.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Yeah, actually I think this will be pre-discussion because after I signed myself up for more homework, I haven't finished this bit of homework. But I did spend a little bit of time over the past week trying to figure out how to address the discussion on parking that we had a couple of weeks ago and wanted to just suggest what I'm trying to incorporate and I think this will help capture some of the conversation that we have that we want to get sort of feedback including from Kylie, who have raised the issue of parking in the Chinese TLDs in general.
	I think as we noted in our last discussion of parking there's already enough – this group has already taken the numbers and give us some advice market share and concentration calculations. Once [inaudible]. So the summary of that are the market share's calculations such as car parking into account. For the total new gTLD market decreased the impact of the new gTLD expansion significantly, but is still directionally the case that new gTLDs are significant part of the group. It's just not the 50% number or even higher that we've been talking about in terms of the initial reports. And in terms of the market concentration statistics, we don't actually see very significant effect largely, just because the market already fairly concentrated even without taking parking into consideration. I think the things that we had discussed potentially

EN

identifying – trying to take a look and see how the [inaudible] and first of all take a look at how the – whether there's actually a relationship between the renewal rates in the new gTLDs and the parking rates since the hypothesis and sort of backing out the parking gTLD is that they might renew at lower rate.

Actually, that is I believe [quarantine] data that ICANN has available and then I'm going to finally respond to her in the next couple of days and figure out what we could probably use as renewal rate. Unfortunately, I have an actual metric that is renewal rates, so we'll have to use composites from some other data that they have.

Secondly, I think Kaili suggested taking a look at the set of Chinese gTLDs in particular. We don't have a way to look at Chinese registrants like the same way we have with the lack data because no one's gone through WHOIS data to try to figure it out.

But I think Kaili did identify data source sort of the top TLDs related to – this look like the Chinese registrants and to look at parking rates and that particular market, and see how it looks. So these are breakouts on the China market because Kaili's [inaudible] looking particular interest. Whoever runs those numbers – if the numbers, I think look particularly interesting, then I think we can incorporate that into the report as well. There should be a relatively straightforward exercises looking at a particular cluster of gTLDs.

So that's been helping. We can incorporate in but those require some additional analysis, so it may take a few weeks to [put that] all in. That's the plan that I have at least and wanted to make sure there weren't

other parking related projects or work streams that I wanted to include before we try to do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That pretty good covers to me, but others please raise your hand. [Alyssa] please.

[ALYSSA]:   Thanks, Jordyn. I just had a question on the analysis you just mentioned. Is that something you need us to do or we need analysis [inaudible]? I wasn't sure how are we going with that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'd love to see whether we can do the renewal rates one. Some [other needs] to come from ICANN, then you guys have the data that would allow the computation of renewal rate by gTLD based on monthly reports. [inaudible] has forwarded to me the list of metrics you guys have available, so I think it's a matter sort of deciding how to use them.

Then secondly there is the effort of calculating correlation between parking rate and renewal rates. And I don't know. I think it would be helpful if Stan's input are [handover] Analysis Group on to what the best way to think about that as a statistical problem is to see whether there's a correlation or not.

[OLIVA]:   Right. I agree with you. We looked at the numbers and there's several ways we could do it. It depends on what approach you'd like to take. But on the first point which is [inaudible] renewal rates, venturing TLDs, that also I think, as you know, there's different ways they're looking at renewals and how long the renewals are. So, I'm just wondering what year, what approach you had in mind or if you had one in mind.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. I think we can talk about this right now. I guess we have half an hour still and not much of an agenda. So, if people get too bored, let me know and we could take this off to the side.

So, the registries don't report of renewal rates per se. The proper way to compute it would probably be to take the set of domains that are eligible for renewal as a denominator and the set that are actually renewed as a numerator and that's your renewal rate. Unfortunately, we only know the number of things that are actually renewed and not the number that are available or eligible to be renewed.

However, it's also mostly the case that domains aren't deleted except for at the end when they aren't renewed. So, we could probably use the sum of renewed domains and deleted domains as the denominator with the renewed domains as the numerator and call that renewal rates and then just look at that over a year period or so.

With the yearends so whenever a domain, a new gTLD is launched but figure out some usual periods to calculate that over. I was trying to raise something like that down but that would be roughly what I would think the best we could do with the ICANN data would be.

[OLIVA]: That sounds reasonable to me. I think it'll have to acknowledge it's still kind of [inaudible] calculation that I'd be interested in your [father's and mother] opinion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I can't think of a more perfect one. Do other folks have a comment on this? I don't see anything in the chat. That seems like a good agenda. Go ahead, [Oliva].

[OLIVA]: Sorry. I was just going to say the only other caveat would be we'd want to take out those TLDs that haven't even out a year yet, and then presenting we would remove brand. This will help.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Brands for sure. Then I guess if the extent of which it's a percentage, then the amount of time it's been delegated isn't as relevant, right?

[OLIVA]: I'm sorry. Say that again, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If we're talking in percentages, then the time delegation is not as relevant, right?

[OLIVA]: Or if the TLD hasn't been around for [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The TLD has to [operate]. Exactly. Yes. You have to look for the TLD's been launched for a year before [inaudible] start performing this calculation.

[OLIVA]: They wouldn't have had any renewal otherwise.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. The renewal piece.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: To the extent, they are. They're not part of the expiration life cycle they're part of just like people spontaneously renewing ahead of schedule. Yes. I think you have to wait until a TLD has been launched for a year before you start producing the calculation. It's like the last six months of data provided and all those months are at least 15 months into the life of new gTLD or something like that.

EN

[OLIVA]: Yes. Waudo is asking are there longer periods and are they categorized from one to ten years?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's interesting. Any other questions or comments? Hi, Jordyn. For reasons that [per year] indication, based on when you feel like it'd be a time for [inaudible] on that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Review of public comments received from the working group. Jean-Baptiste?

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. So far, we still have three public comments received. The latest one being the one from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Group. What I try to do for you is to prepare quick summary of the input in case you have not read it yet.

Before I start, just a reminder that the closing date of the public comment period is this Friday at midnight, UTC. So, if you have a chance to share the Public Comment page, please do so.

So, looking at the different comments that were received from the SubPro Working Group, so many commented on, of course, the recommendation that were targeted to them.

In terms of all the feedback, there were many requests on clarifying the language and so forth. And also on providing a definition of some terminologies. Here, they are asking to clarify how quickly the CCTRT expects their group to interpret and adhere to the language of the recommendation. They asked for more detail to the report about procedural elements.

And as we have a few recommendations directed for example to ICANN Org, to the Board and to the SubPro Working Group, they ask to clarify whether this recommendation is targeting all at the same time or some parts of the recommendation of just one group, some as part of the other groups.

And also, there were a few question marks on some priority levels where they realize that it might not cope with their own processes and it's from us having first [inaudible] it would be hard also for ICANN Organization to complete the data collection than share it with the working group.

So, I'm just going to go into more detail on each recommendation for you. The first one on Recommendation #10 here on the screen. There's [three in comments]. First is that they are still deliberating on who would be the appropriate target for this recommendation. The review team will clarify the costs related to different registration, which one are included in this term and for whom. And finally, why this does recommendation specifically refers to a small number of brands which is doing a large number of domains.

I don't know if you want to react already or if I can just move on with just the review as you wish, Jonathan.

ZONATHAN ZUCK: I would say just move on. It's not going to have some sense of how [inaudible] and ask questions as they go.

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. Yes. So, under the Consumer section, Recommendation #14, create incentives to encourage gTLD registries to meet their expectations. This one is directed to the SubPro Working Group. Their comments here is to define what do we mean by user expectations, adding more detail required about the rationale for encouraging content to match the TLD's understood purpose, clarify how the reference to relationship of content of a gTLD to its name is consistent with Section 1.1 of the ICANN Bylaws.

On the Recommendation 33, they ask that we clarify the target audience of this recommendation. It's again as it's targeted to ICANN Org, PDP Working Group and [CCTCC] Review Team, they just want to make sure that this is. So, all of the recommendation applies for all the different groups. And the sooner that it needs to provide a more targeted definition of trustworthiness.

On Recommendation 14, here, they again just asks that we'd clarify the target audience for this recommendation.

On the Recommendation 35, this is the same comments as well. It's again targeted at ICANN Org, the PDP Working Group and [CCTCC] Review Teams.

[inaudible] safeguards on Recommendation 36. Here, they ask for clarification on how does the recommendation sits within the scope of the New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Working Group. And clarify when the PDP Working Group will be at the public comments. They also would like us to provide more clarity on the term "undue preferences" and how these impact competition.

Still on same parts, Recommendation 38. To them, this is properly assigned. They understood the recommendation. Finally, their comment is to the extent peaks our part of subsequent procedures, we think they will incorporate it into their relevant discussions.

Also, what I want to mention is that they also raise several times that the call that the CCTRT had with them on April 10th was really up full on clarifying some of the recommendations so they were really grateful on that.

Moving on to the Recommendation 39, still on the same [parts]. Here, they have more comments on this one, although this is appropriately assigned. So, they have remarks regarding the concept of fix and the applicability for subsequent procedures under consideration. They ask for more information on whether this would prevent the incident of voluntary PICs after application submission.

They suggested to reword this recommendation as follows. Over and to recommitments made by an applicant should be submitted during the application process such that there is sufficient opportunity for committee review and time to meet the deadlines for committee and limited public interest objections.

Finally, the working group is considering whether commitments can be modified at the time of application or as a result of our GAC advice and they are wondering how this would fit with the CCTRT recommendations.

Next one under Application and Evaluation and the draft reports, Recommendation 43 on setting objective for application from the Global South. Here, this is again appropriately assigned and underway within the Track 1, they ask for clarification on how rigidly this recommendation should be interpreted. Will the focus be exclusively on goals of number of applications and number of delegated strings or could objective for the Global South extend to their measures as well?

Here, in terms of terminology, they ask that the CCTRT provide a clear definition of Global South in the reports. And this is something that come back later on in the Application and Evaluation section as well. We'd get back to that.

And especially here under Recommendation 46, it's mentioning the term "undeserved communities" and they're wondering whether undeserved communities in Global South are distinct terms or interchangeable.

This Recommendation 46 is appropriately assigned to the group and is only way we can work Track 1. They are wondering if this recommendation pertains only to costs of applying for a new gTLD additional [inaudible] fees such as objection related fees also drives to operating costs.

Moving on to the next one, Recommendation 47. This is appropriately assigned but they are requiring that the CCTRT clarifies the scope of this

recommendation. And on Recommendation 48, this is the [remarked]. This is appropriately assigned and considered within Track 3. Recommendation 49, still under Application and Evaluation is the same, properly assigned and considered within Track 3.

And last one, Recommendation 50, last one in the report. They believe here that the priority needs to be reconsidered as the working group may have completed its work by the time this recommendation should be implemented. And they wonder whether this shall be redirected to another party. So, they would like us to clarify the [Internet] timeframe.

That's the summary for the different inputs and in any case we'll have, once the public comment period is closed, to review all the different comments received and to work on actual items and the draft updates.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, John-Baptiste. I think everybody knows what they own at this. So, I think the key is to come up with answers to propose on the next call to these questions and just sometimes it's around us, and incorporate them into the entity, incorporate the adjustments of applications into the final report.

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does that make sense to everybody?

[OLIVIA]:   Make sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Awesome. John-Baptiste, draft report edits.

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. On this part, you will have received together with the presented clarification. So, the draft report and the 93 edits on footnotes. So, this is the result of a thorough review from Brian on the footnotes in the draft reports.

We can review these edits right now and check whether those can be incorporated in the draft final reports. And so, this is following the process that was adopted during our Plenary call two weeks ago. So, I'm just going to keep this on screen. I'm sorry if you can't scroll down but I will guide you. I'm trying to make it as big as possible and I'm going to share the link in the chat to these little ones in case you don't find it in your inbox.

This is quite small. I think it will be ideal if you can follow that directly on your computer because I'm just afraid it might be too small for some of you.

Here, the first one is an update of Footnote #3. It's a change. I'm giving more details on the footnote and maybe Brian, you can give some more input on that.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Before you launch it, Brian, thanks a lot for doing this work. It's really important to get some of these details, right. Do you have a sense of the subset of these that might be controversial because you've made a change to the text as oppose to a reference update or something like that? I think going through an improvement changes feels like an unproductive task.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yes. Thanks, Jonathan. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. Great. Yes, I agree. I don't think it's necessary to go through each one. All I did was I noticed some sort of inconsistencies in the references. We had agreed that we would have a long version of the reference as the first reference and every subsequent reference would be a short version. Of course, we have a bibliography so readers can always reference with that. But that's all I did.

I just made sure the long version came first and every subsequent reference was the short version and in the appropriate format. So that's it. I don't think it should be too controversial but further review it as you wish.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. No, thank you. I mean I think it's really added professionalism in the reports. I don't want to in any way diminish the importance of the text. I just think it's probably not controversial enough to focus on.

I mean I welcome people going through the sections of the report and particularly looking for any textual based footnotes and making sure that those are still you're happy with. The straight references, I for one, am happy to trust Brian's efforts in this area.

Any questions or comments about that? Is there Any Other Business?

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jonathan, if I can just add something. Would it be possible if you still want people, the members to review these changes in the footnotes? Would it be possible to set up a deadline just to make sure that we can consider those approved and that a clean version can be updated to the wiki for those who wish to update the draft report?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Sometime within the next couple of days. Let's say by the end of the week that this person goes to, as I said, just to clarify to text, I think it's to go to the footnotes where there's more than just a site but where there's text and make sure that those still read the way you want them to read and get back with any changes. Otherwise, we'll consider these changes final by the end of the week.

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Any other business? Oliva?

[OLIVA]:   Yes. Thank you. I just wanted to add on the public comments that ICANN Organization will be hopefully was getting on submitting our comment in time to meet the deadline on Friday. So, I just wanted to let you know that that one's coming. And that's it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Great. Jordyn, if you're not done yet, you know whether there's a comment in process from the registries?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, there is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I think David, I think there's one in process from the IPC and DT as well. I don't know about beyond that. Any other questions or comments? All right, folks. Thanks for joining the call. Bye-bye.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jonathan.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]