ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Tuesday, 27 February 2018 03:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-27feb18-en.mp3   Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p6w4od6ksvl/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/IwWfB

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

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 27th of February 2018.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now? Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to 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 it back over to our cochair, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Please begin.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Terri. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And I would remind you all to identify yourselves at the beginning of any of your interventions. We have a very large slide deck today but fear not, not all of them are discussion points; some of them are in fact background material and if we can move to the next slide which is me doing a welcome, this would be Slide 3, I would like to let you know that for today's agenda, we'll be getting into another of our important overarching issues and that is the TLD types.

This is work that we last visited in any grave extent back in November last year but we just had homework arising from that particular meeting in November and we're going to be doing a recap and review of all of that material today, particularly seeing so we now have to keep an eye on our initial report and the development of that. So that's what we're going to be doing today. I'd now like to ask if there's anybody who has any updates to their statements of interest. Not seeing anybody wave at me in the Adobe Connect room and not hearing anybody on the telephone line, I will assume that there no updates to statements of interest.

And with that we'll move onto the next slide which is Slide 4 on the agenda, and we'll go through work track updates. So who's going to take it for Work Track 1? Don't all rush at once. Christa is not on audio, that's annoying. Perhaps, Christa, if you want to just type something in we'll move to Work Track 2. Who's going to take that? Go ahead, Michael. Over to you.

Terri Agnew: Michael, it's Terri. Your microphone is unmuted. I know we tested your audio a bit ago and it was working, however we're unable to hear you.

Michael Flemming: Can you hear me now? Can you hear me now? Hello?

Terri Agnew: We certainly can.

Michael Flemming: Oh great, okay. So for Work Track 2 this week we have a call upcoming on Thursday at 15 UTC and it is our plan to talk about the contractual compliance issue as well as TLD rollout. We also had global public interest scheduled as well but I think that we'll only be able to get through about two of those topics so we're going to concentrate on these two. And when we are currently discussing what we would - what we plan to have for ICANN 61. So we look forward to everyone turning out this week. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Michael. Let's move to Work Track 3 and is Karen or Robin taking this one? Robin got her hand up first, over to you Robin.

Robin Gross: Hi, can you hear me okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Loud and clear.

Robin Gross: Great. Okay so Work Track 3 - our next meeting is tomorrow, 27 February at 2000 UTC. And (unintelligible) is finalizing as we coalesce the opinions of our work track with respect to string confusion and string similarity. And then we'll also talk a little bit about our upcoming meetings in Puerto Rico and what to do there. So I hope folks will join. Again that's tomorrow Work Track 3, string similarity and string confusion. Thanks so much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much Robin, appreciate that update. I'm thinking I better take Work Track 4, I don't think my co-rapporteur, co-lead is on the call. So I can assure you that we will be getting an agenda out shortly for our upcoming meeting which is running at 2000 UTC on my Friday, which I believe is your Thursday, which will be March 1, 2000 UTC but staff can just double check that to make sure my calendar is in sync with the real world. And with that I'm assuming that we will be continuing with our building a consensus and clarifying of questions. So I will now ask who is going to - and this is Cheryl for the record, by the way - I'll now ask who amongst our Work Track 5 leadership team going to the - taking the Work Track 5 update.

But just before I get to that I wanted to formally on behalf of Jeff and I and to the wider PDP working group, welcome Javier Rua-Jovet, I didn't do that very well I'm sorry, (Javier), you know I'm terrible at your second name, I apologize, who is the EU ALAC appointee to the leadership team. And I will give Javier a moment to say hello and introduce himself while I assume someone else from the leadership team puts up their hand to do the - that was fine, I'm astonished - the update. So, Javier, if you have - oh no mic, well then you'll have to talk to everybody when you meet in your hometown or your home country when we come to Puerto Rico.

So who's going to be doing the Work Track 5 update? Not seeing anybody's hand up, I guess that will fall to me as well. Work Track 5 had I think a very productive meeting recently. I know Heather and I'm pretty sure Greg and a few others were on that call. We certainly are beginning to see not only progress in discussions but also specific understanding of some of the timelines and requirements that will be on Work Track 5. And regarding Work Track 5, and in fact all of the work tracks, I'll mention that again, when we come to looking at the timeline for the development of our final reporting and indeed our initial report.

So with that let's now move, unless there's any questions for anybody from any of those updates? Not seeing any. Christa, go ahead if you've got a mic now.

Christa Taylor: I do. Hopefully you can hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfectly. And I'm glad you've got your audio sorted. Go ahead please, Christa.

Christa Taylor: Great, thanks. So our next call for Work Track 1 is on March 6 at 2000 UTC. We'll still be working off the same document and share that link again for anyone who would like to review it. And I think we're going to probably hit a couple or a variety of different topics trying to fill in some holes and just focus on cleaning up the report. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. I was talking to a muted microphone, never a good thing. Appreciate that, Christa. And assuming that no one does have any questions now I'll ask if Terri can progress our slides skipping over Slide 5, which is just the introduction to Agenda Item 3, and jump straight into Slide 6 so we can get to the substantive issue for today's call. And I want to thank Steve and staff for putting this slide deck together for me to use today. And I certainly hope that you've all had the opportunity to update yourselves with the shared Google Doc on this topic. But this will be the highlight slide set.

So we're going to start now, and Christa, I'm assuming you'll be putting your hand down and that you don't have a question for yourself or anyone else? Thank you. That we're going look at why there are different categories. So let's start first and what we might do I believe is probably best for us to go through the first two - perhaps the first three slides which will be a recap of where we believe the leadership team believes we are at this stage on this matter, and then we'll open for discussion when we move perhaps to 9 - to Slide 9. So you should all be looking at Slide 6 at the moment. And it's the what is the rationale for having different of application categories.

We need to consider is it to define different ways in which applications received must be treated differently and certainly my feeling from the conversations and consensus building to date is that that is indeed a specific rationale and one that would need to be considered if one was either making changes or making modifications to the categories list that was in the 2012 round.

The next point we need to look at is what type of different treatment was seen in 2012 and what we may want to do about it in the future. There are some particular questions which have been discussed and matters which have been discussed and the ones that we have clear recognition on, the matters regarding applications questions, in other words are there additional or simplified or altered questions that will come into play depending on a type or category of TLD that is being applied to; matters of differences in the evaluation process, whether or not that should indeed occur and if it should occur what should it be?

The contractual requirements issues which of course include certifications and the PICs, and of course matters of post delegation challenge mechanisms and we've listed a couple there. I know I'd certainly be happy for any other which we've got a little question mark after if you believe you have

got an "other" in your memory recall, which is better than perhaps ours, then if you'd be so kind as to pop that into chat we'll make sure we capture it.

I'm going to ask us to however, move straight to the next slide, while you digest all of that, and we're going to look at what is needed beyond the existing categories, if anything. And right now we'll just look at the existing categories have the following characteristics that there is a standard, where there is no additional requirements in terms of the application process; there is a community based type; there is a geographic name type and there is a brand type.

And if we can move to the next slide this working group to date has identified some possible - this is a preliminary list and these are just here to be considered. There is no consensus as such established on these being a definitive list or even a list that any of them need to be considered. But we have identified to date this preliminary list which will include intergovernmental organizations - slow down to speaking (unintelligible), validated registries where we believe there will be restricted registrations and specific qualifications and verifiable criteria, the possibility of not for profit, nonprofit or non-government organizations.

And here there would need to be undoubtedly a demonstrable service to the public benefit for those. There is the highly regulative or regulated or sensitive TLDs and these we assume, in our thought bubbles to date, have included highly regulated industries, banking of course coming to the floor in that, but may not be of course merely highly regulated industries. Who knows what clever things people will come up with.

Then of course there's exclusive use. This is keyword registries limited to one registry and their affiliates. There is the closed generics, generic string that's operated in an exclusive manner. The option of an open TLD with minimal registration requirements; this would be a highly targeted TLD we are assuming.

And there's also the one for opportunity for governmental organizations, and here there would be a probability we believe of specific contractual requirements but having been involved in a ccTLD that has had specific governmental organization TLD types, one would also, I suggest, have to consider how one identifies and defines governmental organization because even that simple phrase is open to a variety of different expectations. Is one going down to, for example, the local government and village council level in that particular classification. If so, then there's a myriad of different considerations that would have to be looked at.

I'm going to ask you now to move to Slide 9, which is where I think we need to start looking at getting some input from you all. Now just to remind you, the homework from our last meeting is that we needed to look at a couple of questions. Do we believe it's critical to carve out exceptions for some identified types? We were to discuss that on the list. A little discussion has happened in meetings and a minute amount, if any, on the list but that was part of our homework.

Our homework was also to help us to identify any pros and cons for specific proposed types. It was also to help us identify the critical exceptions for any specific proposed types. And again, to remind you all of the mantra that you hear from Jeff and I echoing of course what Avri kept saying to us for all those months is, if we don't reach consensus to recommend change, things will remain the same.

So with today's slide we've added the point that to date there does not appear to be support for substantive change. So what we want to do now is discuss with you is that in fact the correct conclusion? So with that I would like to open up the list on that point speaking just pop up your hand or if you are only on audio make yourself know. Do you believe that we are correct in what we believe is the case and that is there does not appear to be, I would

suggest considerable support from this PDP working group for substantive change? Are we wrong? Or are we right? Let's open the queue.

Silence will be taken as consent and we'll have a very short meeting. Donna, thank you for saving me. Over to you, Donna.

Donna Austin: Hi, Cheryl. Donna Austin from Neustar. I would support the idea that we don't have agreement around this moving forward and that the status quo is probably where we are, absent any agreement to move, you know, to provide anything beyond that. I would note that with brands I think there's - and I don't know whether this has been discussed in the legal side of things, but it still is necessary to have brands codified I think as a category but I think we can do that based on the specification 12 - 12, 13 - 13 of the Registry Agreement. Thanks, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, for that Donna. And just making sure that that is of course captured, yes there it goes, in the notes. I'm going to read to the record because Maxim indicated earlier that due to the hour of this call there'll only be typing. And his point is that he thinks we need to at least, sorry, to at least to conduct a poll and not to base it on a temperature of the room in this meeting.

So Maxim is suggesting that we should poll the group for that. We'll make a note of that as a suggestion and I will look to the group a little later in this meeting to ratify or otherwise that. Alan is agreeing, however. But I'd like to hear first of all I think this is coming I order, I think it was Christopher Wilkinson, followed by Greg. Christopher, over to you.

Christopher Wilkinson: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Christopher Wilkinson peaking from Spain. Donna, I would like to defer. I think there is a very strong because for specific categories. I think the geographical names and the geographical indications are such specific categories particularly as I've mentioned in previous calls, semantically speaking, the geographical

terms, the geographic names are not generic. So I think they need to be treated in a specific manner. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, took a moment to get off mute. Cheryl again for the record. Thanks for that, Christopher, and I'll assume you'll take your hand down momentarily. Greg, over to you.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg Shatan for the record. A couple of comments. First with regard to a specific category of type for brands, as and perhaps this extends to others as well, as you indicated there could be a number of times in the process where things could go differently for one type versus another. And as we found during the prior round, the application process asked a lot of questions and assumed a lot of things that were just not true or were not applicable for dotBrands. And so Spec 13 is really kind of the end of the road that has nothing to do with the application process.

So while Spec 13 might be necessary or some version of it, it's certainly not sufficient to deal with all the issues that arose. A lot of time somehow there seem to be some blindness to the idea that a significant number of dotBrands would be applying. And so, you know, one shape of all this created round and when our square pegs attempted to be tamped into it, it was not pretty. So we need to consider this from the beginning to the end of the process.

Secondly, just to pick up on one thing I think I heard in Christopher Wilkinson's statement, he mentioned geographical indications. So far we have not talked at any - in any way or any point about giving geographical indications as such, any type of category or any type of consideration as an even recognized genus, if you will. And so allowing say dot(Seta) to be put into a category by itself I think is not something that's even necessarily on the agenda and if it is, we have a lot to talk about. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Greg. Appreciate your input as ever. Alan, over to you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. There's an old joke that I won't repeat on this call but I don't think we're talking about if we are going to have categories or types. We de facto do. DotBrand is treated quite differently - have been treated quite differently. There are other types of TLDs that we assign different rules to. So the real question is, do we go whole hog and have 97 different types of categories or do we have three or four to make it easy to identify what categories things are in.

And conceivable, a given TLD or given string might be in multiple categories and we'll have to figure out how to resolve that if that makes any sense. But it's a lot easier to assign the rules that are going to differ based on the details of the TLD if we simply go ahead and put it in a category, then we have a name, a label. To not do that means we're going to have to construct the equivalent of categories and types of TLDs but call them something else because we don't want to call them categories.

We ended up with categories last time, what we called them, so let's simply admit we have them and then try to figure out what the rules are and decide how many of them and how varied they're going to be. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Alan. And back to Donna. Over to you, Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, Cheryl. Donna Austin. Could we go back to the slide before this one, so Slide Number 8? So one of the challenges I see with this slide is that we've really categorized this by the entity and not necessarily by the string. And I think it's the string that is potentially more important and becomes the more contentious. So for a geographic name there is a definition within the Guidebook of what that means. And if the string meets that then that's the category.

I think, you know, intergovernmental organizations I don't see how that is a category. So if the Red Cross wants dotRedCross, then I can see a match to that. But if the Red Cross organization wants something like, you know,

dotRedHat, then I don't see that the Red Cross would have any reason to have - to get dotRedHat over any other entity. And I think that's where the confusion or the problems will come in if we start - if we decide to categorize based on entity, it will make it very difficult.

To do it on string is also difficult as well but potentially it makes more sense to do it by string and then I think you're looking at potential exemptions or type of use. So this is where I get a little bit confused about, you know, when we talk about a category, if you're talking about the entity that's one thing, if you're going to - why would you treat an IGO organization any differently to any other applicant if the string that they are applying for is not related to their core business or anything else?

So I think - I don't know - I can't remember whether we've had this discussion before or not, but to develop categories and we're doing it based on the entity, are we doing it based on the string, are we're doing it based on the use of the string? So that's where categories start at least in my mind to be quite - to become quite complicated. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Donna. And if I can take my cochair hat of very briefly, what I hear you saying is something akin to the ruling within some criteria in some other particularly ccTLDs and that is that there would need to be a close and substantive link between a string and an entity applying for that string. That of course is a very different approach to what's here but perhaps some of the terminology wrapped out things of close and substantive demonstrable proof of closeness to substantive may be useful if we take this discussion further.

And of course we still haven't decided if we are going to be taking it further than the 2012 round. Alan, I see your hand is back up.

Alan Greenberg: It is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I largely agree with Donna that it shouldn't be the entity but if we perhaps decided - and I'm not proposing it - but if we decided that IGOs or NGOs or nonprofits or companies whose logo is green, get half - get the gTLDs at half price, then it might be a category. So if something about the entity is a determining factor in how we treat them, based on some decisions that we've made, then it would make sense to have it as a category but not in its own right if there's nothing that otherwise differentiates it. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Alan. And I see agreement from Anne on that in the list. And for those of you who are typing in the chat, after Kurt, I will be covering off for the record what's in the chat. Over to you, Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks. I hope you can hear me. So beyond the string itself I think we should also be looking at the purpose of the TLD. So for example, a brand might be exempt from using registrars or certain other requirements in the standard contract, but there's other entities that might also qualify for that. There's entities that might decide to use the TLD for infrastructure purposes or internal purposes. So I don't - so I think we should be talking about how to accommodate and be flexible about different business models.

So we've managed to accommodate different brand models but there's other entities besides brands that would also legitimately qualify for some of their exemptions. Another example might be fees. So there might be a real innovation in the Internet where, you know, thousands of names might be released for no money or something like that to provide some very legitimate public interest purpose. But the, you know, the rigidity of the fee structure might obviate the goals and the hopes and goals of some of those TLDs.

So I wonder if our policy statement might be about instructing ICANN to not necessarily create a lot of categories of TLDs, but to create the criteria for

exemption from certain contractual requirements. So others besides - so the big example would be so others that besides brands could qualify for the same exemption as brands by demonstrating the same or similar purpose as a typical brand might use their TLD for. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Kurt. And I'm delighted to see that staff has captured that in the notes because that's certainly fodder for more thought. With that I'm now going to go through to the record some relevant interventions that have happened in chat. First of all early Phil Buckingham mentioned to us that he would envisage two types, open generics and closed brands as categories and models. And that there would be different specs for different categories and the contractual - in the contractual process and Registry Agreement.

Maxim mentions in the field of inverted commas, other thoughts in the poll, members should also be able to explain or clarify their decision. And again, I'll come back to that, Maxim, as we wrap up this section a little later. Further down - make sure I don't miss anything, there's some discussion about to-ing and for-ing between statements made on interventions. I won't go into those.

Maxim indicated the use of a terminology tag could be quite an interesting way forward. And also that governmental organizations have different provisions in the RA. He was posing the question, "Was that enough?" And we need those who have it to be questioned on that, which he believes is mostly NGOs.

Kristina was I think only clarifying a little more of what Donna was saying when she mentioned the only basis that she can think of from IGO category is that the - seek provisions that are different in the RO if it is an IGO. And of course that does take us back to the future discussion perhaps on the requirement for a close and substantial linkages between a string and the applicant's purpose or recognizable qualities be it a common or trademark or other.

From that further down Maxim also points out that not for profit is a form of a legal body and therefore many registries have this. And I think Phil was just going back to his argument that there should only be the two. There is agreements with Kurt's approach which seem to be giving some us into fresh thinking.

And beyond that Edmond did say, "Perhaps we need to ask when we create or not create categories, whether it adds to the fundamental goals of competition, choice and consumer trust." (Unintelligible) of course not only the trinity as Greg Shatan defined it as but I think (unintelligible) innovation comes into play as well that it should foster not stagnate the opportunities for innovation.

And with that I think the only thing we've missed is the comment by Alexander where he states we need to understand what we use categories for, is it for the evaluation, the prioritization, prioritizing of awards of the string, for example, in communities, the RA application requirements or costs. And I guess that also resonates with some of what Kurt said regarding exceptions .and with that, Kurt, looks to me like your hand is back up again. And I have no idea why you lost me, hopefully you haven't lost me. Kurt, go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: My hand isn't up, I just left it up, I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. All right then. I'm going to ask us now to - and if obviously if you answered me, Kurt, you haven't lost me at least. If you'd be so kind as to forward to Slide 10 because we did have a couple of other things, questions to consider. And a few minutes that we have left in this section obviously we can go over time if it's important, I think it is - if we need to, I should say, not if it's important, I'd like you to ponder on the following.

Questions to consider, are there additional instances where there is a need to treat an application differently? It may be yes, it may be nay. Is it appropriate to consider these instances as more exceptional in nature? And Kurt, I

believe that would resonate fairly completely with some of what you were saying earlier. The next point to consider is rather than focus on types is it possible to try and identify the ways in which an application must or should be treated differently and then identify allowable instances? Again, that resonates with a couple of the points that have been raised earlier.

And I think that perhaps can open up some new thinking for us. Not that we have much time to do new thinking, people, but we do have to do a thorough job here. And finally, acknowledging - acknowledging that we may not be able to identify all of the ways TLDs may be used in the future, should the focus be a framework that allows for exceptions even after program launch? And Kurt, I promise I did not have some sort of telepathic stealing of your very good and original ideas, these questions I think do resonate strongly with some of what you've raised however in your intervention earlier.

Donna says, "What do we mean by 'additional'?" I assume we mean "by additional" in more than was offered as TLD types in the 2012 round. Phil has also just put into chat that in terms of the specific business model he agrees with Kurt, each applicant would need to apply for or contract for each specification to need or not to use accredited registries, etcetera. So are there any immediate thoughts and reactions that any of you would like to share with this group noting it is a relatively small group and obviously this time of day is not particularly friendly to some parts of the world. It's delightful for me for once but not particularly friendly for large pieces of the world, I know.

Is there anyone who wants to make a comment or intervention on these questions to consider? Let's take a queue? Donna, over to you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Cheryl. Donna Austin from Neustar. So just to the extent that this is relevant, maybe I think with the application for the 2012 round there was a whole section in there that the applicant had to provide information about what the purpose of the TLD was and how they were going to use it. But the

only applicant that was held to that in the Registry Agreement was really the community applicants. They had to go into quite some detail about their policies and all the rest of it. So that was I think that was the only applicant type that was held to things that they stated in their application.

So maybe that's - when we talk about additional circumstances and where we would treat an applicant differently, so I guess if we decide that a string or a purpose or however we want to decide on different ways of looking at TLDs maybe there's more emphasis put on what the applicant says within the application itself and any policies that they put in that as well that they are held to that in the Registry Agreement and that forms the basis of any exemption or the way that they're treated differently. Thanks, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Donna. Appreciate that. Would anyone else like to weigh in before I go back to the matter of polling? Kristina, please, over to you.

Kristina Rosette: Sure. Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. I understand Donna's point but I'm going to disagree for two reasons. First, I think requiring the applicant to agree when it submits its application that it'll be bound by whatever use information it puts in Question 18, doesn't take into account innovation. It also certainly doesn't take into account the fact that, you know, we're almost six years out from the 2012 round and there's still I think roughly a dozen applications that are still pending.

And I just don't think it's fair to the applicant to require that in all cases they need to agree to be bound ahead of time where technology evolves, how they might want to use the TLD will evolve. And I think we're going to really end up stifling potential innovation if we put too strong a requirement in on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Kristine. I have Alan and then Kurt again.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I tend to agree that it is not reasonable to expect all applicants to commit to how they're going to use a TLD but we already have a good number of examples of cases where that's going to be necessary at some level. Community applications are one. If we end up allowing generic terms which are also brand names, and because of the commitment that it will be used as a generic term, in the cases it's not applicable anymore, if someone gets dotApple to sell apples, they can't repurpose it to start selling computers.

So there's certainly going to be exceptions and probably more than we can think of on this call where that will be required in order to make sure that there are not some level of conflicts or problems in the future. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: So to respond to Kristine, I think it's reasonable to hold the applicants to what they say in the application if they get relief from contractual obligations or some sort of accommodation. So I think that's reasonable. And then, you know, if things change as they always do, you know, that's what the RSEP process is for. So TLDs that don't envision as qualifying for an accommodation could ask for one later if they agree to operate their TLD in a certain way and those that agree to operate in a certain way to get certain accommodations can file an RSEP to relieve themselves of the requirement and you know, abandon that accommodation. So you know, the process has to, like you say, be able to accommodate change. But I don't think that's too hard. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Kurt. And I see Anne's tick of agreement with you on that. Alexander, over to you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I don't disagree with Kurt in the general case but RSEP as it's currently defined can only be refused if it affects the stability or security of the Internet and not for competition reasons or other reasons that might come up

in the context of how gTLDs are used. So it couldn't be RSEP as currently defined. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Alan. And I did say Alexander because I saw his hand up. Kurt, you've got a right of reply and then we'll go to what was being said in the chat.

Kurt Pritz: But, Alan, the only tradeoff is a TLD gets an accommodation and agrees to operate in a certain way and then abandons the accommodation and goes back to the standard way or vice versa which is a set of well-defined requirements for getting an accommodation. So I don't really see a problem with that. And if it's - if there is a complex contractual matter than the RSEP is approved but then the whole matter is referred to the ICANN Board anyway. So, you know, it has to be thought through, I agree with you, but I generally think that that process would serve our needs. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Kurt. And in the chat Alexander did raise a problematic example which he gave, what would happen if someone went for the dotFrankfort string but claimed it was not for a city, therefore there was no need for letters of non-objection, etcetera. And then afterwards they change their application model and I think Kurt recognized as well that there is a bit that needed to be thought of in terms of going to the RSEP process based on Alan's interventions as well.

Alan has reacted a little bit in the chat about RSEP and obviously if we were to go down that pathway there would be more to discuss. And Kristine has also weighed in on the RSEP noting that given the duration and the complexity I'm assuming of RSEPs, she has significant concerns about the business impact of pushing business model changes to an RSEP in addition to the not so minor concern that we're then allowing ICANN to decide business models. And I'm sure that is also in support of her concerns about effects on innovation.

So with that I think there's interesting information going on in the chat but not particularly changing the direction or bringing new thinking into our directions at the moment. So what I'd like to do now is go back to the proposal of having a poll for the question that was noted on Page 9.

So if we can go back to Page 9 just briefly, the question that Maxim was suggesting we should poll is the one that says, "To date," this is the hypothesis or null hypothesis, I suppose, "To date there does not appear to be support for substantive change," I'm going to insert "to the categories in the 2012 round. Is this a wrong conclusion?"

So as a question to poll, obviously we are just taking temperature of the room here today, I'm concerned to do any sort of polling that has call a particularly low compared to the total number of active participants in the PDP working group turnout. But that doesn't mean we can't poll because we have this wonderful thing called an email list. So what I would like to ask you all is, is it your will that we poll this question to our email list and to embellish that possibility if we can now move to - back to the Slide 10, if we're going to be polling, would you further like us to ask the full PDP list to consider these three points?

We could also ensure rather than it just be a simple yes or nay or most concerning work along the principle that silence is consent, we could perhaps ask staff to pop together a very simple and brief Survey Monkey or survey form, whatever the technology of choice is, so that we encourage people to not only weigh in on yes agree, no disagree, or do not wish to make a statement on this, but if they agree or disagree to give some rationale.

So I'm not going to use a temperature of the room process to see whether you all think that is a good or objectionable idea. So if you are in today's call and you are able to put in the Adobe Connect room a green tick it will be then an action item on Jeff, I and staff to put together a little mini poll survey

considering the questions on Slide 10 and the particular question on Slide 9 about whether or not there is an impetus for change.

I've got a few green ticks. Feel free to put up a red X if you feel very, very strong about it, but unless I see expletives going across the chat saying don't you ever dare make a survey go out to a list, what a terrible idea, and seeing no red Xs but a few supports in chat and some green ticks, we're going to take that as an action item so let's make sure the happens in short order because it would be very good if we had the analysis of such surveying to discuss when we meet in - at ICANN 61 in San Juan.

Heather, thank you for joining us. I appreciate as ever the extraordinary amount of time you put in in addition to your normal workload and leadership role in GNSO Council to stick with us through so many of our meetings, the PDP and indeed the work tracks.

Okay, now what I'd like to do now is run a line, if you can remove your ticks and crosses etcetera, from your Adobe Connect room, that would be fantastic. I'd like to now take us to the sort of Part B of our overarching issues application type. And I want to look at the supporting materials. So we can jump straight to Slide 12 just to remind you all, the status quo, the different types in 2012 were the standard application, as long as it wasn't a community-based application, the community-based application which was demonstrably a gTLD operated for the benefit of a clearly delineated community.

Here there were additional questions asked at application submission, there is a requirement of endorsement from the representative community, there is responses to community-based questions only evaluated in the matter of string contention, and there is also certain contractual obligations. To that end, I would like to remind you all also that even with that status quo Jamie Baxter has certainly in the past raised some serious I would suggest, to say the least, concerns about some of those particular processes, the one on

representative of the community and endorsement is the one that I particularly remember.

Alan, you have your hand up. Over to you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Can I question the word "elected" there in the third bullet, the third sub bullet of the second bullet. My recollection is that the CPE was only done if there was contention. And elected sounds like it was a self-decided decision to subject themselves to evaluation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: May very well be a typo, Alan. I'm going to ask Steve, because I would have thought selected as opposed to elected, but then why not just leave it at string contention?

Alan Greenberg: But I don't think they selected - okay.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I don't think they did. It was just, you know, so one had to apply for CPE, that's right, yes it was a positive - it was a positive thing, okay. So CPE was a separate process, that's confirmed by Kristina and by Alexander. It was a separate process from the application evaluation. So perhaps we could footnote that and make it a clear explanation but it looks like that text should stand.

Alan Greenberg: Then as a follow on, I don't understand that use of the word "elected" but fine, I'm willing to be educated.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So noted. Perhaps we can use the term "selected" and still have a footnote. Jamie, over to you.

Jamie Baxter: Yes, Jamie Baxter for the record. I think the term "elected" is probably being used here because the applicants had to elect to go to a community priority, they didn't have to elect to do that, they could have just went to auction if they were in a contention set. So that's probably a - that's a term that seems familiar to me so that's probably why it's there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Jamie, that makes sense and is in keeping with the points that Alexander and Kristina were making as well. With that I'd like us now to move to the next slide which I believe is Slide 13, which is a continuation of the status quo. And here we are looking at the geographic and then the brand, geographic names were defined, as has been pointed out in this call, and in previous discussions in the Applicant Guidebook and the reference is there.

There was additional documentation required on submission and there was a panel review, even if it was not designated as a geographic name but it could be inferred to be a geographic name. If it was a geographic name, documentation and support or nonsupport - or sorry, non-objection - needed to be verifiable by the panel so that's the status quo. The status quo on Spec 13, the dotBrands, was approved in March 2014. And here it was applicable if a TLD is trademarked the single registrant model and not a generic string as defined by Spec 11.

There were modified - sorry, modified is the Registry Agreement. And the other thing is that there were obviously not registrants which is an exemption from Spec 9. With that, I'd like to make sure that you all believe what we have with the exception of the use of the term "elected" on the earlier slide, that's all clear and unambiguous and that you all understand that is the status quo and that would stand if we do not reach consensus for any recommended change.

Steve Chan is typing. Okay, Steve, I'll wait to see what you type. While we're waiting for Steve to type, oh, he stopped typing, okay I put him off, sorry Steve. Let's move to looking at the work track related efforts in Page 14 -

sorry, Slide 14. And so Slide 14, which will be with you shortly, Work Track 2 has been doing some deliberations as have Work Track 3 and Work Track 5. The Work Track 2 work is on closed generics. Their deliberations are focused on the pros and cons of allowing closed generics. And this work track has also discussed the possible means for allowing a closed generic TLD where there are - where they are consistent with the public interest.

In Work Track 3 the work's been focused on community applications. And here under - this is under deliberation while they're also reviewing the community consultation Number 2 import, they developed a, in inverted commas, straw bunny definition of what community is here and there has been consultation with the GAC and the ALAC to seek their input. And I believe there is continuing consultation certainly with the GAC and I suspect with the ALAC to take that further.

In the Work Track 5, the geographic names, the ALAC, the ccNSO, the GAC and the GNSO all selected their co-leads for Work Track 5. They've held their first meeting on the 15th of November, they've done their terms of reference, that is now accepted. That slide needs to be updated, Steve, please make a note for that. And indeed they've started looking at definitions and discussions which I believe we will see rapid progress in their discussion and deliberations on the geo names category or type.

So with that, that's sort of a review of where we are, let's now move to Slide 15 and have a look at some of the current application types, in other words, the attributes. We all agree, and all I want you to do is run your eye down this to make sure it is a complete and accurate list. We all agree that there are no specific attributes to the standard application. There are quite a list for the community-based applications. There is a lesser list for the geographics and there is an even shorter but highly specific list for the brand ones.

And if I can get you to now move immediately, unless you have - no, I do, Jamie, go ahead. I was going to say somebody does want to say something about these slides. Go ahead, Jamie.

Jamie Baxter: So Jamie Baxter for the record.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can you just speak up a tiny bit, you're very faint at least to me.

Jamie Baxter: Yes, sorry about that. Is this better?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A little better. Thank you.

Jamie Baxter: I think there was one other thing - I think there's one other thing I might begin just to draw attention to with respect to attributes of community-based applications that I think it's forgotten a lot in the conversation and that is that community-based applications have to become public from the very onset which also makes them big targets throughout the entire process. It's very difficult to build consensus in a community without awareness.

And I think that's something that has to be looked at because as we've seen from this last round, in order to eliminate points in the community priority evaluation competitive efforts all they have to do is just twist one rubber arm to write a letter of objection. And I think that that's a problem. And I'm not sure what the answer is but I think it's important that everybody recognize that community-based applications really put themselves in harm's way by simply taking that route. And it does make them large targets. And I think there needs to be some sort of awareness - much better awareness of that and just a point. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Jamie. Cheryl for the record. And a very important point because when looking at this list I'm always struck at what looks like the most bizarre inverted pyramid on requirements and pressures for names that are attributes for names and applications that are arguably and demonstrably for

a greater public interest or community good which always, at least to my meager mind, seems a little bit surprising but I do understand the rationale for them, I'm just saying it does seem interestingly balanced.

So what we might also need to look at is even if there is no change to the types of TLDs, should that be your belief at the end of this process, that we may need to still propose some review and adjustments to some of the attributes of the existing types. So I'd like if staff could capture that, which I think is what your point was leading to, Jamie, and if not type in the chat what it should be.

And we're going now move to the next slide, which is Slide 16, and we get to pose some more questions for you. So the question of course here as we eventually move to Slide 16 is, what happens if we change nothing? So I guess one of the things if what if we change nothing and did not create any new types we may need to look at whether or not even within those existing types there are some policy recommendations that should be considered and made. And Jamie, if you can ensure that we have good language for that for discussion that would be very, very useful from my point of view.

Of course if we only had standard community and geographic names and the dotBrands in the future, would that have a particular impact on the ability to - the potential for new types? And finally the question is, if we don't reach consensus to recommend change, you have to - it is a mantra we will keep saying it - things will remain the same. So Alan, over to you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I hate to be pedantic; actually sometimes it's fun to be pedantic. What we changing from? Are we changing from the Applicant Guidebook or are we changing from the last policy? What's the question in relation to?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Alan, seeing as we've got dotBrands in there, I suspect it would be the last policy, wouldn't you? And feel free to be pedantic; I know it's one of your passions.

Alan Greenberg: The last policy did not mention dotBrands; that was a construct of the implementation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Fair point. The dotBrands would have to be enshrined as part of our recommendations if we were going to include that then.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, if we change nothing from the policy then we don't have dotBrands and I don't think we're going to survive that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Would agree with you wholeheartedly.

Alan Greenberg: And we had geographic names last time with certain rules such as in some cases you had to get clearance from the people who live there or the other cities…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: …so we didn't call them - that goes back to my previous point. We didn't call them categories, but we treated them differently.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And of course Jamie's point as to the non-objection aspect that was applicable to geo as well as community…

Alan Greenberg: That's correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: …is that you only need to twist one person's arm and that therefore is not no objections. And that would mean if we change nothing a panel review. Thank you, Alan. Greg, over to you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I think my comment is kind of similar but maybe more universal in what Alan's saying is if we change nothing from the policy then we don't even have the AGB because that was

implementation. And furthermore, this was kind of a constantly mutating strain so as was noted, PICs were not in the policies, PICs came up at some point. DotBrands came up at some point after the application - after the AGB and really the application process itself was all underway.

The name collision, you know, so really the dust settling, there is no true documentation of the dust settling because it's really the policy plus the implementation which in some cases was not all that close to the policy, plus kind of the post implementation changes and things that developed. So if we're talking about changing nothing we don't have - really even have necessarily kind of a really stable thing that that represents kind of the end of things because a lot of it was kind of assembled on the fly, you know, building the plane while we were flying it. And I think just for that reason all of this stuff needs to be, you know, can't just be taken for granted. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Greg. And yes, we do too need to make the point that things need to be enshrined here. I would point out, and this is in absolute keeping with my thinking, from Avri in the chat that she thought it was policy plus Applicant Guidebook plus the rest of the rules that were added later in the process that we were taking as the status quo. So I guess what we need to do is make sure we have in our notes that the status quo would need to be ratified in our policy recommendation if indeed nothing else changed.

Karen, over to you.

Karen Day: Hi, yes. I was simply raising my hand to point out that Steve had had his hand raised for a long time and he had put a note in the chat asking to speak, but now he seems to have taken his hand down. So Steve, if you want to speak, now is your time.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Karen. This is Steve from staff. I'm trying to recall what I was going to say. I think I was going to make a comment on the previous slide where some of the attributes of the - let me just go back actually. So the - I think part

of the rationale for why this slide was designed this way to call out the different I guess we called them attributes for these different application types from the 2012 round was to try to draw out and tease out what those exceptions such that they exist might be for some of the other application types that had been identified by this working group.

So we had talked about taking a poll of whether or not we wanted to make changes to the I guess as we're talking about now, the policy plus AGB plus other stuff (unintelligible) to go back to what Avri is saying ,but something to that effect. So I guess I just wanted to draw attention - actually I just - the other thing I was going to say is that some of the slides we're looking at right now are things that we had looked at a little while ago, so apologies if they're a little bit redundant but I think some of the things that we're looking at now are helping to bring to light some of the things we had covered before, and just covering some. So sorry, kind of forgot my point, but thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's all right, Steve. Cheryl here. And let me first of all get down on my virtual knee and most humbly apologize to you and anyone else (unintelligible) that I've been ignoring. When we did our temperature of the room taking I had scrolled so I could see if there were any red X and how many green ticks there were and I had looked and had it only showing on my screen from the zero presenters line down so you weren't being deliberately ignored but you certainly were not being able to be seen. So my apologies for that. And thanks, Karen, for bringing it to our attention or my attention, I'm not - or mine. Alan, is your hand still up?

Alan Greenberg: It is a new hand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, please.

Alan Greenberg: My recollection is identical to Avri's that what we are considering the status quo was essentially the Applicant Guidebook plus whatever happened afterwards. So it was the final set of rules that we ended up with. Now some

of that we believe was implementation, that is how it differed from what might have been written in detail or imagined in detail. Some of it some people claim was policy changes that were made on an ad hoc way. So implicitly if we proved what happened in the first round by the end of the round we are likely making policy by doing that.

I will point out something that no one has ever talked about before, and I understand why we don't want to talk about it, by grouping everything together in what we recommend it will be in the future indistinguishable whether something was recommended by us because it was policy that we were changing or because it was implementation that we were reaffirming. But since we're not putting a P or an I on everything, in the future we may have an interesting situation of not knowing whether something is policy or implementation because it was all approved in a single package with a bow on it. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Alan. You know how to make my day. Wonderful working with you. Greg, over to you.

Greg Shatan: Hi. Greg Shatan for the record. I would actually contend it's a little bit different in the anything that we as a policy development group put into our final report is policy. It may not be picket fence policy but it is policy. And once it leaves our hands after that the filling in of the blanks is implementation.

So I think this is kind of what, you know, lawyers might call an amended and restated agreement; everything becomes - everything is kind of brought up to the level of policy whether - unless we want to affirmatively state that something is not policy but is merely continuing implementation or we want to - if we're silent on something that was implementation and it continues in the next round, that we're continuing to add implementation. But I think the bias will be - the output of the policy development group is policy. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Greg. I see a couple of red Xs up against that. And also I note both Alan and Anne, who are the ones with the red Xs are writing in the chat so their points will be made clear in chat undoubtedly. Just from chat, while that's coming up on screen, Edmond points out that whilst he agrees with Avri's concept of what it is, is the status quo, is that, you know, of course it's rolled off on screen hasn't it - that we should still explicitly point to those iterations, in other words, if there's been any policy changes from previous recommendations even if we agree with changes, in other words he's a card-carrying member of the absolute and unambiguous clarity in our report and recommendations, which I think we all agree with.

Anne pointed out - and this is obviously her rationale for putting up a red X while Greg was speaking, "There are GNSO policy recommendations," sorry, Anne, the damn screen moved exactly as I was trying to read that. "These don't actually become policies unless they're adopted by the Board." And then Alan states, "If everything is policy to change any of the details no matter it how much it looks like implementation, it will take a GNSO PDP or equivalent to change." So we seem to have stirred up a nice hornet's nest here. Greg respond, "Of course rejected policy recommendations are not policy."

So with that, and I'll finalize Justine's intervention to chat, what we should be concerned about is after we as a group conclude a policy of which elements are not adopted by the Board then it's not policy. And Kurt goes on to define the bright lines. Okay, so yes, Alan is correct, he's raising in the chat that there was a lot of time spent a few years back to try and differentiate between policy and implementation.

So as exciting as this side debate is, and I'd encourage you to continue it on the list, we have still a reasonable amount to get through and not a lot of time to do it in. So if I can have Slide 17 up please? Here we are asking questions about do the types have unique needs? And we're - points here are, are any of the requirements similar to those that we saw in the existing types? This is

the new types it would be, any of the proposed new types. Are there requirements that are unique to preliminary types? And how can these needs to be accommodated in the process?

I would suggest that if it is your wish - sorry - if it is your wish we can add that those particular points in the appropriate design to our short survey to the list. With that, if you would be so kind as to move to Slide 18. And here the Slide 18 looks at some of the previously identified potential attributes to future application types. This is very much a list that we believe has been raised by the different work tracks. If the work track leads would be so kind as to run their whether eye down this slides list and see if we've missed anything or misstated anything, that would be appreciated.

And if you could let Steve know directly if there's a proposed edit to the list on this slide that will save us a lot of time and risk of misinterpretation of what's been happening in the work tracks. Does anyone wish to speak to this slide before we move to Slide 19?

If not, let's move to Slide 19 and I'll let you know that Slide 19, 20 and 21 are your full file and ready reckoning copy of the attributions or attributes matrix that has been prepared. You can just quickly pop now, Terri, to Slide 20, just so everyone sees what's on the list. And you'll see the matrix is one we have discussed before late last year, this is an aid memoir for you. And now to Slide 21.

That is I believe still a spreadsheet, which should be shared and I suspect editable. And if that's the case then I'm sure Steve can - or Emily can put in the chat the link to that so if you're hot under the collar to make some changes you could do that directly, even if it's comments. And I'm now going to ask that you move to Slide 22.

Now Slide 22 is a perfect example of what you don't want to see on a PowerPoint presentation slide and that's a horrendous amount of text. Again,

we're not going to read through this; it is again part of your aid memoir. There was from our homework a request that we look at developing a good list of pros and cons for various categories. This is our belief of the list to date that can be gleaned from the work you have done. So if you would be a wonderful team and look at Slide 22 along with your commentary to the matrix slide, your commentary and any effective edits or changes to this slide can come straight to Jeff and I and the staff and we will update it accordingly.

Anne mentioned that Slide 21 would be a great slide for public comment. I assume, Anne, you mean the full matrix which is inclusive of Slide 20 and 19 as well or perhaps you meant Slide 22, so if you could just clarify. No, she means the full matrix, excellent. Okay, but we will take that note and look as to where we might be able to put that matrix in perhaps even as an appendix in our initial report.

And as a wonderful segue, we're now going to move through Slide 23 and into Slide 24 for our agenda Item 4, which is indeed the timeline for our development of initial and final reports. And I am going to have a well-earned breathe break and ask Steve if he would be so kind as to take you through Slide 24 and I suspect into Slide 25. Steve, over to you.

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks, Cheryl. This is Steve Chan from staff. And so what we wanted to do is try to put the timeline for this PDP down onto a slide and try to get everyone the clarity on what we're trying to do. So these four gray lines that represent work tracks 1-4 the idea is that their initial work is going to conclude prior to ICANN 61. And so the outputs of those work tracks which might be recommendations or it might be a set of options or maybe not even options, maybe it's just a series of questions that we're posing to the community for public comment, all those things will get integrated into the initial report.

So if you see at the bottom line ,that's the line for the full working group. The blue diamond represents the intended and hoped for publication date for the initial report; that's about mid-April. So if you actually - you look at the

additional notes box on the right hand of the slide, that speaks to us as saying the work tracks are going to seek to wrap up their deliberations prior to ICANN 61 but they will reengage again after public comment is completed on the initial report.

So the goal of the initial report is to of course take into account the deliberations and outcomes of the work tracks but we'll also be able to take into account feedback from ICANN 61. And so the idea is that staff and the leadership of the working group, which is the cochairs as well as all the work track co-leads are going to essentially crowd source the initial report and prepare it for working group review and agreement and eventual publication for public comment. And so as I mentioned, that the target is mid-April for that. We're just ambitious but we're doing our best to try to meet that deadline.

So in red text here at this point no formal consensus calls are being taken. We're essentially taking a moment in time of where things are with all the work tracks and that's what's going to be included in the initial report. And of course when the final report comes out there will of course be consensus calls taken on every recommendation that is intended to be put forth by this working group.

So I think that's all I had on this slide. Unless there's questions on this, I'll move to the next one. Seeing none, moving to the next slide. So what we wanted to talk about here is I think this is something Jeff wanted to talk about but he's not with us today, is just to start looking at the steps that are going to take place after this PDP working group delivers its final report, which as you saw from the previous slide is we're targeting sometime around end of 2018.

So some of the expected and actually required as part of the process next steps are laid out along with a plausible timeline. I'm not going to say it's the best guess or a likely timeline it's just a plausible timeline. So the - assuming the final report is delivered to the Council you could conceivably have

adoption of the final report and recommendations and implementation guidelines or whatever else is in the final report by the GNSO Council in early 2019. Assuming it gets adopted by the Council there is an additional public comment prior to the ICANN Board taking up the final report.

The ICANN Board could conceivably adopt the recommendations or adopt the final report and recommendations in the middle of 2019 with implementation efforts immediately initiating right afterwards or potentially if the community supports it you could have some limited implementation efforts initiate even prior to the ICANN Board adopting the recommendations of the final report, although it's not generally part of the process, it could be something that the community thinks might be appropriate in this situation.

So inclusive of the - in the implementation efforts would be the drafting of the Applicant Guidebook and the Applicant Guidebook would be published for public comment or could be published for public comment in early 2020 with approval and adoption of the Applicant Guidebook by the ICANN Board in middle of 2020. There is still a need to operationalize the Applicant Guidebook and the new gTLD program and then you could have a launch of the new gTLD program in which applications are received in early 2012.

And so I will reemphasize again that this is just a timeline; it is not - yes, I don't know how to say it any differently, this is not an estimate or anything, it's just what could be a timeline. So questions please, and go ahead, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Steve. It is indeed a hypothetical but even doing it out as a hypothetical the amount of time taken between the 2012 round and the on this timeline the earliest launch date is pause for considerable consideration. So I think based on that we cannot dally and we do need to hold an aggressive timeline on our work as well.

And just before I go to you and then to Donna, and I'd ask you both to be relatively brief, the notes have captured your comments regarding Work

Track 4. I'm not going to make any commitment on the next agenda other than the fact that I will - and staff will raise that to be put into the next agenda, but there will be many questions put into the initial report to seek public reaction to from each of the work tracks and anything that does not have a consensus agreement to in any of the work tracks, including Work Track 4, would certainly be a candidate, no indeed, it would be necessary unless it was awfully frivolous to be amongst that group of questions. So, Anne, over to you and then to Donna. Anne, we're not hearing you.

Terri Agnew: Anne, this is Terri. I don't see where your Adobe Connect microphone is active and you've not joined on the telephone. To activate your Adobe Connect microphone on the top toolbar select the telephone icon and follow the prompts.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, she's stated, Terri, that…

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: …yes, that's been captured. The initial report draft we've - I know you've raised that before and after the next leadership team meeting we will get back to you. I did say that that would happen after our last one but in fact the leaders of each of the work tracks have head down into our lap, putting material in to the draft and I would assume that before the next meeting I will have considerable progress done on that and that would make a firmer time for that. Thanks, Anne. Let's move to you, Donna, very briefly.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks Cheryl. Donna Austin from Neustar. Just Cheryl, this is somewhat to your suggestion that there's pause for thought in that if we launch a next round early 2021, that's a long time between drinks with the 2012 round. I thought of one point in the process, and this could be through the Contracted Party House rather than through this working group, but I thought there was a communication with Akram that suggested that there might be ways to speed up the implementation but I just can't recall whether

that's Contracted Party House or whether that was through this working group.

But I think it would be helpful if it was through the PDP working group that we go back and revisit that and see if there's some way that we can, you know, what we would need to do to start the implementation earlier because I think Akram did have some ideas about that. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much for that, Donna. And I may have been in a fugue state at the time but that doesn't resonate with me as a discussion we've had. So it may have come through from the Contracted Party House but regardless, it seems like an extraordinarily valuable exercise to explore that suggestion - or those suggestions from the Contracted Party House and their responses from Akram in the period of time that we will have available to us between the publication of the initial report and getting the public comments back in from it so staff could make a firmly pinned intention to look at that during that period of time so there will be no slacking off, ladies and gentlemen, we will continue to have our shoulder to the wheel.

I'm going to ask you now to skip through to - jump through 26 and go to 27; 27 is a list - beginning of a list of the meetings at ICANN 61. You'll notice there's meetings on Saturday; the red ones are the ones that we would like to see you all at. There are also other meetings held by other entities; the GAC, for example, on Saturday is having a discussion about Work Track 5. We also have highlighted in addition to GNSO working sessions, other on our topics, or relevant topics including the very important one of the RPM and SubPro consolidated timeline all of which you're welcome to attend.

We've got the GAC discussions listed there for your viewing pleasure as well. Quickly hop to 28, there is of course the Work Track 5 commitment to our large block of time, 8:30 in the morning to 10:15 local time on Wednesday the 14th of March. With that and by just about two minutes over our - but we did start two minutes late - our time for today's call, there was no any other

business that we are aware of, if there is any other business anyone would like to raise now, please do so. And that takes us to Slide 29 and our close.

With that I would like to thank our fabulous staff and especially the fact that I was ignoring Steve for so long, albeit unintentionally, and all of you who joined us today, I think we've made considerable progress in where we are recognizing where we are and where we need to be. Look for the survey or poll that will be coming out and for those of you who are traveling to San Juan, if you're not part of one of the work tracks, I won't have another opportunity to wish you safe travels but Jeff and I certainly do look forward to meeting many of you again in San Juan. And we will have work track meetings between now and then. With that, thank you one and all and bye for now.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, everyone. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, (Paul), if you could please stop all recordings? To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

<div align="center">END</div>