ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A
Thursday, 06 December 2018 at 20:00 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: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-a-06dec18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p2vuzlb8nr2/

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/1AXuBQ

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

Unidentified Participant: We make sure everybody reads their lines. And Ashleigh, can you start the recording?

Operator: Yes, the recording has started.

Unidentified Participant: Great. Thanks. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening; everyone. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub Group A call held on Thursday, the 6th of December, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?

Okay. I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes. And please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking, to avoid any background noise. And with this, I will turn it over to Robin Gross. Please begin.

Robin Gross: Hi. This is Robin. Can you hear me okay?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, perfect. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay. Terrific. Great, and thanks to everyone who showed up for today's meeting, and let me quickly go over the agenda; the usual business over the agenda and updating SOIs, and then discussion of public comments. We will finish up the predictability section, which is 2.2.2, and go into the clarity of application process, which is 2.2.2.2, and if there's time get started with the

application assessment round, and then any other business. And so that's our agenda today. Anybody have any questions or comments on that?

Okay, not seeing or hearing anyone, let's press forward. Is there anyone who would like to update their statement of interest?

Okay, I don't see or hear anyone. Let's move on then and get into the discussion of public comment. I should have mentioned earlier, as many of you probably are aware, today's call is a 90-minute call, as will be next week's, just so you're cognizant of that as we go through these materials.

Okay, so let's get started with the section 2.2.2, predictability, which we left off in the middle of before. I think we left off down on row number 27, which is 2.2.2.e.3, and that's a question that was asked to the community as follows. "A component of the predictability framework includes the identification or criteria to determine whether an issue can be handled through existing mechanisms or whether it can or should be handled by a standing IRT. What are potential criteria that can be applied to help distinguish between types of issues and resolution mechanism?"

Okay, so that was the particular question that we're about to get started on that was answered in public comment. And what have we got here? We've got a lot of new ideas. As you can see, there's a number of comments here that all came in with new ideas. There's one from the brand registry group, and under that is one from ALAC, and then one from the business constituency, and the registry stakeholder group. And so I thought we'd all sort of treat these very similarly, at least in our discussion today, which is that we would move those to the full working group for discussion, as these are new ideas, new suggestions, that came out in the public comment. And you can see what that specific suggestion was, and so those would go back to the full working group for their analysis. Does anyone have any thoughts on that? Or did you want to go through these particular ones individually? Or are we pretty much satisfied that these are all new -- can be grouped together as new ideas to be passed on to the full working group? Anyone have any thoughts on this?

Okay. I see in the chat box, Jim Prendergast has typed, that makes sense. The question did ask for new ideas and we got some. Fair enough. Okay, and Kathy Kleiman has her hand up. Kathy, please go ahead. You have the floor.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you, Robin. This may be a silly question, as I'm still fairly new to the processes. When there are new ideas, how -- and I know this isn't a (inaudible) question, but how are they going to be treated? And then how do they go back out to the community? Because new ideas by definition are ones that the whole community hasn't commented on. I don't want to take us completely off course, but just kind of wanted to see the umbrella of everything. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Yeah, so that's totally fair. I think it really depends on what the particular idea is. I mean all of these new ideas go back to the full working group for discussion in terms of how did it relate to the question that was asked before, and to what extent do we want to carry that forward into the next rendition of the report or not. So I think, again, it's going to be really -- it will depend on what that new idea is

and the extent to which it's a wildly new idea or something that just kind of gets us a little closer to where we're trying to get anyway, with respect to consensus. I think Jeff's got his hand up. Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. And I think as we go through some of these new ideas, there may be patterns that emerge and I'm not necessarily talking about these specific ones. Because I can't remember them off the top of my head. But there are -- again, our job is going to be to present an analysis of the comment to the full working group in terms of are these ideas that the initial report had suggested. Is there generally support? Is there general divergence? Is there support, but certain things around the edges or concerns with it? And then it's ultimately up for the full group. So all these new ideas will be presented in some fashion to the full working group. But that doesn't necessarily mean that all the new ideas are going to go off to the community. It's going to be up to the full working group to see what it wants to adopt, or not adopt, or get more information on. So really at this point, it's just our job to present these to the full community. And like I said, if some of these new ideas have patterns, like maybe there's three groups out of the four that suggest something very similar, then that obviously has more weight and that could be presented in a certain way to the full working group. So as Robin said, it is kind of a case-by-case basis. But ultimately it's up to the full group to decide whether it should go out for further comments.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. Did you say you thought we should go through these particular comments one by one and discuss the new ideas? I just want to make sure I understand what you said. Or you were talking about the full working group doing that?

Jeff Neuman: Well, I don't think we should -- sorry, this is Jeff. I don't think we should discuss the merits of whether we like them or not. But are there any patterns with the four -- I think there are four, right -- with these four comments? Is there anything that ties them together or are they just completely polar opposite? So while I'm not sure we necessarily need to drill down every comment and say, yeah, this sounds like a good idea or not, because that's not really our job. But without kind of looking at them a little bit closer -- or sorry. We have to look at it a little bit closer to see if there are any patterns. Do some of the groups have similar ideas or on they on the opposite end of the spectrum? We have to kind of give the full working group that kind of analysis. And they may be four completely new ideas on completely different subjects. I just -- I don't remember.

Robin Gross: Okay. No problem. So let's take a closer look at these four comments. Line 28 is from the brand registry group. And their new idea -- their suggestion is providing guidance for criteria to determine whether an issue can be handled through an existing mechanism. So any new issues arising could be considered on a case-by-case basis and where possible, use existing mechanisms to resolve. The resulting actions, lessons learned, should feed into a continuous improvement program for the new gTLD application.

Okay, and again, that was a suggestion coming in from the brand registry group. And then if we go below that to line 29, which is the ALAC comment on this question; the idea that they put forward is providing guidance on issues for resolution by the standing IRT. So there's a list of criteria post launch issues for

registration that the standing IRT would include. Yes, go ahead. I'm sorry. Did somebody say something?

Unidentified Participant: I think someone's line was open.

Robin Gross: Okay. Sorry about that. Okay. Sorry about that. Let me go back to where we were here on line 29 on the ALAC comment. So the criteria that they suggest would be whether an issue is a one-off occurrence, how urgent is the action or decision that needs to be resolved, or how badly does the gap in the law need to be addressed, or the number of parties that would be affected by a recommendation or a decision of the standing IRT. And there's also a suggestion for the working group to revisit the recommendation of the policy and implementation working group mentioned in the initial report on page 25. Okay, so those are the suggestions coming in from the ALAC on this question.

And then below that, line 30, from the business constituency, provide guidance for criteria to determine how an issue should be resolved. So again, this is about the framework must be representational of the community. A determination could be made on the level of impact to the existing policies and processes. Perhaps a ranking of the impact of the change needed could help determine the mechanism required. And they suggest a change to the process that does not violate policy may not need as much review as a change that would require policy.

And there's one final comment on this question from the registry stakeholder group, again, providing guidance for the criteria to determine how an issue should be resolve. And the registry stakeholder group suggests it should be made clear at the outset that not all implementation issues should be referred through existing mechanism at the GNSO disposal. Only those items that have a broad impact to the community should be subject to the GNSO processes. So to the extent that the impact is only on applicant, these issues should not necessarily go back to the entire GNSO community to resolve, unless the proposed resolution of the issue is in direct conflict with the applicant guidebook.

Okay, so we've got a number of suggestions here on this question. And some are very general, and some are very specific. Does anyone see anything developing here in terms of pattern or something that we should take back from these, issues to the working group? I see we've got two hands, Jeff and then Kathy. Please Jeff, go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: Can't hear you, Jeff.

Robin Gross: Jeff, I don't hear you, if you're speaking.

Unidentified Participant: Jeff, we still can't hear you. Okay, he's going to call in.

Robin Gross: Okay, I see he says in the chat box he's going to call in. So why don't we go to Kathy next in the queue, and then we'll come back to Jeff when he can get his audio back on. Okay. Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. There seems to be a number of inputs on kind of categorizing the type of change that would be going through the IRT. And there seems to be new ideas.

And I was wondering if it's worth creating a coupling of these, to put them together, new ideas for when an idea is so-- it's still close to policy that it should not go to the standing IRT, but should go to the larger GNSO, versus when it's kind of connecting dots between two technical details or existing policy. So I see an emergence, and I wondered if other people did, and whether that could be presented to the working group as a set of new ideas. Thanks, Robin.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Kathy. That's a really good suggestion to pull something like that together. And I expect we should be able to do something like that. Jeff, are you able to speak?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I think so. Can you guys hear me?

Unidentified Participant: Perfect, thank you.

Robin Gross: Yes, we do.

Jeff Neuman: Great, okay. Sorry about that. I'm not sure what happened. I heard some of what Kathy was saying, but I think my comment was a little bit different in the sense of things that I saw kind of jumping out were it seems like with the new ideas, if there are some patterns, it would be things like handling things on a case-by-case basis. So there may not be a way to have certain rules govern everything. Using existing mechanisms to the extent possible seems like a theme in a couple of those comments. And then looking at either urgency, impact, when deciding where those issues and how those issues should be resolved.

So I think if I were to read the comments, those were some elements of the new ideas that kind of jumped out and I don't think actually -- if I remember reading that section in my report -- I don't think those are actually new ideas, at least those aspects of it. I think those are agreeing with what we already have in the recommendations, unless I'm mistaken. So someone can jump in. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Yeah. Thanks, Jeff. I think you're right that it might be a little bit misleading when we characterize these as new ideas, because really it's just something that drove down a little bit deeper into the direction that we were heading already. And yes, it's kind of like a new idea to get us where we want to go. But it's it doesn't (ph) -- it's wildly divergent from what we've been doing before this particular comment came in. Kathy has her hand up. Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. This is Kathy Kleiman. But there does seem to be a pattern of, say, look at the registry stakeholder group in line 18. And I'm on the table at Google, with the spreadsheet, which is the only way to see those line numbers. And so registry stakeholder group is just one of several groups saying that there has to be guidelines for determining what goes to the standing IRT versus what goes to other GNSO procedures, what's an operational -- minor operational change versus presumably something much more important, something more policy-oriented.

So I'm not sure if it's similar or different, but it is certainly different than standing IRT outright with full responsibilities. So I do think there's the essence of a different type of idea here that could be encapsulated. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you very much, Kathy. Anne, you are next in the queue. Please go ahead, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you, Robin. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. I think that the new ideas, first of all, they do have to be read in connection with whether that's actual agreement on the standing IRT, because I think agreement on the standing IRT reflects -- if it exists -- reflects a framework that will help process all these other questions and new ideas. So I don't know if we're seeing agreement on the standing IRT or not. But it would be really important that we coalesce around that particular element. And then I did want to note these questions of people continuing to try to define if there's an implementation issue, whether it's policy or whether it's minor and implementation; there are some already existing procedures in GNSO, operating procedures to address that. And in fact, any councilmember of the GNSO, if they think there's a policy issue involved, they can invoke a process to raise it before GNSO.

So again, as we're considering new ideas, we need to consider those in light of the existing framework and the rules that were already adopted by the board. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Anne. And I note in the chat, Kathy has added there is disagreement on the standing IRT and what I was hoping is that some of the new ideas might provide a roadmap to compromise. Okay, did anyone else in the queue on this issue have any other thoughts?

Jeff has his hand up. Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. Just on that last point, because I think it does -- there's a couple things I want to just address. And the first one, I think Kathy brought up -- I think it was Kathy or maybe it was both Kathy and Anne -- that yes, this section obviously relies on the previous section. So to the extent that there is a standing IRT, then this question would be relevant. Obviously if the group has decided that there's not going to be a standing IRT, then this question would probably just get thrown out, because it's really only talking about that kind of thing. But at the end of the day, when you go back to the comments that were initially on the standing IRT and we talked about this the last time, and I want to make sure that -- not that I want to re-drudge over old ground. But essentially most of the comments seem to be in favor. There were some concerns expressed and I think there was one that was divergent. And again, I'm not weighing those at all, I'm just saying and just looking at them.

Unfortunately, and I heard what Kathy said about we're hoping that the ideas kind of address those concerns. Unfortunately, the group that was divergent did not file an answer to this question with any new ideas. So perhaps it's worth going back to the group that was clearly divergent on this issue, which I think was the NCSG if I'm not mistaken. I'm just going back a little ways. And perhaps then it's worth -- as we try to get something that might help, as Kathy said -- I'm not finding it now -- oh, roadmap to compromise, perhaps we can then get the NCSG -- so I think this was 2.2.1-- I don't even remember the number, sorry. But I think that was the one that was for the most part divergent. There were others that

expressed concerns. But I think that was the only one that was divergent. And I'm looking at section 2.2.2.c -- my eyes are killing me here -- .1.

So perhaps that's worth kind of jotting down as to go to the NCSG who was clearly divergent, and ask them if there is new ideas for compromise. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. I see there's a couple of hands in the Adobe Connect. Anne and then Kathy. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I apologize. Old hand, I'm lowering it. Sorry.

Robin Gross: No worries at all. Kathy, that means you are up. Go ahead, please.

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. And I apologize, because I must have missed a meeting somewhere here. But I think a stakeholder group being divergent is a big deal. I'm just saying that. Also there was another divergent opinion that was not the stakeholder group. It was from the Electronic Frontier Foundation; the Samuelson-Glushko Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic -- which is Michael Geist -- Public Knowledge and others. And they submitted also very strong objections, which are listed, so at least two very divergent opinions. I don't think it's the obligation of the stakeholder group when they're divergent to come up with a compromise. But what you're hearing and what we're seeing in these comments is a pattern of no, IRTs don't do policy. Because the registries are commenting about that as well. So it's not just NCSG's job. They're objecting right out. I'm the one who's kind of suggesting there might be a compromise, but also that these new ideas should be played with. But right now there's a strong divergence from the non-commercial community on this that this isn't fair.

And again, registries and others, we're not hearing -- there's a real concern about the IRT handling minor operational changes versus the IRT handling policy. And we heard this as well in Barcelona. So I really think it's important to make a note about this. There is not general agreement on this and there are very, very deep concerns. And there's a group of stakeholder groups and others presenting some ideas in the middle. And I think that's where I'm highlighting, is let's highlight what's in the middle. Because it may create a bridge.

But no, I wouldn't just go back to non-commercial stakeholder group. Because right now they're divergent. They're saying, no. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thank you. We've got a couple other hands in the queue here, Jeff and then Anne. Please, Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. I'll put aside the characterizations at this point. Because I think we're too early to kind of put characterizations of agreement and disagreement. But I do think we should go back to those groups that were divergent and to say, is there anything that would take them from divergent to okay, if certain conditions are made. Or alternatively, are there the groups that did say, okay. Are they fine with not okay? I think at the end of the day, there's going to have to be a recommendation to the full working group. And the full working group is going to need to discuss it and make a call one way or the other. And then when that call is made, then it will be up to Cheryl and I, as overall leads, to determine

whether there's consensus on what the full working group has come out with as their recommendation.

So I actually do think it's -- I differ a little bit from Kathy there, where I actually do think if we can, it would be good to go to the groups that were divergent to see if there's anything that would get them from divergent to support, or what it was specifically that was the issue. I think you can see from the comment from the NCSG initially, I think there was a fear. And I think I heard it from Kathy as well that it seems like there's a fear from those that are divergent that this IRT will be a substitute for policy development. And I don't think that was the intent and wasn't the wording of the standing IRT. And if there's ways to clarify that in the wording, again, this is all kind of for the full group. But if there's a way to clarify that, then maybe we can get to a full or a compromise or a road to a compromise.

But sorry, I've went on a little bit too long. But essentially I do believe it's appropriate to go back to groups that may not agree with the working group determination to see if there's anything that can be a compromise. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. Yeah, no. That's a good idea, actually, is to try to build in the kind of protections that would help make some of these concerns be alleviated. So I think that's a really helpful comment. We've got Anne and then we've got Michael. Anne, please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Robin. It's Anne. I agree with the idea of going back to these groups. But I do think we also have to clarify something, which is Kathy had said that the concern is that the IRT would make policy. But under the existing GNSO guidelines, an IRT and even a standing IRT, is not at all empowered to make policy. They might raise a red flag that they could send to the GNSO for consideration on an issue that looks like policy. They certainly have no authority under the current operating procedures for constituting an IRT, they have no authority to make policy. So if there's a fear underlying these comments that somehow that the IRT is going to make policy that that shouldn't happen based on the existing rules. And I think the great thing about a standing IRT personally -- and this is a personal comment -- is just that it clearly identifies what does and does not have to be brought before the GNSO and it's representative of the community. And I agree. The existing guidelines already say that the requisite technical expertise should be required in the constitution of the IRT. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much, Anne. That's really helpful. Next in the queue is Michael Casadevall. Michael, please.

Michael Casadevall: So the one point I want to bring out here is that there is a running trend against having multiple rounds, at least on predictable. Skipping ahead a bit, the response is copied over and over and over again. It's not just a divergence here, it's a problem with the idea and concept as a whole. And we'll see this again. This has also been discussed that basically allow the stakeholders diverge on the concept of having rounds entirely. And that was Michael Casadevall for the transcript.

Robin Gross: Thanks very much, Michael. Okay, I see next in the queue is Jeff. Jeff, please?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. And I think hopefully we can try to wrap this part up. Because I think we've kind of run into a little bit of a danger of talking too much of all the substance that's really kind of the purview of the full working group. But I think it's really important that when we're analyzing these comments that we have to consider what the initial report says. And I think -- and I agree with Anne. I think Anne's kind of interpreted everything the right way as -- to the right way, sorry. That's a judgment statement. Anne's comments were in line with what the initial report had said, which is that existing mechanisms to handle policy -- but obviously there are concerns. And that's something that we're going to have to bring to the full group. But we need to be careful about just making generalized statements of -- we need to be careful of making generalized statements, especially if the initial report actually said something different, with the exception of if we think there's language to make the initial report better for when it goes to a final report or if it goes to a final report, if that could be clarified.

So if people say, well look, you're saying the initial report said this. But it wasn't clear. So then that's our job then to make it clear. So that's the one exception. But let's try to stay a little bit off the actual substance of whether we support or don't support the notion of a standing IRT. Let's really drill into the comments, see if there's common ground, determine patterns, go back for clarification if there are any, and then also make sure that we can be in a position to recommend something to the full working group. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thanks, Jeff. I think Kathy's got her hand up, and then we'll close the queue on this particular issue, so we can move on to the next section after this. I do worry that we're drilling down a little too deeply into the substance of some of these comments. So Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah, just very briefly, Kathy Kleiman. I'm concerned that serious disagreement comments are being dismissed as not understanding the report. I don't think that's the case. So I think we have to present them as serious disagreements and objections to the standing IRT. And they present their reasons, so just saying, we can't dismiss this as a misinterpretation. I promise you, it's not. Thanks.

Robin Gross: All right. Thank you very much for that comment. I think we can move on to the next question here in the public comment, which would be line 32. And that's number 2.2.2.e.4. And the question is, do you have thoughts on the open questions or details related to the standing IRT panel discussed in section (inaudible)? Is there a different structure, process, or body possibly already existing that might help provide needed predictability in addressing issue raised post launch?

Okay, so we got two comments stacked on this particular question, one from the ALAC and one from the registry stakeholder group. And both of them had some concerns and bring in new ideas. So let's deal with these two comments in a little bit of detail as well. So the ALAC comment on line number 33, it suggests additional conversation and a separate process to address the details for the standing IRT. The ALAC believes more extensive deliberation is required on the open question details regarding the standing IRT panel and a separate process

outside of this working group's present public comment process is warranted to address the same.

Okay, and anybody want to get in on this particular comment from the ALAC? Any thoughts about how to take this one forward? And then we can move on to the one from the registry stakeholder group beneath it.

Okay, I don't see or hear anyone. I think it's an interesting idea that additional conversation and more details regarding this panel should be created. And I think actually that kind of dovetails into what we were just talking about just a few minutes ago about trying to build this process out a little bit more concretely in such a way that it ensures that the concerns that we have won't actually be able to come about in the final implementation of the IRT.

Yes, Jeff? I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. So on this one, and actually Kathy and I agree on this one. I think that I'd like to know obviously the first part of their comment is basically that open questions need to really be answered that we can't have open questions, I think. So that makes total sense. I don't think that needs clarification. I think the second part, with a separate process outside of this working group's comment is warranted to address the same. So I think we probably should have -- should go to the ALAC representative, or sorry, the liaison, not the representative, small "l" liaison. And I think we should see what's behind that comment.

What are they talking about as separate process, other than of course that the full working group is going to see if we can answer some of those, if not all of those, outstanding questions. But at the end of the day, after the policy is decided on, ultimately there will be, according to the GNSO policies and IRT implementation and review team, that's going to even try to provide more complete definitions to the extent that there still are open questions.

So I think we should go back to the ALAC and explain to them, well, this is what's going to happen. Is there still a need for something again, some other process? Like, what is meant by that? Thanks. And let's read Michael's--

Robin Gross: Thanks very much, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, sorry. I was going to just ask you, Robin, to read Michael's comment into the record. And then maybe I can respond to that.

Robin Gross: Okay, sure. Michael in the chat box says, it's concerning that when we see objections across the board and we just move right along, there was a lack of support at all for that, and that comment is again repeated in a bunch of other settings.

Okay, Jeff, did you want to respond to that comment?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Just a quick response, there was not objection across the board for the standing IRT. There were a number of groups against. This is in a section we covered on a previous call. So there were a number of groups that supported it

outright and there were a number of groups that supported it but had some concerns around -- I shouldn't say the edges, because that's a loaded word. There were people that supported the concept of the standing IRT, but had some concerns about too many unanswered questions or whatever there were concerns around.

There weren't concerns about the notion of having a standing IRT. There was concerns about different aspects of it. So let's -- I know what was said earlier on this call. But I don't -- we're not glossing over any objections. We will certainly present those to the full working group. But I just didn't want to it here on the record. It's not a full -- I don't think you can even say that -- well, never mind. There was certainly a number of groups that actually did support that notion, thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. Did anyone else want to weigh in on this particular issue, this particular question in the public comment?

All right. Well, I don't see any hands or hear anyone. So let's move on to the next question. And in the spreadsheet, the Google doc, that would be line 35. And that's question number 2.2.2.e.5. How do you see the proposed predictability framework interacting with the existing GNSO procedures, known as the GNSO input process, GNSO guidance process, and the GNSO expedited PDP?

Okay, so again, this is the last question that's been asked in the predictability topic, generally speaking. But we've got a number of responses on this one. And there's a few that are in agreement and a few with new ideas, and a few with concern. So I was thinking we would just quickly go through -- well, I say quickly -- try quickly to go through each one of these. Because they all do seem to have somewhat some different ideas, even the ones that have some agreement also have some divergence and new ideas and that sort of thing.

Okay. So let's look at the first comment received on this question. And that would be line 36 in the Google doc. And this is a comment from the ALAC. And there's sort of general agreement is how this has been characterized, or more precisely does not see conflict. There is a new idea, however. So the ALAC suggests that if the standing IRT is limited in scope and time, there should not be overlap. So I should also mention that the ALAC welcomes the public comment process, although further consideration is warranted on whether all operational changes should be subject to public comment, and knowing that all fundamental possible policy impact changes to the program must always go through a GNSO procedure.

Okay, again, we don't want to sort of debate the merits of the different comments. But in terms of the characterization of this and do we see general agreement on one hand and also a new idea, a new suggestion for how to take it forward as well? Anybody want to weigh in on this comment? Yes, Jeff. Please, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. My question is on I'm rereading the blue text again that was classified as a new idea. And I'm not sure why that's a new idea. And so I'm trying to -- part of this was my own fault. Because I might have classified it as a new idea the first time I went through it. But now as I'm rereading it and through

all the discussions, I'm not sure that this is new. I think this is just a comment on the -- well, I don't know. Maybe if others think that this is new, I think is -- can either be a concern or, sorry as I'm reading it through, I guess the new idea is whether the whole notion of whether all operational changes should be subject to public comments. But then I'm trying to fit that into what was in the initial report. And I'm not sure that the initial report said otherwise. But maybe someone can correct me on that.

So I think I'm not at all dismissing this comment. I'm not. But I don't know if this is actually a new idea.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thanks, Jeff. Steve, did you have a -- I thought I saw you typing there. I thought maybe you had an answer to this question. Yes, please?

Steve Chan: Hi, Robin. Thanks. This is Steve Chan from staff and I will do my best to try to recollect what in the report. So part of the framework it tries to draw distinctions in how things should be treated, based on whether or not it's operational or more fundamentally policy-related. But part of that was also trying to draw distinction when the changes might need a public comment. So I think in highlighting the blue part is, as Jeff said, the new idea would be that any changes that come out of the standing IRT would warrant -- possibly warrant public comment. So I think that was why it was highlighted. So rather than trying to draw distinction, everything would then require public comment. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks very much for that clarification, Steve. And I note that Anne typed in the chat a comment. She says, I think we may need to ask the ALAC liaison to clarify the comment. Okay. I think that's probably a very good suggestion. Anybody else want to weigh in on this? Kathy? Yes, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. This is Kathy Kleiman. It does seems like a new idea to me. It's one of those kind of ongoing ideas that would modify the standing IRT. And because of the way the numbers are done, you have to repeat suggestions multiple times. Or you have that possibility. And so even if it's mentioned somewhere else, they're mentioning it here. So I think that's important. I also wanted to note that both the NCSG and public interest community comments do address this question on line 35 directly. So I think that they should be added down here as well, not taken out of where they are, but added here.

We had this issue that those groups that don't necessarily have professional comment writers and things like that, looked at a larger umbrella topics. But to the extent -- but I think we agree that to extent that their comments are relevant to specific questions, they should go in. And so again, I think NCSG -- significant sections of NCSG and the public interest comments belong here as well, because they address this question directly. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Kathy. I think we should be able to get them added into this section before our call next week. Anybody else want to weigh in on this question, or excuse me, specifically the ALAC comment on this question, which is on line 36? Okay. I don't see any new hands. Then let's go on to the next comment, which is from the business constituency. And again, it's agreement or more precisely does not see conflict. The BC suggests that the GNSO is responsible for enacting

recommendations coming out of the predictability framework. The GNSO would govern whatever mechanism is used in the predictability framework. Since the GNSO council is currently reviewing PDP processes and we now have a working EPDP process, we should keep these in mind for the predictability framework.

Okay, again, this is general agreement. Anybody want to weigh in on this? Kathy, I see your hand is up. Is that a new hand?

Kathy Kleiman: Sorry, old hand, Robin. I'll take it down.

Robin Gross: No worries. Okay, thank you. Okay, no comments on the BC comment. So we can move down to the one under that, which would be line 38 in the registry stakeholder group. Again, it's agreement, but there are concerns about representation in the GIP and the GGP, and does not believe an EPDP is appropriate. So again, this is sort of in conflict with what we just heard. But we're not here to debate the merits of the different proposals, just to sort of try to categorize them.

The registry stakeholder group says the GNSO input process and GNSO guidance process could interact with the predictability framework, but may not be appropriate in all cases or accessible in all cases. We need additional input on EPDP. So the registry stakeholder group does not see an EPDP as an appropriate solution to sort out the issues identified during an application process. While issues that arise during subsequent rounds may be eligible to initiate an EPDP, the registry stakeholder group believe the EPDP process is not as scalable as alternative processes that might be available to applicants concerning the time and effort needed to conduct and complete an EPDP in a timely manner.

Okay, I see Anne has her hand up on this comment. Please, Anne, go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh, thank you, Robin. I think that it seems they're saying, well, an EPDP can be too cumbersome and maybe the comment results in part from the fact that we're in the middle of one and it's not very fast. But I also note that there are two other processes that are shorter, but in terms of the substance of it, the determination of which process to be used is based on how significant the policy issue is.

Now I was going to note that in the ALAC comment, they state -- and I think this is listed as a new idea. But it's really not. And this is cell 29. The WG is also urged to revisit the recommendations of the policy and implementation working group mentioned in the initial report on page 25. Well, I don't think that that's a new idea in the sense of -- I mean I guess what they're saying is hey, we recommend the full working group look at what the recommendations are on page 25 of the policy and implementation working group. And I think that that's a good idea for the full working group to do. And I think that by the word revisit, what they mean is look at what this working group did. I don't think they mean revisit in the terms of like reconsider or change.

So it would be good to get a clarification from them as to what they do mean by this. But it would also be good for the full working group to actually look at what

the ALAC suggested that we look at in the -- from the policy and implementation working group work.

Now there was a final report. It was adopted by the board. And there may be some frustration with how long it takes to do an EPDP. But when you're making policy, if the issue really involves policy, it's hard to do it in a short manner as we see from this very process.

Robin Gross: Thanks very much for that, Anne. I see we've got a couple other hands up, Jeff and then Michael. Please go ahead, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. On the registry comment, I don't have any -- I'm not going to talk substance here, but I think the shorthand that we have in the fourth column where it says, agreement and then it says, concerns about representation; I think we -- when I read concerns about reputation, I tend to think of concerns about -- it's not really concerns about representation. It's really concerns about having applicants be represented, I think is the real concern. Because I don't read from the registries' comment and I wasn't one who helped put that together. But I don't read that they're concerned with how a GIP and GGP are -- how the representation there is determined. I read it as they want to make sure that applicants who aren't normally considered as part of the GGP/GIP sub (ph) that they want to make sure applicants are represented. So I'd like us to reword that concern appropriately. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. And maybe this is another instance where it's appropriate for us to go back to the comment drafters and ask them if we've mischaracterized this. Because we certainly don't want to do that. Okay, I see Michael has his hand up. Michael, please go ahead.

Michael Casadevall: Jeff covered most of what I was going to say. But I read this comment and I don't see agreement. I see divergence. Because it says it could work, but they don't think applicants are represented properly in the GNSO. I mean this doesn't read as agreement to me. This reads as concern/divergence. I think the correct action here is to go back to the registry stakeholder group and have them clarify this comment. Because I read it three times and I cannot see an agreement here, unless I really squint. So that's my two cents on it.

Robin Gross: Great. Thanks very much. So we do see a number of concerns along the same line here. So I think we've got a pretty clear direction on how to handle this one going forward. Anybody else want to get in the queue on this one? Shall we move on to the IPC comment, which is next?

Okay, I don't see any hands, so let's go on to the next comment, which is from the intellectual property constituency and it's line 39 in the Google doc. And it's characterized as concern. So the IPC says the standing panel should determine what is in its mandate. And GNSO leadership should be able to challenge the determination. The standing panel's first job will be determine whether this is something that's within its mandate, or whether it should go to the GNSO under one of its processes. The GNSO leadership should be able to challenge that determination as a check and balance to make sure that the panel is not

exceeding its scope or mandate, or doing things that are rightfully within the GNSO's jurisdiction.

Okay, so anyone have any thoughts on this comment, how it's been characterized as concerns? And again, I see there's a little suggestion here for how those concerns could be alleviated. Jeff has his hand up. Yes, Jeff? Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. I want to make sure we characterize this one right, so it's not on the comment itself. But it seems like the particular concern here, again, it's not the standing panel. It's basically on who has the right to determine whether something is within its mandate or the GNSO's mandate or not. And the report says that the standing panel is the one that's going to make a call as to whether this is something that should go before the full -- before the GNSO or whether it's something that is really for ICANN -- an issue that ICANN itself needs to handle or whatnot. Because remember, this is all coming up during applications.

So I think we need to be careful. It's a concern, but it's a concern about -- specifically about who has the right to determine whether something falls within the standing panel's scope. So I just want to make it a little bit more explicit. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. And it looks like the phone lines have really heated up here, as they say. We've got a queue forming of Michael, and Kathy, and then Anne, and then Jim. Michael, please go ahead.

Michael Casadevall: So, again this is another comment where I -- this is actually the inverse of the previous one. I see this as agreement or does not conflict. Because the only thing that they're challenging here is specifically what the standing panel has as its mandate. It's not talking of density idea. It's just looking for clarification. So I think this one should have a green flag on it and not just concern, unless I'm misunderstanding what the green flag is for. But I'm not actually seeing something here that is a disagreement.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thanks for that, Michael. Next in the queue we have Anne. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks Robin. It's Anne for the transcript. I would tend to agree with Michael. I think that this does reflect agreement and I also want to note that these issues of who can raise a question and who determines the question, they are very specifically addressed in the procedures that were adopted by the policy and implementation working group. And it's clear that an IRT, standing or otherwise, can't make policy determinations. If it thinks that there's not a policy issue involved and makes an implementation recommendation, it's also very clear in the procedures that any member of the GNSO council can raise an issue about that and bring it before council as to whether or not it's policy. So -- and it's true what Kathy said. I commented one person's policy is another person's implementation and vice versa, depending upon how you feel about the issue. But through the work of the policy and implementation working group, there were mechanisms put in place to address this in that the IRT can make recommendations. It can tell GNSO, hey, we think there might be a policy issue

here or policy guidance, or could you give us some input. But it's also possible for any councilmember to bring that issue before the full council.

And historically the reason for that was because there was a big issue that GNSO council was upset that ICANN staff didn't bring back before GNSO council because council thought it was a policy issue, that it violated existing policy. And others said, oh no, it's implementation. And that was the whole reason for those guidelines being developed through a lengthy policymaking process. So I agree that there is -- this actually should say agreement and I'm not sure people are really familiar with what the operating guidelines on these things really say, and there are checks and balances in place. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Anne. Next in the queue is Kathy and then Jim. Kathy, go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Let me defer to Jim, thanks. And then follow up. Thanks.

Jim Prendergast: Okay. This is like backsies, frontsies, cutting in grammar school lines. So Jim Prendergast. Somewhat tied into what Jeff said, I'm just going to plant the flag for folks that in the group C, (inaudible) that we met earlier. There was a similar question as to what within or not within the purview of the SubPro working group when it comes to GAC objections. And that's something I think we kicked to the plenary level. So another area where what is within the purview of this policymaking process is something that we're going to have to tackle at some point down the road. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Jim. Kathy, you have floor.

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah, I have the floor now, thanks. This is Kathy. So to all those who want to reassure us that IRTs stay within their mission that is not historically the case. And we're seeing some terrible divergences by the IRT, and a lot of pressure on the IRT. So proxy privacy, let's just pick on them because they're stayed (ph). But a lot of -- there's been a lot of pressure on them to revisit policy. And in the review of all rights protection mechanisms, there are -- it's still out there. But there's real concern that the IRT went against existing policy.

Now there may be ways to appeal it. I'm not sure people know about them. But I think the concerns are deeply, deeply rooted about IRTs in the community. So I don't want to second guess what Anne -- because I think you're probably a drafter of this comment. So your decision -- your characterization would hold. But this idea of raising the flag, I think there's a pattern now of raising the flag of what's policy and what's implementation. And god help us if the IRT is the one that determines that. That's not fair, and I think you're seeing a lot -- without going too much into the substance -- I think you're seeing a lot of people raise procedural concerns and those procedural concerns are well-established in light of history. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Kathy. Did anybody else want to weigh in on this comment, this IPC comment, in particular? I don't see any new hands. Okay, so then let's go on to the next one, which would be item number 41. And this one is from the Geo TLD group who raises concern or more precisely a suggestion to improve predictability and why it's critical.

Okay, so the Geo TLD group says, improved predictability and longer lead times are needed, especially for Geo TLDs. For future rounds, therefore we have to improve and provide Geo TLD applicants and their respective governments in a more trustworthy and reliable framework with enough lead time to clarify and cater for government processes. So it looks like the concern that's being raised here has to do with the timing, the lead timing in particular. Anybody want to comment on the characterization of this one?

Okay. I see we've got a couple hands, oops, one hand. Michael, and then Jeff. Go ahead, Michael.

Michael Casadevall: Old hand, sorry.

Robin Gross: No worries. Jeff, you are up.

Jeff Neuman: I think mine is an older hand. So I think on this one, so we're almost switching gears here. Because this is a concern about how the last process was not predictable enough, as opposed to concerns about the predictability model. So I think we need to make sure that we separate this a little bit more, because we've changed gears. So we need to make sure that, again, this should be labeled as concerns with the predictability of the last round, which I think is actually agreement with what the initial report says. I think everybody in the initial report -- I'm sorry -- I think the initial report and everybody agrees with that there were issues about predictability in the last round. So I actually the view first paragraph as -- or actually the first two paragraphs -- I'm just trying to read the third one. Yeah, in fact, I think all of that should be green, as agreement. Because it agrees with the initial report that talks about how the last round was very problematic and not predictable enough. So I would put that as green as opposed to a concern.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thanks for that, Jeff. And I note in the chat, Martin Sutton says, he agrees with Jeff. Okay. I think that's right. Okay, so should we -- did anybody else want to weigh in on this comment? I actually think it's worth noting the next several comments are all very similar to the one we just discussed. So we probably should have discussed them as a group, because they pretty much all say more or less the same thing. We've got -- in addition to the Geo TLD group, there's the dot-berlin comment. Under that is the Hamburg top-level domain comment. And all of these are calling for an improved predictability and longer lead times, especially for Geo TLDs. So I don't think we really need to discuss each one of these individually. Because they're all kind of making the same point. I see -- Jeff, is that a new hand?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, just to again, re-raise the comment that all of these should be green as agreement, and then I think we need to, I believe, so maybe this is a question for the small l-l-l as we're calling them, the liaison. Because we did get one from the Geo TLDs. I believe that Hamburg and dot-berlin are on the executive committee of the Geo TLD. So it's really -- although it's in three separate comments, it's really, I believe, the same -- it's really from the same party. So let's put them all as green and just group the three together, because they say the same thing. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thanks for that, Jeff. Anybody else want to weigh in on this issue in grouping all these together as green? I note Steve types in the chat, the comments are literally identical, I believe. Yep. Okay, Donna has her hand up. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Robin. Donna Austin. So while I don't disagree that these comments are pretty much identical and probably written by the same person, I'd be careful to suggest that we lump them together, just because of that. I mean the Geo TLD group is a separate group from Hamburg and whoever the other one is. But they are different entities. So I think let's acknowledge that they're the same comments, but I would caution against lumping them together just because they have the same -- the same person was holding the pen.

I'd hate to think that comments in the registry stakeholder group and comments from Neustar were lumped together just because I was holding the pen on both sets of comments. So I think we need to be a little bit -- I'd like caution against that. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Donna. I think that's right, although I think in this case they were grouped together because they were making the same point. They were all saying the same thing, which was that we need to improve predictability and longer lead times are needed, especially for Geo TLD. So I think that's an important distinction. But I think we're okay with the grouping in this context.

Did anybody else want to weigh in on this point? Yes, Jeff. Please, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I just -- I wanted to just make the point, just a quick response to Donna. These were identical wording and I'm not saying that just because someone's a member of one group or another that they should all automatically be grouped together. But then again, when we do weigh the comments, if there are comments that are completely identical from the same people who run, yes they're from different organizations, but they're identical. We just need to be careful. Ultimately at the end of the day, there's going to have to be some sort of weighing by Cheryl and I, when we make a determination for a consensus. And it's important to note that if there are identical comments and the same person was -- same entities were involved, that may or may not give additional weight.

So everything is going to have to be taken on a case-by-case basis when these comments come in. But these were identical. And in this case, they deserve to be grouped together the way we're talking about it, and also change to agreement as opposed to concern. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. Would anyone else like to weigh in on this group of comments, or shall we move on to the next one? Okay, I don't see any new hands, hear any new voices. So let's go on to line item number 44. This is the comment from Christopher Wilkinson. And he has concerns about the focus of the framework and about the policy development process.

So Christopher said, where the predictability is equally important from the perspective of the ultimate final users or third parties, and that would be impacted

by the new TLDs, he says, one could equally well argue that those problems arose from a lack of multi-stakeholder consultation during the previous policy development process. For example, the requirement for enforceable public interest commitments or their equivalent was manifestly inevitable and desirable long before the matter reached the application stages.

Okay, so I guess this issue here is we've characterized this one as concerns about focus and framework of the policy development process. Anyone have any thoughts on this particular characterization? Jeff, I see your hand is up. Is that a new hand?

That's an old hand. Okay. Anybody want to weigh in on this characterization of this comment? Okay, I don't see any hands or hear any voices. So the next comment is also from Christopher Wilkinson, and this would be line 45. And it looks like it's the final comment in our group here. And so this comment again is concerned with the predictability of the standard implementation review team.

The comment says, in what sense has the ICANN board a duty to respect the IRT? Also in the light of the complexities of the proposed IRT, who is responsible for its creation; with what budgetary resources or authority? What is not in the draft report?

Okay. So it leaves us with a bunch of questions here, rather than comments, per se. Okay, so they're characterized as concern. Does anyone want to weigh in on this comment or this characterization? Or we're wrapping up the predictability topic generally here, and so does anyone have anything further to say on this one, on the overall topic of the predictability, 2.2.2?

Okay. I don't see any hands or hear any voices. So we can move on to the next issue, which is clarity of the application process, which is number 2.2.2.2. And I believe Jeff is going to pick this particular topic up and run with it. Am I right?

Jeff Neuman: Correct. Yes. I could have played a joke and just -- thanks, Robin. I could have played a joke and just for a minute left you hanging, and said, no, I thought you were doing it. So I know, I recognize we only have about a little over 10 minutes left. But I think we can cover this first question, because it seems like there was general agreement, at least on this first part of -- I love going through these numbers, 2.2.2.2.c.1.

And so this one basically, it seems like a pretty obviously recommendation, which explains why it got a lot of agreement. But it basically says that when substantive disruptive changes to the applicant guidebook or application process are necessary and made through the predictability framework discussed above, there should be a mechanism that allows impacted applicants the opportunity either A, request an appropriate refund, or B, be tracked into a parallel process that deals with discrete issues directly, without impacting the rest of the program.

So we had comments here from the Geo TLD group, dot-berlin and Hamburg, which I believe again were -- and Steve, correct me if I'm wrong. But I think those were the exact same text from all three of those comments. Then we had a comment from the ALAC, the brand registry group, Neustar, the registry

stakeholder group, the business constituency, INTA or the International Trademark Association, and with Valideus, and I should say as always when we go over comments, I do work for Valideus, as many of you know. But I had no role in drafting the comments for Valideus. So I'm reading these for the first time, like you all. Or I should say I have read them, because I've read all these comments. But I read it for the first time after it was submitted.

So the first three comments essentially are, like I said, agreement that they talk about the lack of clarity in the 2012 rounds and point out some specific examples of where there was lack of clarity, and ultimate they state in the paragraph that's green, for that reason we fully support this comment. And regarding a mechanism that would allow impacted applicants to either request a refund or be tracked into a parallel process that deals with these issues, without impacting the rest of the program. And then it says, we strongly recommend that both the applicant guidebook and the registry agreement are provided in their version at the beginning of the program, which actually does deal with a different group that's looking at the registry agreement, although we deal with the applicant guidebook. So this will come up again.

So those three comments are all fully, we believe, in agreement with what the initial report had said. Brand, and I'm looking if anyone's got any comments -- because I do want to get through this. I'm looking at the chat and I'm looking at the hands raised. The ALAC also seems to talk about there should be greater transparency, vis-à-vis impacted applicants and notifying them of material changes, inform them clearly of the consequences and their options, rights, resulting from those changes. We classified that as agreements as well.

The brand registry group says that they support the recommendation and there should be a predictable way to handle any unforeseen changes. And then it's appropriate to have this option -- the option to proceed or request a refund, if the consequences of the changes impact the applicant. Neustar -- I think this is Neustar -- hold on. Yeah, Neustar supports the recommendation as well, and they state that the applicant -- same thing that they should be able to request a refund in the event the program changes and the application window has closed, and the program change has a direct impact on their application. And then they point to impact from the GAC advice, and then talk about that there should be a process for this.

Registry stakeholder group supports the recommendation as well and wants to give the applicant the freedom of choosing which option. And then going to the next comment, which is the business constituency, this is one that does have a cautionary note, where it supports the recommendation that if there are changes, they support the preliminary recommendation. But they do say, if it is a substantive change that would change an applicant's business model, a transparent process should be in place to allow the request to be submitted.

I'm going to go back and question myself as to why we put this as a concern. This does sound to me like agreement. Maybe I can get Steve to help refresh my recollection. It does seem with agreement, right? It says if it is a substantive change that affects an applicant's business model, a transparent process should be in place allow the request to be submitted. So do we put it as concern

because it's got to be a transparent process that maybe something differentiates it? Or maybe Jim or Anne know. So please, Jim?

Jim Prendergast: Yeah. Thanks, Jeff. It's Jim Prendergast. I don't know. But reading the question that they are answering, it doesn't say anything about transparency. So maybe it's a conditional agreement. But maybe that's why it's not a green agreement. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Jim. I think that might be it. I think you're right. The transparent note there is probably why we had put it as a concern. So I think that's right. But Anne, please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, thanks Jeff. I think -- it's Anne for the transcript. I think you guys hit on the word that results in it being concern, because unless I misunderstand the question, but transparent I think means the opportunity for public input. That doesn't necessarily mean public comment. But it could mean just that the proposal itself is somehow public and the change in the business model that there's a chance for the public to weigh in somehow, or the stakeholders at least. So I think transparent process is the concern.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let's -- yeah. Okay, we do have that in the next column. So let's -- so it is as we classified. It's general agreement, but there is a concern or a recommendation actually that they have that it should be a transparent process. And then finally -- or not finally, sorry. There may be a couple others. There's a comment from the International Trademark Association. So I think there's a couple additional comments. Without reading the whole thing, INTA supports the recommendations that their applicant is given the opportunity to request a refund. But they do -- now here there are some more concerns, and then some more maybe some of it's actually a new idea. So they're saying that a refund should be of the majority of the application fee. So that's actually a new idea. Where the withdrawal is due to changes imposed after submission, the applicant should not be more financially disadvantaged than possible.

With regard to the alternative of being tracked into a parallel process INTA believes that this also could be a beneficial subject to the following. One, this must be at the option of the applicant and they should not be obliged to proceed down a parallel track if their preference is to receive their refund. So I think that's new as well.

I don't think that's a concern. I think that's a new idea. Let me just double-check. It's agreement because I think we do -- well, the part that's agreement, number one says that it should be at the option of the applicant, which I think agrees with what the initial report said. But the second part is that they shouldn't be obliged to proceed down a particular path at the discretion of ICANN. They should have a choice. They talk about a parallel path should have a clear path and timelines for resolution. There are good reasons why a parallel track should not impact the rest of it.

And then of course, they do say all applications submitted in a prior round must have priority over applications in any subsequent round, which I think is agreement, not necessarily with this section. But that last part is agreement with

another section of the initial report where we do make a statement like that. So we should probably make sure that that last part is labeled as agreement. But it's agreement with a different section. So we'll have to make sure we link that to the section it agrees with.

I'm looking to see if there's any questions on that. Okay, not seeing any questions, the next one which is Valideus, is the last one. And then we'll go to any other business. It supports the notion of a request for a refund and it agrees with the concept of a parallel track to handle things that may only apply to certain applications, without impacting the rest of the program. But such process would need to be scoped and implemented in advance on the subsequent round commencing. So this is a comment on predictability. And I don't think it's in disagreement. Well, it's a concern. It just wants to make sure like this whole section, which is really dealing with predictability and clarity that it is laid out in advance.

Okay. I think we're coming up against time. Anyone have any comments? And then we'll start the next time on 2.2.2.2.e.1. Any last comments? And then I'll also save time and ask if there is any other business?

Okay, not seeing any other business, thank you, everyone. I know 90 minutes is a long call. I really appreciate you hanging in, and enjoy the rest of your evenings, mornings, or late nights. Thank you very much.

Robin Gross: Thanks, everybody. Bye for now.

Unidentified Participant: And thanks, everyone, for joining today. This meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines, and have a good rest of your day.