
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call on Wednesday, the 22nd of August, 2018, at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede, Yrjo Lansipuro, Vanda Scartezini, Joel Thayer, Christopher Wilkinson, Eduardo Diaz, Jonathan Zuck, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, Carlton Samuels, Gordon Chillcott, and Alfredo Calderon just joined as well. Thank you to everybody.

We have received apologies from Marita Moll, Bastiaan Gosling, Satish Babu, Sebastien Bachollet, and [Kan Kali].

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogan; and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everybody to please state their names for the record and transcription. Thank you, and I turn it over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Claudia. First thing I need to ask is whether everyone can hear me well or do I need to speak louder than this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: You're fine.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm fine? Okay, super. Well, welcome, everyone to today's call on the Consolidated Policy Working Group on the 22nd of August, which means we still have only a couple of weeks until our first deadlines are coming up. Today, we have the first part of the call that we'll be looking at the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process feedback that we need to provide on work tracks one to four.

Then we have a quick presentation and update on the unified access model from Greg Shatan. Is Greg with it? I'm not seeing Greg yet, so if I could check with staff if they could check with Greg. I haven't had a feedback from Greg yet, although I did send him an e-mail earlier. If we could please check with him whilst we proceed through the first part.

Then, after that, we will have an update from the Expedited PDP, from our representatives on there, Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi.

Finally, if we have time, we'll continue our discussion on the penholders, drafters, etc. But that's kind of a standing item.

I would like to ask at this moment whether there are any amendments to the agenda or indeed any additional items, like any other business? The floor is open. Seeing no hands and hearing no one shout their name on the call, I believe there are no amendments to the agenda which means the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen.

Let's go then strictly to our action items from the last call. There were quite a few action items there. A couple are still outstanding. One is for Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogan to follow-up after the call to determine

a deadline on GDPR comments. Do we have an update on this, please?
Hello? Evin or Jonathan, one or the other, please.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We don't have an update on this. We didn't do this. It just slipped off my radar.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. No worries. That's for next week then. Then, Greg to review upcoming updates of unified access model. Well, hopefully, if we manage to get Greg he'll be able to come back to us on this. Otherwise, we will just move on to the next item.

All the other action items are complete. Are there any comments on any of these, any additional points to be made? Nobody is putting their hands up. Wow. You must all be waiting for something really exciting in anticipation. Let's go through, then. Let's move to agenda item three. For this, I hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck who has a presentation for us, bearing in mind that a lot of people have volunteered also to provide us with updates and so on. But I'll pass the floor over to Jonathan and we can have a look at the presentation and the update. Thank you. Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I need to get back to the top of this. Do I have control once you've made it bigger?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, you have control, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Maybe a PowerPoint isn't the best thing to get to. It never seems to work very well. Okay.

So, we had a conversation last week where we talked quite a bit about where we were going to comment and what we thought those comments should basically say and took some volunteers to begin drafting those comments as well. That drafting has begun to happen in the Google Doc spreadsheets that Evin created that's on the ICANN Google Drive and then also Justine Chew has created a separate Google Doc that's more in doc form rather than spreadsheet form, and so people commented there.

It's just a question of combining the two. So, try to find the comments, wherever they were. I'll keep that offer open, that however you make comments and begin drafting, that's okay. Just put it on a message in a bottle and we will attempt again to bring them together into one document at the end of this process. So, this spreadsheet is an attempt to look at where we are with the subsequent procedures comment and what we still need to do. I guess I could just scroll, maybe.

So, the topics that we said that we would comment on was metrics, universal acceptance, predictability, different categories of TLDs, specifically community applications, PICS, and applicant support.

The penholders that we have thus far are here, the different categories of TLDs. We can see names here. Community application, we have names there. We got an update from Justine that she won't be able to join this call, but has begun the process of collecting information from some existing communities and Sebastien and others for the draft. PICS was Holly and Bastiaan and applicant support, again, was Justine, Marita, and Alberto.

Alberto has a question about language support. Again, whatever automatic translation you do, Alberto, if you get it to Evin, then it will be cleaned up for you. The language will be cleaned up for you before it gets posted into the draft. So, feel free to just submit things in whatever form you have them in.

So, some topics that still need penholders. One is metrics. We had a discussion about this on the last call about defining some metrics that we think will drive some of the aspects of the program. So, we need some folks that want to take a hard look at metrics and get some volunteers on this particular topic. I'm happy to participate in it. If others would like to participate on this metrics discussion, please get in touch. Put your name in the chat, whatever way you can. Send a smoke signal and volunteer.

The other is universal acceptance. There seems to be some consensus that we want more to happen, so the answer to the question is should

we do more and we said yes. I think that we're not entirely clear on what that more should be, but there is some possibility that the At-Large community itself might play a role in reaching out to – I don't know what to call it. The websites that continue to be an issue. We need somebody that wants to take the pen on universal acceptance. Part of that may be engaging the At-Large as part of the solution.

Holly, I saw your hand go up and back down. Now it's back up. go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm not sure why that went down. Never mind. Look, from last week's call, I did put my hand up and also I put Evin's hand up. We had done, gosh, a few years back just work on metrics in terms of how do you determine whether the new gTLD program has been a success from the end user point of view. I put [inaudible] Evan. I'm happy to provide input on metrics. We haven't done work so far, but Evan said that he's really happy to provide metrics and applicant support. So, we'll put that down for next week and we'll include you in that discussion. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Alright. That sounds good. Thank you very much, Holly. What about universal acceptance? Is there somebody with a particular interest in that? Alright, nobody is rushing to volunteer for this. Holly and Evin have both raised their hands. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a thought. Can we reach out to Edmon Chung or Don Hollander? Either one of those two have been absolute champions on the issue and we could probably get some update and where we're up to on that one. I just think that other people have done the work who are friends of ALAC, if you will, so let's not repeat work that we don't have to do. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Then I will reach out to Edmon. I'll reach back out to Mike Palage because I know he's done a lot of work on that because of that [inaudible] as well. Let's try to ... I guess I can take a – Eduardo, we're talking about universal acceptance, to answer your question. Evan, go ahead. Your hand is raised.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, Jonathan; and hi, everybody. Sorry, I've been away for a bunch of meetings, but at least better late than not at all. Jonathan, you know probably better than anybody about the work that the consumer choice and trust group did on coming up with some of the metrics and collecting some of the [inaudible] that staff had done. Would it be possible at all to go back on some of those, which in my eye, were never totally properly reviewed from an At-Large perspective, and perhaps use that to try and guide the metrics?

I'm a little concerned that if we create new metrics when even previous ones weren't really followed up on might not be that fruitful an issue. Anyway, I'm just saying there's myself, you, Carlton, Chris Wilkinson who are all involved in the CCT efforts and there were a lot of metrics

that came out of that and I don't know if those things properly got vetted in such a way that gives us something useful to go forward. I do think they provide us something that could help going forward.

And as for universal acceptance, I guess my own point of view is I don't even think that's an At-Large issue. Personally, I think universal acceptance is a promotional campaign from the domain industry [inaudible] to accept what they do. But that's just my point of view. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evan. I guess there's been a consensus within At-Large that you've missed the creation of around universal acceptance as being sort of critical to the success of the new gTLD program. So, I think there's been some consensus that something more ought to be done about it prior to just introducing more TLDs. Your point is well-taken. I think it's just a question that if people go sign up for an e-mail or something and it's not then accepted by a website, that becomes an education issue. So, that's part of the problem there, I think. Christopher, go ahead, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Hello, everybody. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. There's always latency in opening the unmute. Jonathan, regarding universal acceptance, I think I [inaudible] several years ago the proposal that vertical integration should primarily be about allowing new small registries to accept registrations directly without going through registrars. I think it is still a valid issue. As you know, I disagree fundamentally with the way in which vertical integration was implemented, but it still remains valid that [inaudible] registry, independent registries, especially in new areas where the registrar community has not yet penetrated, new registries must be allowed to register names directly. I think that is a shortcut to universal acceptance in many cases.

Of course, [inaudible] do discover that registrars are interested in servicing their names, but [inaudible] that the current registrar community should be allowed, in effect, to filter what should or should not be a new registry.

Regarding metrics, [I don't care to] repeat anything I've said before over the last two years, so I won't. I'll refer you only to slide eleven of the slide deck that was presented on the 13th of August, just a few days ago, to the PDP.

It's disgraceful. You have the whole 2012 system and the attention of the staff and we still can't produce metrics, at least in terms of how many names the new gTLDs have registered. I think, and I've said, [inaudible] footnote and I hesitate to bring this up directly with you, Jonathan, because I know how much time you've spent on the CCT review. But, it's really difficult for those of us who confess, still consider

ourselves as professional economists. It's really difficult to say anything sensible about the last round in the absence of the CCRT [results].

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Chris. Most of the findings of that report are certainly public at this point. Just as a point of clarification, Chris, the point you raised is an important one. Just as a question of vocabulary, though, when we're talking about universal acceptance, we're not talking about registrars' willingness to sell domain names. We're talking about American Airlines willing to accept an e-mail address based on a new gTLD that won't, because of old legacy, it looks for just three-character top-level domains, for example. That's what we mean right now when we're talking about universal acceptance is about the world accepting these new gTLDs on their websites in most instances. That's the discussion that we're having right now.

We'll move on from this and take the pen and I'll follow-up with you on the other issue. And Evan, I'll dig back into the At-Large metrics, but most of those have become a part of the marketplace indicator processes Olivier has mentioned. Eduardo, you have your hand up.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes. I want to volunteer for the universal acceptance. I will get in touch with Edmon Chung and get something going on there.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Perfect, Eduardo. Edmon Chung and Mike Palage I think are two people that would be good to talk to.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Will do. I will do that and get something going [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Talk to me if you forget who I'm talking about.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I will. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. Evan, is that a new hand?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah. Thanks. Chris was ahead of me in the queue. I don't know if that was an old hand or a new one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think Chris took his hand down.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I just wanted to make the point that Greg made a very good point in the chat, that this is about universal acceptance at a technical level and not promotion or enthusiasm. If that's the case, then this [inaudible] falls into the same pot as ICANN efforts to try and get acceptance for IPv6 or try to get acceptance at a technical level for IDNs. Isn't this all really part of the same pot, that at a technical level, we're

trying to get the routing world to accept some of the new initiatives of ICANN whether it's in IDNs, whether it's in new TLDs, whether it's in IPv6 or all the other good things that are trying to be put out.

Without passing judgment on good or bad, this seems more like a technical advocacy effort rather than anything that needs policy work. It just seems to be my take on it. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes. I think that there's definitely an analogy, that part of universal acceptance is IDNs. They are a big part of it. But it's a different community altogether than the people we're talking to about IPv6. Universal acceptance, at least as I understand it, is literally about people's webpages that have validation code in them and they're doing things like rejecting people's e-mail addresses as invalid because they don't have a three-letter domain. Unfortunately, it's a much larger issue than the IPv6 issue which is more technical. This is literally legacy validation code that's all over the Internet. That's the universal acceptance problem as I understand it and that does apply to IDNs as well as generic top-level domains.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Right. But I'm saying it's not a policy issue. This is basically one of advocacy. The stuff is there and it's a matter of getting the world to do it. I'm not quite sure what the policy implications of that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I guess the issue is that we've been asked about it by the Subsequent Procedures Working Group about whether or not the community needs to do more on universal acceptance. So, we're responding to specific questions being asked of us by the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. Olivier, go ahead. Christopher, is that a new hand?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: It's a new hand, actually, [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Then you're next in the queue, then. I didn't realize it was new. I apologize.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay, thanks. First of all, since Evan and I never coordinate, I continue to be amazed about how often we agree. I accept your narrower definition of universal acceptance [inaudible] ICANN's job. I really don't see why At-Large needs to do things ourselves.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry, I need to cut you off just because we're running out of time. We already agreed that we would say yes to the answer about whether the community and icann.org should be more universally accepted. So, we need to draft that and circulate it and that will be the time for feedback. We've already [inaudible].

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eduardo has volunteered to hold the pen. Is there something else that you want to say as well, Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'll pass for now. I'll pick up again later.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. I appreciate it. I'm really just trying to run through this and I've only got a half-an-hour and I think I have like ten minutes of that left. Olivier, go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Just mentioning I've heard some things being said about the metrics about ICANN not having any metrics and so on. I just wanted to point you to the domain name marketplace health index metrics which I've just put a link to in the chat. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jonathan. I do try not to jump into these discussions and debates because it's my unique position surrounding this PDP, but I do want to make two clarifying points which may assist your drafters on this. First of all, the concern about any metrics that At-Large has been passionate about in all the work we did and I'll include myself in that list way back when [inaudible], if your memory serves, Jonathan.

This is an opportunity because we are looking at putting new policy recommendations for subsequent procedures in. So, if there is something [inaudible] picked up in marketplace health index is something that you feel very passionate about, this is a perfect time to mention it again.

So, that said, newly one, very quickly, to universal acceptance. The policy rationale [inaudible] rough draft [inaudible] understands why that question is asked is that, just like we do with IPv6, just like we do with IDNs. There is an opportunity in the technical specifications part of the policy for applicants to also include certain expectations of universal acceptance [inaudible] enough of the community say we should do that, that is what we'll do. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cheryl alluded to what I was going to say on both universal acceptance and metrics. It's fine to say, yes, we should do more, but the specific comment we're talking about is what should be specified for

new gTLDs applicants to commit to or do or whatever that might help these things. So, it's not just a matter of saying, yeah, we support it, but what is it we should be building into the policy that will help the situation. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Agreed. Thanks, Alan. Okay, I'm going to quickly move on, if I can, here. So, we had undesignated penholders, Eduardo and Satish was another one, but I believe he is not on the call, so I'm not going to pause here. I'm going to move on.

Then there was a couple of areas where we did not make a final decision about whether or not what we were going to – that we were going to comment on and what the gist of that comment was going to be. One had to do with applications [inaudible] rounds and if we had a perspective on that that we wanted to propose or not. There's definitely been discussion but not consensus yet, and I think if there isn't consensus, we shouldn't comment on it.

Community applications Justine is working on and I believe also objections. So, the only other thing that I wanted to talk about was rounds I guess to see if anybody wanted to try to break the [log jam] on whether or not we should be commenting on applications, [as in rounds]. Should it be rounds? Should it be continuous? Should it be continuous applications [inaudible] evaluations? That was the question that we haven't made a definitive consensus on, or if we did, I missed it. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I would strongly suggest that we want to advocate the continuation of rounds without some level of rounds for evaluation. That's not saying whether there is a continual window to submit an application but the question is how will they be evaluated? And I believe evaluation [and] rounds is necessary because that's the only opportunity we have for looking at issues like user confusion, like competition and community priority applications. And if only for community priority, I think the evaluations have to be done in rounds. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Oliver?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. I would also advocate for rounds for another reason, which might be a bit of a reason just for ICANN, which is if you do have rounds, you do have the opportunity or the possibility of having conflicting the strings themselves, thus bringing forth some auctions and auctions might be an additional windfall for ICANN, auction money. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Carlton, go ahead. You might be on mute, Carlton. There you go.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I am not seeing a need for round application. If you tell me that there is a window for applications, there are going to be multiple applications received in the period and we have to have some way to evaluate [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: I can still hear you, Carlton. I don't know if that sound is coming—

CARLTON SAMUELS: [inaudible]. Staff, are you able to identify where that's coming from and mute it or not?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: I think it's Carlton's line, actually.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Well, [inaudible]. It's a landline. All I hear is [inaudible]. Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We have some kind of echo from your line, it looks like.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Well, [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you want to try to type your comment and I'll go on to Evan and read out your comment? Sorry about that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Alright, [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry about that, Carlton. Evan, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Jonathan. Not knowing Carlton's rationale, I think I would agree with him. I'm not sure that rounds are needed. We haven't needed them at the second level in any TLD. First come, first serve for all its warts has seemed to circumvent a lot of the contention issues that we've had to deal with. As long as there is some kind of facility that mandates a periodic review of the TLD program, justice is done with all of the constituency groups, that there's a mandated cycle of reviews where things stop for a period of time, get reviewed, and then policies may get revisited. I would prefer that to actually rounds. So, you'd have a period, let's say, for four years where it's first come, first served, then things shut down for six months while a review is going on and people have a chance to assess and possibly tweak the policies and then it goes back on and it's first come, first serve.

While I've never been fond of totally going to first come, first served when it comes to second-level domains, most of the alternatives are worse and this way, Olivier, I understand what you were saying about this allows for auctions and contentions and things like that. Personally,

I don't know if I agree that ICANN needs to be in the auction business. It might be a moneymaker, but at the same time, I'm not sure if that's a proper use of ICANN's resources.

So, I guess my own point would be to say forget rounds, just go first come, first served. As long as there's a regular cycle of mandated stoppage review and requirement of policies as discovered from previous activity. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evan. Yes, Carlton? You sound much better now, if you want to read out your comment.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. My own feeling is I really am starting to see how rounds improve the situation here, beyond first come, first serve. I really am not seeing ... I didn't hear everything said by anybody, so [inaudible]. But, I personally do not see having [inaudible] round and what came of it, I do not see a compelling reason why you couldn't achieve the same ends using first come, first served approach. That's my feeling on it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlton. Christopher? Everyone, let's try and be as [inaudible] as possible.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes. I have argued [inaudible] first come, first serve. I think we need rounds [inaudible]. We need rounds that are defined in terms of the priorities. I think there should be a three-month round for underserved regions, a three-month round for community applications, a three-month round for geographical names.

If you go to first come, first served, you give an enormous tactical advantage to the most funded and most experienced [inaudible] applicants. We want to work towards new applicants. The idea that the registrars who have accumulated [inaudible] registries cannot be carried over into the new round. The next round must prioritize diversification, innovation, and the bubble of competition and consumer interest.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm against first come, first served.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Got it. Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I agree with Alan regarding the application and rounds for the same reasons. I will not repeat them. And I am against the first come, first served principle. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think Greg was next and then Alan.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I agree as well, but rounds are the better approach, in part because I don't think there's a good design yet for first come, first served that doesn't have all of the current problems of the second level TLDs. There's no design for dealing with the problems at the first level anyway.

I do think that there's no – other than community, there's no pre-defined set of priorities. [inaudible] perhaps down a rabbit hole in debating those things, finding some ways to support more applications from underserved regions and trying to straighten things out a bit more in that regard. I don't think that auctions are the real main reason. I do think, though, that contention sets that avoid having first come be the only reason party A gets a TLD versus party B is superior, but whatever we do to set up how to resolve its intentions, that is a different question.

Finally, I would say that we are not debating the [inaudible]. As Christopher noted, this has been debated extensively in the working group and it's reflected in what we are commenting on. So, we may all want to go back, especially on this one, and look at what has been said and proposed rather than just having a freeform discussion and saying that one isn't convinced [inaudible] other one. We're not really debating so much with each other, but with whether we support or don't support what it is we're commenting on. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. And congratulations on your position becoming permanent over there at ISOC New York. Alan, go ahead. Carlton, I'm assuming that's an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that is not an old hand. For the record, Adobe Connect puts the hand in the order they were raised, if you're looking at it in the normal view. There's others that don't.

Two very short comments. Number one, I would strongly advise saying we should use rounds because that generates auction funds and is a cash cow. That will send some really bad messages to a number of parts of the community. And number two, we cannot advocate community priority evaluations and community TLDs which we have come out very strongly for because it's one of the few public interest benefits that was in the original programming we're talking about maintaining. We cannot advocate that and then say no rounds. That only works if there are round evaluations. Our answers have to be consistent with each other, and if we are going to support community applications, we cannot support a free-for-all application period. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Carlton, new hand.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, it's new. I'm going to say I strongly disagree that you can only ... The issue of community or any one of those is about [inaudible]. To say you have a pen and you use the pen [inaudible] everybody and then you

decide [inaudible] is. That is a problem that we had here. The community specifications would be on a very horrid idea of what the community application was, and so that basis, most of them failed.

I am saying if you have [classifications] pre-established that are very clear and we have a definite way to express any [classification] [inaudible] any application against the [classification] there is nothing to say that we could not have [inaudible] geographic, or any one of those classified on an open first come, first serve basis. It all depends on the classification that we extend to it. Our problem in the last round is that those classifications were not a priority. They were after the fact.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Carlton. It looks like we're not going to reach consensus on this call, and unfortunately we're not equipped to debate this endlessly right now. Alan, I'm going to ask you a procedural question since you have the most experience with this. Do we have some other mechanism, a survey or something like that, that gets us to a point of consensus on this? Because it certainly seems to be that we're having a hot debate with it right now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jonathan, we could certainly take surveys and whatever, but I really think this is an important issue and it's worth spending a little bit more time on. You gave me the microphone and I'm going to abuse it by saying what Carlton was just talking about is not what I was talking about. I wasn't talking about whether we have community applications or not. I was talking about whether we have a community priority

evaluation process. Dot-bank is a community TLD. If it had been evaluated as a community TLD, it probably would not have made the cut. But, there was no competition, so it never got evaluated. We're not talking about designation of community TLDs, which I think we all support. We're talking about whether if there is multiple people applying for something, should community applications get precedence. I believe that is one of the very few really public interest parts of this gTLD program and I believe we need to support it. I think we already made that decision and you can't do that unless you can establish rounds, so that you can see if there's competition for a given string. Thank you.

I really think this is an important issue because it comes down to exactly what it is we stand for, with respect to community priority and therefore it doesn't stand on its own right. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. Evan, go ahead. Oh, okay. I guess there's not another comment there. It is true that we did all agree that we want to see more true community applications [exceed]. I'm sorry, did somebody speak up?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

No, sorry. I was on mute. First of all, there's the procedural thing. ALAC has been known to put in a comment saying that we have mixed community feeling. Some people believe this, some people believe that. ALAC has put in that comment in the past. The lack of consensus doesn't meant we have no opinion. It simply means we have a diversity of

opinions, and if that happens, that's not necessarily the end of the world.

I was only going to speak one last time on the issue of rounds or not and I'll simply look at how companies get registered. A company can get registered as a non-profit or for-profit. If it gets registered as a non-profit, there's different criteria. There's different obligations and different benefits.

Success in a contention set is only one of the things that might be granted to a community application. Without grounds, yes, there's no contention set to deal with, but there are things like reduced fees. There's things like different criteria with regards to PICS, with regard to other community obligations. So, there might be a lower fee charge and there might be a lower ongoing fee charge, but in return, it has to meet certain community criteria.

The ability to win a contention set is only one possible, one out of many potential benefits of being a community application. So, rounds are not the be-all and end-all for being able to have community applications. I'll just leave it at that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: It's all about classification.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl, did you have something you wanted to add?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Have you finished your presentation, Jonathan? I've got a couple more minutes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I didn't know which topic. You meant on subsequent procedures generally. [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'm sorry. I think we need to move on. We have some points of views. We're going to have to keep working on ... These are some of the specific areas where some drafting has taken place. If you look at the Google Doc, and Evin I think will put that in the chat or over on the notes, so that you can see, that should be a fairly comprehensive place at least to look at where we stand now. I know some of you have got a preference for working in Justine's document and that's fine, but right now, there is a summary of everything we have thus far in the Google Doc, so please take a look at that and we will pick this conversation up about rounds and I will get with staff and with Alan and others to figure out how we might go about breaking our [log jam] on this.

In the meantime, I am done with the presentation, so Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you so much, Jonathan. I'm glad you had time to come back to me. Hopefully, what I'm going to be telling you all at the end of your deliberations and what you're going to be putting into the PDP as advice is going to be hopefully useful, and that is we have agreed and it will be advertised, too, so you're hearing it here first, that we will extend our public comment period to adjusted date of the 26th of September. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But we should have everything wrapped up except whether or not we want rounds by then, so that's very exciting news, Cheryl. Thanks, everyone, for your participation on this. I'm going to hand it back to Olivier to figure out where we are, if we're going to Greg or jumping to the EPDP. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. I can't bear to even speak now at the moment while keeping still so much of my joy to hear that we have more time for the input on the subsequent procedures. That's a great thing.

I understand a number of people have to leave in ten minutes. I think Greg Shatan is one of them, but there are also some people that have to leave that have to take part on the discussion on the updates on the EPDP from At-Large. So, what I would suggest is, Greg, if you could just spend a couple of minutes, just if you have an update on the unified access model, then that let's us then move to the update on the EPDP as well. Is that okay, Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: Yes. That's fine. I can give a very brief update on that, which is that ICANN published in the last couple of days a draft framework for the unified access model, as opposed to the first document which came out which was about eight pages. This one is about 25 or 26 pages with pretty pictures in the back and a much more highly developed proposal. So, I'm currently going through it and trying to evaluate what changed and what was added to try to come up with a concise way that we can provide input on it. But I encourage anybody who can – and I don't know if staff can place it in the chat here or I can circulate it around our mail list, the link for the new report. I encourage anybody who wants to comment on this to download it or however you want to do it and read it. It's a report, not a slide show or anything like that. It's done in kind of a Q&A style. But, basically goes through the whole [inaudible], to use that term, on this. Maybe even the whole [McGilla]. But at least 25 pages of [McGilla] on this. That's where things stand. I won't take anymore of your time. If you have questions, let me know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Greg. It would be very helpful to indeed have a copy of this. That's the report that I was eagerly waiting for. If you could either yourself forward a link to it on the mailing list and then if staff as an action item could also have this in our document storage location. I would also like to ask Alan then on whether – because I know there has been some discussion as to whether the ALAC should comment on this model. Should the ALAC now comment on this [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we should, given bandwidth. It's obvious that whatever is published there, it's potentially something that could be used by the EPDP and therefore come out as part of it, and therefore any input we give on it to refine it before it gets to that stage is a good thing. It really is a matter of bandwidth. There are relatively few people in our midst who understand these issues and are well-versed enough to really do a good critique from a user perspective. There may not be a lot of user perspective issues related to it.

So, should we do it? Yes. I put a slightly lower priority than the gTLD one and working with the EPDP when we get into substantive issues, but it is something that, all other things being equal, we should do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan.

GREG SHATAN: Can I give a quick response?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Greg Shatan, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Yes. I'll just say with regard to this I'm happy to be the penholder for this comment. I hope to be joined, so that I'm not just writing to myself, but obviously I'll write for whomever to comment on.

I think that there is definitely an end user perspective here, clearly. If end users directly and indirectly can't benefit from the information and access to the information in a way that is legally appropriate, then there are going to be security, stability and trust issues, among others, that definitely get implicated. So, I think the end user perspective can definitely be fleshed out. It shouldn't be confused with other perspectives. For that reason especially, it's a unique perspective that needs to be heard because it's not always heard in the debate between and against various highly involved sets of stakeholders. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Greg. Was there a policy development page already for this, a policy commenting page that was created [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: There was one set up for the previous one which can be morphed into this one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's what I was going to suggest. Thanks, Alan, for that. That's another action item, please, to morph the previous policy commenting Wiki page into the one which includes the latest [inaudible]. Thanks for that.

Four minutes until some people has to leave us indefinitely for the next call. Let's jump into the EPDP update. I'm not sure who is to speak on this one, whether it's Alan or whether others have to contribute to this,

other people that need to run have to contribute to this. So, [inaudible] my part. I'll pass it over to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Hadia is not with us. At least I don't see her on Adobe Connect, so I will start off anyway. At this point, we have not really entered the substantive work. We have been working on a triage which was required by the charter essentially trying to assess where we agree and where we disagree. The hope I think was that we would find there's all sorts of things everyone agrees with and that makes it easy. We don't have to talk about them any further. There's virtually nothing that we all agree on and some of the opinions are very strong and very far apart.

We had a rather surreal discussion that took, I don't know, at least 15 minutes on a meeting yesterday that the topic was not substance, but process, and specifically, should alternates be allowed to be in the room in the face-to-face meeting?

It was a long discussion. I believe, although I may be wrong, the only people who were speaking against it were NCSG, but they were speaking against it serially both in the chat and on the call, and it took a long time.

On a few substantive issues, there has been lots and lots of input, again, from NCSG. They are using their six members very effectively. This is going to be a real challenge to come to closure. If we can't come to closure quickly, do we allow someone to sit in the room in the back row? When we get to the real substantive issues, I really worry for this group.

That being said, we are proceeding. We should be getting into the substantive issues soon where you'll start seeing from me and others specific questions to be asked or issues that will be discussed, but note there are two meetings a week – Tuesday and Thursday mornings for me. They're at 9:00 AM my time, which is 13:00 UTC. If questions are going to be asked and people want to give opinions, we don't have a week. They'll probably be turned around from when the agenda is published until twelve hours later when the meeting is being held.

So, if you're interested in these kinds of things, pay attention. These discussions will be held on the gTLD mailing list. So, if you are not a member of the gTLD group, that's where you want to be if you want to participate or at least see what's going on there. That's really all I have to report.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I can vouch. I also subscribe to the EPDP mailing list as an observer and it makes for interesting reading, provided one has a suitable filter put it in one specific folder. I'm not as ... Well, I don't have the time to listen to the calls, but it sounds equally as exciting. Greg Shatan, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: It was an old hand, but I would just say goodbye until the next time as I go off to work track five. Bye.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Greg. Any other comments on this EPDP? One of the problems I guess that I'd like to ask is given the current debates about keeping this group so closed and so on, with the EPDP group meeting in Barcelona, does this mean that there's a chance that it will actually be a closed group, so anybody else wishing to follow will need to be situated in the room outside the EPDP room? It's one of these things that's kind of unheard of. There will be no audience available [inaudible]. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a really interesting question that hasn't been discussed yet. Given the discussion yesterday that having someone in the room would be disruptive because it's going to be confusing who is the real person, I would've thought whoever is sitting at the table and whoever isn't at the table makes that distinction clear. There were comments that you're going to get an unfair advantage if you happen to have someone else at the meeting and then you can go out to dinner with them and talk to them or the alternates might talk to someone in the hallway and campaign for something or other.

I really don't know how this is going to be managed when these are the concerns that are being raised. I'll use a line that I've used before. It's going to be interesting.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I ask a question?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I heard somebody asking if they can ask a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's Carlton, but I'm not sure.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is it Carlton? Please, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, it's Carlton. My understanding of the alternates was that they were supposed to be heartbeat replacements in the event a main person was incapacitated in some way. The idea that you would not wish to have [inaudible] up on everything that's happening, the sense of the room and so on is just preposterous to me.

The person who is advancing the idea that the alternative is going to be the source of leaks and because that's how interpreting from the room [inaudible] examined.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, to be clear, no one used the term leaks. That was not part of the discussion.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No. I was saying that I'm using the term leaks when they say they're going to go out in the hallway. I understand it's the sense of what you heard, you're interpreting, I understand that. But the idea that the

alternate in some way is any less reliable than the person in the first order is really very strange [inaudible]. It doesn't [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

To be clear, there were comments made that the negative comments were presuming that we are not professionals, would not act professionally. That was said. The replacements, by the way, are not heartbeat replacements. You have to fill out a form and work has to be done, so you have to give advance notice that someone is going to be replacing you. But there will be people, for instance, we know who can participate for two out of the three days or two-and-a-half out of the three days. So, there will be substitutes.

The question is not whether the alternates can listen and even see the Adobe Connect room. The question is are they allowed to be in the same room, breathing the same air? That was the substance.

I believe it's going to be resolved, that the answer is, yes, they can. There will be limited room, of course. If 30 alternates show up, we have a real problem because the room will not likely hold them. But I believe the outcome will be they are allowed to be there, but there was very strenuous discussion and I didn't bring the issue up on the substance of the discussion, but rather just to show we can spend a lot of time talking about that, what's going to happen when we get to substance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Are there any other comments or questions?

I have a question regarding the collaboration between ICANN Organization and the EPDP. As you are aware, Goran Marby wrote to the EPDP chair asking the EPDP how they would envisage the collaboration between the EPDP chairs and the organization itself since the goal posts are moving on the organizational side when it comes to [inaudible] specifications that they currently have, and especially in light of the lawsuit that is currently taking place in Germany.

I've read a response that [we] haven't spoken about this. Is there anything you'd like to highlight from that, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. There has been some concern in the EPDP among members that there are things going on that we may not be privy to and may not be kept up to date on and there certainly has been a request, a generally accepted request, that we somehow make sure that we are kept up to date on these things and that we not be left behind in the dirt as things are changing around us. It would be nice to say nothing is going to change around us, but we know it will and there has been some concern raised to try to fix that. Exactly how that will happen is not 100% clear.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Has there been any discussion on the EPDP with regards to the handling of confidential information that you might be

given from ICANN Org since we are dealing here with [inaudible] papers, in some cases?

ALAN GREENBERG: There has been no discussion that I'm privy to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Will it be worth mentioning this, remembering the ATRT 2 that has to deal with some confidential information in some cases and agreed earlier rather than later in the protocol that would be used for handling such information.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but I'll remind you that, in that case, we also had a significant number of people on the team who said, "I will not sign a non-disclosure agreement. I will walk out of the room if there's going to be confidential things discussed." I suspect the same will happen here. It has not been discussed, to my knowledge, and I do not know if it will or if it even should.

I don't think ICANN is going to share confidential things related to a court case in this kind of environment. That would be my expectation. It's not governed by anything I know as a fact from anyone in ICANN, but I would not think that they would show their hands in what is essentially a very open environment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Any questions or comments from anybody on the topic that we are discussing here? One of the questions is whether there has been, there is a plan now as to what is coming next. So, what are the next things that the EPDP will discuss in the forthcoming two calls?

ALAN GREENBERG: There probably is that I'm not privy to. I'm having a hard time keeping up. The timing for me for this week is really bad because the RDS review team is trying to finalize its report this week. So, I'm in the middle of a whole bunch of things that are going on, so I'm a little bit more behind than I should be otherwise. That won't last more than a week, but it's an issue I have to content with today. The bottom line is I think an agenda has been published for tomorrow. I haven't looked at it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thanks for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: But, then again, if there was an agenda published, you have it also.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not seeing any hands up. This discussion seems to be a lot less contested and enjoyable as the previous one that we've spoken about, perhaps because this is such early days and all we're hearing are just small updates about how little has been achieved so far.

So, I would suggest that we can then move on in our agenda. Wish you luck for the next week. And go to the next part of our agenda and if the agenda could please be unsynced that would be helpful.

The next part is the follow-up on discussion of the penholders, drafters, etc. I'm not quite sure whether this agenda item is still pertinent at this stage in time since we've spent a significant – well, we already are moving forward with some people in charge of the different component parts of the public comment on the subsequent procedures PDP. I'm going to ask ... Well, I see that Tijani Ben Jemaa has put his hand up, so let me ask Tijani to take the floor, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. This issue of the penholder, I think it is not done in the right way because you cannot have four penholders. It must be a drafting team with one penholder. If it is like this, I don't see how the work will be going on. This is my first remark.

My second remark is [inaudible] request, that I am added to the drafting team on applicant support. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Tijani. That's relating back to the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. Somebody just tried to speak. Who is this please?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It sounded like Jonathan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Your hand is up. Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. That wasn't me trying to speak before. I just thought I'd respond a little bit to Tijani. I think that the single penholder might come down to semantics and that model works for the smaller comments, but with something as big as subsequent procedures, there's going to be several penholders that are part of the initial draft at least. I am not only the penholder of the entire comment, but there are a lot of people that are drafting individual components of it. So, we can change the names of those things, but that's sort of how it's sorting itself out in the real world.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Jonathan. Now, there are two sub-parts to part six and I'm not quite sure whether these come from last week or this week. The first one was creating an internal deadline for the feedback of the community comment [inaudible] synchronization and access model for non-public data version 1.7. Is this still on the cards? Bearing in mind all of the advances that we had [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: is 1.7 still current?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, is it still on the cards or are we going to have to comment on this? I note that we've got Holly Raiche, Jonathan Zuck, and Alan Greenberg listed in our open policy comments and advice and I wondered ... I'm not seeing any closing date and stuff on the page at the moment, so would we be able to decide on one now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the same answer goes on the unified model. This is the only work going on an accreditation model. If 1.7 is still the current one and they're still accepting comments, then optimally, somebody should be looking at it and saying, "Are there issues that we want to raise? There may not be. There are other people, particularly in the security community, that are more actively involved than we are and I think they're covering the bases pretty well. But, I do think we should be looking at it and deciding whether to comment. And if it is still a relevant, the current copy, the current up-to-date version that they are still accepting comments on, optimally, we should. It's a matter of resources. Again, there are a limited number of people who are sufficiently familiar with it who could actually do that on our behalf.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Jonathan Zuck? Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, I left myself on mute. I could take a look at this, 1.7, since I held the pen for the last few comments we made on this. I'll take a look to see if there's updates of the comments that we made in the past.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Jonathan. The question is creating an internal deadline for feedback on this. Should we set ourselves a time and date of some sort, maybe next week or something? Then, we'll make a decision next week on whether we want to proceed forward with a response or nothing?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. That sounds good.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thanks. So, next week will be the 29th of August. We'll make a decision. So, a deadline for this. Next, penholders and resource people for wider consolidated policy working group resource workspace. This is just a call to get anybody you have some time on their hands, maybe not immediately but later on this year, and be able to help with drafting to put their name down. I know that we're not short of volunteers when the going gets tough, but it's good to have at least an idea of who is interested in what topic, specifically, in this working group. Alan Greenberg, your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that's an old hand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Alan. Right. I think that's all we really have today. I know that some people are waiting to still jump onto work track five. I was going to turn – Jonathan, do you think we need to spend a bit more time still on the subsequent procedures discussion? I know that – and for those people that have looked at the agenda, there are a number of people that were listed there, so unfortunately, Bastiaan Goslings is away this week so he's not able to speak to us about the fees and the public interest commitments. I know that we touched on the PICs already. There's a discussion going on on the mailing list – not on the mailing, sorry, on the Wiki page, relevant Wiki page for this.

Justine Chew also is unable to make it to today's call because of the timing of the call and she has sent in some comments whilst this call was taking place or a few minutes before this call, some comments. I think it would probably be better for us to read them. Community applications also and objections. She's involved with the three of these things.

Now that we have a bit more time with the extension of the commenting until later on in September, that gives us a bit of breathing time. Jonathan, do you think we need to spend more time on this or we can just call it a day and follow-up on next week?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I would call it a day but I guess I'll try to be following up with people prior to the meeting next week.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's excellent.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great, Jonathan. Thank you for this. Just one thing I was going to ask, which is a bit of clarity. There are many different discussions going on now in parallel, with the metrics, with the community prioritization [inaudible]. Thank you for putting all this on the main Google Doc. Let's try and work out if we can maybe divide the Google Doc into separate tabs for each one of those topics. I thought about that earlier because one of the big concerns with the size of the Google doc itself, even I have problems with my laptop with it scrolling all the way down to line 152 and across. Maybe we can find something to simplify that Google doc or to cut it into more than one piece, one chunk. I hear that some people are using another doc, but I'm a little concerned that with the approaching time, we need to have a bit more organization to make a bit clearer for everyone, especially as the discussions are heating up. If we end up with this intertwined discussion, it's going to end up like a gigantic marsh, I would call it. Cacophony is another word for it. Alan Greenberg and then we'll probably move on to a close. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've heard reference to several Google Docs. One is the spreadsheet that Jonathan has done. There was also reference to something that Justine had done. Can we at least get pointers to where these are so we can look at what's there? I'm not sure we're going to come to closure today on deciding to eliminate one and replace it with

another, but can we make sure we're all aware of the various places? There's also discussions going on on the Wiki. So, can we at least have in one place, in one e-mail, a pointer to all of the places that the discussions are happening? It's not optimal, but it's better than not knowing about them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Jonathan, please, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Either [Ivan] or I will get out an e-mail with all the links. As I said, I feel like we've burned enough time trying to get everybody to conform to a particular place and that's not been entirely productive. I think that everyone should work wherever they're comfortable. If you know what you're supposed to be drafting, then draft it and send me an e-mail. Send me a Word doc. Update Justine's document or update the document that Evin created as the overall spreadsheet and we will continue to try and consolidate that all into the spreadsheet so it can be easily searched and sorted and things like that. The spreadsheet is the closest thing to being a one for one with the questions that we were asked by the subsequent procedures team. So, that's probably where this will end up. Then we'll produce some kind of a document there for people to check over. But, rather than trying to get everybody to agree to something, let's just get people writing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I note that Cheryl who is on the other call is still listening to us and is mentioning in the chat that perhaps we should hide some comments to unhide them later on that Google Doc, on that spreadsheet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll work with staff to [inaudible]. I'll look at simplifying it. I just don't want to have another conversation about the document. people know what it is they need to be writing. Just write. It doesn't matter where you do it. Put it on a message. Drop it in the ocean. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We have another nine minutes no this call. Should we talk process for the next nine minutes?

HOLLY RAICHE: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I can sense some strong negative feeling here. Let's go to any other business, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did suggest an any other business a very long time ago. I don't remember what it was, though, but it was in the chat. Maybe I can find it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It sounds like it was maybe an hour and a half ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did anyone happen to read it and tell me what I said?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg, I told the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are you sure it wasn't about work stream five, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: It started off saying AOB. If that's the line I wrote, I don't know why I would've made reference to work track five but maybe I did. Sorry. If we can't find it, then let's pretend I didn't say it. I don't see [inaudible]. I know I typed it into some chat, but I'm willing to give—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I can't find your text, either, unfortunately, Alan, so it will have to be for next time or maybe follow-up on the mailing list. We are six minutes ahead of the end of this call. If there are no further AOBs, thank you very much. Thanks, Jonathan, for keeping this whole thing moving forward. Thanks to everyone else for contributing greatly on this call. It's been a good one. See you next week. We'll continue with our usual

rotation. For now, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, and night. Bye-bye!

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Bye-bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you, all, for joining this call. This meeting has now been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect your lines. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]