# ICANN
# Transcription
# New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP-Sub Group C
# Thursday, 20 December 2018 at 15:00 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-c-20dec18-en.mp3 [audio.icann.org]
Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p6x6z0lz12k/**
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/kgbuBQ
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Operator: Recording has started.

Coordinator: Super. Thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub-Group C call, held on Thursday, the 20th of December, 2018.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? And I already have Kristine Dorrain noted. Anyone else?

Okay.

I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking, for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking, to avoid any background noise.

And with this, I'll turn it back over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl, you can begin.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Julie. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the transcript record, and we'll be running today through a continuation, looking at the Objections section of the tabs we have that are the compilation – thanks to staff – of the public comments with these and that have been allocated to our group, which is Sub-Group C.

Just to begin today's call, I wanted to first of all thank everybody who has joined us and note that we have a small but representative group of people here today. And we will be continuing in 2019 as a result of today's – or yesterday's, whenever it was in my world – leadership team meeting. We will be continuing

even if we end up with fewer than five non-leaders on the call. So, we can continue through our triage of fitting and sorting of the public comment.

To begin with, I would like to – first of all, if there is anybody who has just joined and is only on the audio bridge since Julie began our call, if you could just let us know and if you would just say your name, and we will put you in the queue when we go through our work today.

I would also like to offer Michael's apologies for today's call but also formally offer Michael and his family congratulations on the expansion of a plus-1. There is a small girl in his life now. And so, he is otherwise occupied with the newest addition to the family.

I would finally like to ask if there is anyone who has any statements of interests that they wish to mention, any substantive changes in their statements of interests that may have anything to do with our call (inaudible).

Not hearing one or seeing any hands, the link to the spreadsheet for Group C has gone out on the agenda, and thank you to Julie who's also shared with you in today's – sorry. Emily has just shared with you on the chat for today. If you are only on audio, you will I'm sure have committed all of this to memory (inaudible) – sorry, I'm intrigued with my sense of humor – or we'll have a decent copy somewhere for your reference. And I think I would also encourage anyone who can use a second screen to do so as we start our next section.

At our last call last week – and I should note this is the possibly last call for our 2018 experience – we actually managed to get to a new section, which is line 195 – that's 1-9-5 – on the Objections tab. We are hoping to finish off the Objections tab – that's in Section (inaudible) – and possibly get into Accountability Mechanisms, 2.8.2, in today's work. Anything that is residual after that will be on our agenda for the first meeting in 2019.

And I can see typing. Okay. Steve is pointing out that for those of you who are lost looking at the master spreadsheet, this in, in fact, line 30 in the displayed version. And if I can ask staff, because I will not be reading the ultra-small text on the displayed version for me, correction: it is line 195 in the Google Doc, Page 30 out of the 35 pages displayed, is where you should be if you're scrolling yourself in the work plane.

Now, I was rather hopeful that I could (inaudible) over. We've had huge storm damage here, and I have power. And of course, with power, the satellite connection for the internet is awful, but I have no phone line. But it did mean that the computer when I turned it on for today's call thought it was a good idea to reload the spreadsheet and hasn't actually managed to finish reloading. So, right now I, in fact, can't see the text that is in my spreadsheet. So, I'm going to read it from the ultra-small text on the screen.

Okay. So, this is – we're beginning at 2.8.1.e.16, which is string confusion objections. And here, the matter at question is a simple – well, it should be a simple (inaudible), but we also asked for approaches. So, there's been interpretative work here, as well.

I'll briefly read the question. "The Registry Stakeholder Group put forward a proposal to allow single string confusion objection to be filed against all applicants." I'm just going to do it in short order, not every word and dotted i's and crossed t's. Under the proposal, it proposed an objector being able to file single objections that would extend to other applications for identical strings. It allows the encompassing of several applications, and that a panel would review all documents associated with such an objection and that panel would issue a single determination across that bit of identicals.

We asked the question, "Do you support this proposal? Why? Or Why not? And would this approach be an effective way to reduce the risk of inconsistent outcomes?" Noting that in the last round, people and entities within ICANN did contend that there was inconsistency between the panels. So, this is an identified issue that we were encouraged to look at (inaudible) to solve.

We have a group of agreements: the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, INTA, NewStar, the Registry Group (inaudible), Google, and IPC. And there was a little embellishment from mostly ALAC and Google in reasonable amounts of detail for (inaudible) how they felt that the better outcome could be drawn.

So, with that, I'm going to open a queue, hopefully a short on, on 2.8.1.e.16. Anyone wishes to make a comment on the sea of green?

No? Okay. Well, the good news for me is that the Google Doc has still not finished loading. So, I'm going to internet trickle (inaudible). So, I shall now go back to the multi – the tiny, tiny, tiny (inaudible). But unfortunately, that means I won't be able to see a hand if it goes up for a clarifying question while we're going through the listing. And so, if you can just make yourself known to me if you have something urgent.

With that, we'll now then move on to 2.8.1.e.17, still in Objections. And here, it's talking about some Work Track members had proposed that there should be (inaudible) string confusion objection if an applied-for string is an exact translation of existing string in a highly regulated sector and the applied-for string would not employ the same (inaudible) as the existing string. The question posed was, do you support his proposal? And please explain.

And we have – and in this case we also have additional materials, important material and comment and ideas brought forward. We have support from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, unsurprisingly. That is – and a reason from a consumer perspective for their agreement, with an agreement from the ALAC. (inaudible) United States Postal Services. We also have agreement from the IPC, but some concerns – in other words, there is some caveat for their (inaudible) Intellectual Property Community (inaudible) understanding details and motivation to have specificity in such a proposal.

We have a concern or some divergence, Brand Registry Group and the Registry Stakeholder Group. The Registrar Stakeholder Group also does not support, and INTA doesn't seem to give us a clear proposal, a response according to the current listing we have on the screen, that I believe – and what I'm going to do, Jeff, is ask you to clarify why we have the terminology "foreign equivalents" here, because you and I have spoken about this today. But in fact, that should be green here: INTA does, in fact, support the proposal.

With that, (inaudible) shrink back down from full screen and open the queue. But I'll ask Jeff to very briefly just to clarify (inaudible) "foreign equivalents" terminology used by INTA. Jeff?

Jeff Neumann: Thanks, Cheryl. And I know that there may be people on here from the IPC. So, they can jump in. But generally, the doctrine of foreign equivalency – at least I'm familiar with it in U.S. law – supports the notion that where a term is applied for as a trademark and that trademark is a foreign translation of an existing trademark, then trademark law would view those two the same and do their normal confusingly similar analysis under trademark law to see whether that foreign equivalent should be allowed or not.

So, it seems to me reading this that INTA is supporting the notion of having an objection process based on the fact that terms are foreign equivalents of each other and can therefore be confusing. They don't necessarily address the notion of having similar safeguards, but it at least in part supports the notion of having some sort of a – at least the way I viewed it – having some sort of objection process.

But it's certainly worth a clarifying question to the IPC to just make sure that that, my interpretation, is correct. But I went back and reviewed the INTA comments, and it seems like it was – it seemed like they were supporting this proposal more so than not addressing the subject.

Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much, Jeff. Gg, over to you?

Gg Levine: Thanks. This is Gg Levine. I wanted to agree with Jeff. I think that looking at the comment from INTA, they say pretty clearly that they support the proposal. And I think the fact that they used the term "foreign equivalents" doesn't take away from the fact that they're supporting the proposal as it relates to exact translation. So, in my observation, this is clearly in support of the proposal.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Gg. Jeff, back to you.

Jeff Neumann: Thanks. I put my hand up in the queue to just – I have a question on the IPC comment. That might be why I was using INTA and IPC interchangeably, because I was thinking about my next comment.

So, I have a question for the IPC. So, where it's labeled "Concerns," it says "at the same time, the criteria for exact translation should be clearly detailed and have limitations." I'd like to go back to the IPC and ask them what they mean by "limitations."

And then, the next sentence I read a couple of times and I don't know if it's just me that's confused, but it says, "the grounds for objection in terms of this proposal should also be limited to applications that attempt to have similar safeguards." Does that mean that if an application sets forth safeguards there should still be an objection process by the owner of the existing string to argue that the safeguards are not similar? I'm just – I'm trying to understand that. So, maybe that's another question for the IPC.

Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We might have an answer to that question, Jeff. Just for the hell of it.

With the question from Justine in the chat, the question relating to INTA's comment on 7.4.3.11, I'm going to confess I have not committed each and every one of these to memory. So, I'm not in a position to give you details on that. But either – while I'm not willing to also try and stretch my internet connection any further, let's take that and put it on notice, Justine, and we will perhaps either have staff copy that cell or Jeff copy that from one of the other parts of their Google – thank you, Jeff – Google Doc, although it sounds to me like Jeff is going to do that orally.

Go ahead, please, Jeff.

Jeff Neumann: I was just going to copy it, because you said copy it. Let me do both. I'll copy what I see in their comment, although it's probably going to come out horribly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There we go.

Jeff Neumann: Yes? Okay. So, that was, I think, the whole comment from that section.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. And hopefully that helps Justine either frame her clarifying question alittle more, but we're also going to be asking INTA for some feedback on this.

So, going back to our listing then, we note reasonable support for the proposal, but in fact have three divergent groups: from the Brand Registry, Registry, and Registrar. And that's all we can do, really, with that, is give note that we have some support but not unanimity on it. With that, the full working group will have to decide what it wishes it to do, or otherwise, on a recommendation. And I'm sure they will.

Now, let's move to, in the Google Doc, line 202. I feel a little bit like I'm calling out the numbers at Bingo doing this. I normally just type those as we go through, but I do feel a bit like the Bingo caller. But never mind.

We are now on 2.8.1.e.18, legal rights protections. The question here is, should the standard for the legal rights objection remain the same as in the 2012 round? And please explain.

We have agreement from Brand Registry, U.S. Postal Services, and the Registry Stakeholder Group. We have a new – she says (inaudible) – a couple of new suggestions and a little divergence from INTA on this and ALAC suggestion for amendments to the Applicant Guidebook. And we have the IPC diverging also, suggesting – still supportive, but suggesting some more relaxed standards for trademark holders to object in specific circumstances.

Wit that, we seem to have our clear marching orders on not necessarily having a result one way or the other here. But let's open it to the queue and see who wishes to discuss any of this.

(inaudible), over to you.

Jeff Neumann: Thanks. This is Jeff. So, just as we pass this on to the full working group, I would say that we should probably classify this as – or all the comments supportive of the notion of the legal rights objection, and really where it's divergent is with INTA and the IPC providing suggestions on improvements to the existing procedure, as opposed to diverging from the concept of the legal rights objection. I think we just need to be careful in how we position it, because I don't think INTA and IPC would want to be on record diverging from a concept of a legal rights objection.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It would be interesting to see that happen, wouldn't it? Yes, perhaps this is another one of those times where we now have actually changed the red in the text there unless all the clarification is divergent, to a green, or support, and new idea. So, we will see it as a predominantly green path with decorative, if not festive, blue bits.

Okay. Susan has also just noted the question is, "Should the standard stay the same?" And that is exactly why I'm quite sure staff has interpreted it to say divergence as they have. The answer to the question is, in fact, divergent from (inaudible), saying "nay." It's a nay. It needs to be (inaudible), but the concept of saying the standard staying the same is supported by most of them, and these two, in fact, wish it to be specifically greater detailed. We need to watch the language in the – when we refer this on to the full working group in our covering of the section.

If I can ask if there's any more comments on that?

Sorry. Steve has just – you're just going to insist on me switching to my tiny screens all the time, aren't you? You're going to make me go blind, if not crazy, by the end of this hour.

Steve was saying he's (inaudible) an explanatory note in the "Notes" column, too, followed by what we have used here – what we mean here when you use "divergence," in that it is a divergence in relation to the standard of proof, rather than the – getting ourselves boxed in, as we often and without careful attention to detail using simple "yea" or "nay" terminology in our brief explanations and then trying to get easy analysis done.

If I can now draw your attention to item 2.18 in the Google Doc, and this is our next section, which is 2.8.1.e.19. And here, the Work Track member that submitted a straw man or a red line edit of Applicant Guidebook section 3.222, and we asked for specific responses on views on this edit. And we, in fact, had INTA and IPC supporting, but we had the Registry Stakeholder Group opposing the edit, with particular explanation from them as to why they thought those edits would significantly extend the scope of the legal rights objection and were concerned that this was "marked course adrift away from the original policy."

So, with that, I will open up for comments on e.19.

Everyone just takes what it is as it is. And though we can note here that there is some support, but not all unanimity and consensus. And again, that's what we pass on in our observations.

Jeff, over to you. (inaudible)

Jeff Neumann: No, I like extending things. This is Jeff Neumann, for the record.

I just wanted to note that this was an (inaudible), and I know when we were writing this section of the report it was a little bit difficult because the proposal that was on the table was from Paul McGrady, who is member of the IPC and is a member of the group. We had kept – as part of that Work Track, we kept inviting Paul back to try to explain the proposal, and for whatever reason we just couldn't get him back to talk about it.

So, it was one of those where it was included in the report, but most people didn't understand it. So, the IPC comment of understanding more about the proposal I think is a good one, because I think, as the Work Track, we didn't understand the proposal. And so, I guess what I would do is go back to Paul McGrady and the IPC and see if he can address the comments from INTA and IPC on understanding the proposal, because it was one that the Work Track couldn't do. It just received the red line from Paul and then, like I said, tried to invite him back several times for the call, scheduled it, and just didn't materialize.

Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It didn't work out. Things happen like that. We work with volunteers (inaudible), and there are no penalties for a volunteer not turning up. Until we change that...no, Paul's life is busy, like many of us, and this is the way that the group thought it was easiest to do in the absence of clarity on exactly what was meant and a deep understanding of what was meant. So, you're given, as requested, to pass it on to public comment, and you can see what the results are.

We can of course (inaudible) to go through, but I'd rather take it through and ask Paul to be present at the (inaudible) some edification for the full working group's consideration than hold it up in a sub-group. However, we will ask and give him the opportunity to try and pitch this a little bit one more time, an elevator pitch, one more time for the full group's consideration.

Right now we have a few responses, and not overwhelming support but some support and, indeed, divergence.

All right. Kathy has asked in the chat a number of questions about the – any data that we may have on the (inaudible) of these – sorry. It's wonderful (inaudible), isn't it. (inaudible) legal rights objections (inaudible). Steve – thank you very much – did say that there are statistics in the initial report on the outcomes, and that is very true. But of course with dealing with this (inaudible) variation (inaudible) between panels, the question is very much influenced by whether the panel determined everything accurately and the objectivity of the system is untested, especially (inaudible). And it is absent a data set that is going to require expansion and considerable more analysis before we could tap into definitive data on that (inaudible).

So, if I don't have anyone else wishing to make an observation on this – I do. Kathy? All right. Speak to the measure (inaudible).

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, everybody. And Hi, Cheryl. Sorry for coming in late. And hopefully you can hear me, with my cold in the background. So, question. If Paul pitches the

working group on a new proposal for the legal rights objection, how does that go out to the public for review, for further review? Because (inaudible) we've got...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you want me to answer that question?

Kathy Kleiman: Right, right, right. But we've got the Intellectual Property guys talking a proceeding that's of great interest to them. But ultimately it should be – any major changes should be going out through the community.

Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfectly happy to answer the expedited version of your question. But I'm just trying to push through to get us to a lump of work reviewed before we take a seasonal and Gregorian calendar break. So, I'm not going to apologize for putting pressure on everyone to continue it today. Yes, Jeff, that does include you.

How would Paul doing an elevator pitch to the working group affect it? May, or may not. But this was a question already posed to and details were given to the public in the interim report. We have responses to it which are six of one and half-dozen of the other, or not quite. It's more 70/30. So, always with the full working group, it is 70/30. And if – as the opportunity wasn't taken for Paul to present to the Work Track in gory detail so that we could get a greater and deeper understanding for people (inaudible) to have been made from the Work Track, we can do him the courtesy of giving him 60 to 120 seconds to finish that. Whether it will have any influence, who knows? I don't. May do, may not. But then again, a final report, if anything comes from this into it, will go to the public when that opportunity happens. This is our initial report, people, not our final report. Fear not, we still have an opportunity.

Okay. And as Jeff is saying, it would only get (inaudible). Well, you can read your chat if you wanted.

All right. I am going to get line 2.2.2, since it's a bit personal objective of a little over a half an hour through our call, and I like to keep up objectives from time to time. And this is taking us to the Other Comments section. And so, here, these are what they are, quite often new ideas.

We have a suggested outreaching for applicants receiving objections, from the dot-trademark TLD holding company, and it is what it is. It's a new idea and probably a thing that we need to pass on for (inaudible).

We also have a new idea regarding homonyms, from the Thai Network Information Center Foundation.

And from a larger comment, a more extensive comment, staff has managed to extract new ideas which are relevant here to this section, from a more missive style of input; two regarding (inaudible) from the Council of Europe. Sorry. Several from the Council of Europe. I'm counting three, not two, from the Council of Europe.

And we should note here that the style of public comment from the Council of Europe means that we will find on a number of these sections and, in fact, in a number of the sub-groups these sort of overarching or general (inaudible) from

the Council of Europe being pulled out as an Other Comment. The comments need to be treated very much in the same way (inaudible) we're not answering specific questions, as such. And over all, they go to matters of general accountability, general transparency of the system and, indeed, in this case, (inaudible), and are intended to improve the general flow and the way that third parties and external bodies can look at and have confidence in this process. So, we do want to thank the Council of Europe for the work (inaudible).

Sorry. I'm getting messages in from my next call. I'm glad Kathy likes the idea of (inaudible).

Right. We have also a bit of discoursing from a few others, a few other contributors. The ALAC decided to give us the rationale in detail for their advocacy of the independent – of ALAC as an independent objector (inaudible) and the independent objection as active roles in filing objections. A bit surprising here that they give their rationale there. We also have a substantive comment from Christoper Wilkinson and Tom Vanderscarvini (ph). And if my document would scroll I would be able to say if there is any more. I don't believe there is. Staff can correct me. And with Vander's comment, issues obviously taking her specific experience from the southern hemisphere (inaudible) and it is moot as well to note that.

I see Steve's hand up. Steve, over to you.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Cheryl. I was actually – sorry. This is Steve, from staff. I was looking at line 227, the comment from the Council of Europe, and it talks about extending the grounds for the legal public interest objections. So, I was thinking that that one, while it's under General Comments now, might make more sense in one of the (inaudible) we just went over that was asking about the standards for (inaudible). Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I don't have an objection to that duplication. Here is (inaudible), but if it has relevance (inaudible) compilation for any advice, I certainly have no objection. Does anyone else? I know that Kathy chimed in. Kathy, (inaudible) on what Steve just said?

You can use the microphone.

She and Jeff are interacting, and that's fine. That's one of the good things about chat. You can have a couple of parallel activities going on. So, no objection to that, Steve. Let's make (inaudible).

I'm getting all very excited now, because we're ready to move to our next tab, and we've got a (inaudible) 15 minutes to dive into 2.8.2, Accountability Mechanism, which was the (inaudible) starting with the Work Track 3. Okay. Are we all ready to move on to our next tab?

Excellent. Line 3 on the Google Doc and I'm assuming Page 1 of this tab (inaudible), which will be loading shortly into the Adobe Connect screen, re: 2.8.2.c.1." ICANN should create a new substantive appeal mechanism specific to new gTLD progress." Such appeals process will not look into whether – to changing ICANN bylaws by making or not making certain decisions, but will also evaluate whether the original action or actions done was in accordance with the

Applicant Guidebook. And I've paraphrased that some from my preparatory notes, which of course are in scribbled shorthand. So, if I've missed a word and changed the (inaudible) of the question, please stop me and let me know.

Not hearing anybody (inaudible), I'm going to assume that my scribbled notes are doing me some justice while the document is loading in the Adobe Connect room.

All right. Okay. My internet has finally caught up. Yeah. Right.

So, we have support from the ALAC. We have support from the Brand Registry Group. We have support from INTA and from the written (inaudible) section 35, specifically the DTRT report.

We have support and new ideas but also a little divergence or concern, which is an outline in this multi-colored text from the Registry Stakeholder Group that certainly supports the introduction of a substantive appeals process is put in place for disputes.

And we have again support, a new idea, and a little bit of limitation or (inaudible) that is written. Not quite divergence (inaudible) as to whether or not an embellishment, shall I say, from Valideus. It's icing on the cake. It really is supportive of the rationale for the new idea.

And we have again here the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group making the point that it thinks that these mechanisms were insufficient in scope and capacity and would like to have the (inaudible) accountability recommendations actually reviewed with the divergent opinion. It's not that they're not looking at supporting change here, but they're looking specifically for a review of what the (inaudible) of a limited appeals mechanism from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

I see Jeff's hand up, and hopefully he's got a larger screen open and the documents are more readable than mine and are able to take us to the next step (inaudible) on this. And with that, I will (inaudible). Over to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neumann: Thanks. So, I admit I'm reading this question and I know we had a number of discussions in a number of different groups. So, I thought that the initial report said that it wouldn't look into whether ICANN violated the bylaws, but only look into whether the action or inaction, which I think is the right word there, was done in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook. But if the question did say what's written up there, then I think that at least with the Registries, Valideus – at least with the Registries and with Valideus, I think that that shouldn't be brown for concerns, but that's really divergence with the notion of having an appeals mechanism that looks into ICANN whether violated the bylaws. And so, I think it should be a little bit stronger than just has a concern.

So, I think if we were to draw conclusions from these comments at least up until Valideus, I think that those groups support the notion of a substantive appeals process on whether ICANN acted or did not act in accordance with the Guidebook. But at least the Registries and Valideus oppose the notion of an appeals mechanism addressing whether ICANN violated the bylaws. So, I think that should be a little bit more clearly set out when we report this to the full working group.

Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jeff.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. Can I get in the queue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (inaudible). Sure can. In fact, you're next in the queue. Over to you.

Kristine Dorrain: Great. Thank you. This is Kristine, and I'm sorry I'm on audio-only. And I just wanted to say, Cheryl, thank you so much for running this call in such a way that I can participate on audio-only. So, thank you.

I just wanted to echo what Jeff had to say, is that the divergence is actually a bit stronger. And I think the Registries – and I helped write the Registry comment. And one of the things that we tried to do to help is we listed a few examples. So, we listed some types of things. And maybe it's further down in another row; I don't remember the row exactly. But we listed two or three examples of the types of things that would be right for an appeals process and then some things that wouldn't be, including, as Jeff pointed out, ICANN violation of the bylaws, because that's what the IRP is for. So, if this specific row is not super instructive, I just invite the group to look down a little farther, because I think we flesh it out a little bit further, possibly below. I get I might be confused on the rows. But thanks, Jeff, for speaking up for the Registries.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And thanks, Kristine, for I think actually giving us text, literally. We're probably going to quote you in what we say to the full work group. So, thanks for that. And I am glad you are managing. It's very difficult. I've done a number of calls on audio-only, and it certainly has its own challenges. So, thanks for being able to step in and, I think, help us all understand.

So, yes, we probably will have (inaudible) more than just a shade of orange, but heading to that umbra shade of red. Thanks very much to both of you. And I think we've got some marching orders on language that we can use to (inaudible) the full working group, as well.

Katrin, also in chat, is asking about (inaudible) does not support (inaudible), and I think that's been dealt with in the chat.

I have a hard stop (inaudible) top of the hour with yet another ICANN call. (inaudible) that one is going to be starting at 03.00 am. That's a luxury. So, I do want to watch our time very closely.

I just want to note before we go to Steve that Jeff made a point in the chat which is important to note for the record that even though he's employed by one of the respondents, he is not responsible for the comments that were submitted from the company. And Jeff, it is important to have us reminded of that from time to time.

And with that on the record, I'm going to go to Steve. Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Cheryl. This is Steve, from staff. So, I was looking at line 12 of the Google sheet into the comment from the NCSG. And in a reread, I notice that

there's a sentence that wasn't highlighted that says that, "bearing in mind, developing accountability mechanisms and/or a reconsideration process (inaudible) to the needs and requirements of the New gTLD program would be a significant improvement." So, in rereading that, it seems like that is agreement. And I've actually already made the change in the Google sheet. So, I just wanted to alert you all to that change, and to the extent you disagree I can back that out, of course. But I believe my reading is correct, but I'd appreciate if NCSG members told me I am incorrect.

Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Steve. Yes, I saw that change being made in my (inaudible), in the enormously sized reading of my mobile phone that I'm trying to (inaudible) in the Google Doc.

So, I see Kathy is typing that that would be line 12, line 12 of the tab on 2.(inaudible), Accountability Mechanisms. Kathy?

We've got a couple of minutes. So, let's see if we can look to qualifying that (inaudible), showing that limited support on the specificity is, in principle, having specific – I can't read it any more. It's far too small. The lines are now green, that Steve has changed into green. It's a level of agreement that Steve is now saying is the recommendation. But there are divergent points which are made in great detail (inaudible).

Steve, I'm not seeing anyone jump up and down saying revert that to some other color. So, thanks for that. That's a very good catch and, in fact, it's one of the reasons we continue to go through.

I just want to stop momentarily before we go into our next section on line13 and see if anyone did have any other business. If we do, then I will move to that section now. But if we don't, then I'd like to push through a little bit further into our next section, on 2.8.2.c.2.

Not seeing anyone jump and down with any other business, great. Let's spend a couple of minutes, and then just two minutes at the end with any other business (inaudible) of our next call, and see if we can get a little bit of a way through 2.8.2.c.2, which is line 13 of the Google Doc. And here, this is one of those, hopefully, relatively simple issues, which is why I want to get to it. "The process must be transparent and ensure that panelists, evaluators, and independent objectors are free from conflict of interest."

We have the ALAC in support, Brand Registry Group in support. Business Constituency are in with support. INTA in support. IPC in support. And we needed to go back to the previous response from the Registry Stakeholder Group, but I believe it's support, at least particular qualifications and I think additional suggestions made from Registry Stakeholder Group. But if someone with a larger screen and quicker capabilities than mine under my current storm-damaged circumstances could just support me on that, I would (inaudible) appreciate that.

Steve, Jeff, have I got the right of it on the Registry Stakeholder Group, line 25? If so, then we have a sea of green in that section.

Katrin, obviously not. Because she's asking about referencing the previous answer how can we classify it? Limited support? I'm not objecting. Jeff feels yes. So, I'll let you two discuss that further if you feel the need, but right now I'm certainly seeing overwhelming support, if not complete consensus, on that question.

And with that, we've got to pretty much where I wanted to – thank you, team – in today's one hour of allocated time. But noting we did start three minutes past the hour, we've done extraordinarily well, which means next year – isn't it delightful to say? Not "next week's," next year's thrill-packed and exciting venture, we'll pick up our agenda starting with line 20; that is, section 2.8.2.c.3 of Accountability Mechanisms.

Well, I'm thrilled. I hope all of you are, as well. I – all seriousness. While staff hopefully put up the date and time of our next sub-group meeting in January, I'm assuming it will be in the week of January 9 (inaudible) momentarily and save my fiddling about and finding it for myself.

Indeed, Jeff. Jeff notes, because he's been on enough of these calls with me, that I constantly over the years do say (inaudible), but at this time of year say at the beginning of the Gregorian calendar new year because living in APAC I'm well and truly aware that there's a whole bunch of new years that come up at the beginning of one – next lunar markings also. January 2 will indeed be a new year – sorry. January 9 will be a new year; January 2 will still be this year.

And we will be meeting, in the Gregorian calendar, 2019, Thursday, the 3rd of January, at 20:00 UTC. Heavens, I can actually have my morning coffee in hand for that one.

And I want to thank all of you for not only joining us in the I-know-not-terribly-exciting-but-still-very-important review of public comments. Please, all of you, be safe if you are traveling. Have all the best wishes of the season to you all. And that's alright because I'll wish you various new year's as we go through to, I think, the last new year is in March in our 2019 Gregorian calendar.

Thank you, one and all. Thank you, staff. Stay safe (inaudible). And I look forward to working with you more. Bye, for now.

Coordinator: Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for joining. Today's meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines. And have a good rest of your day. Thank you.