
ICANN Transcription

GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Tuesday, 01 December 2020 at 03:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/8oXzC>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Meeting being held on Tuesday the 1st of December at 03:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you.

Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

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

With this, I will turn it over to our co-chair, Jeff Neuman. Please begin.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thank you very much, Andrea. Welcome, everyone. And for many of you, happy 1st of December. So, hopefully everyone enjoyed a couple days off, at least from the Working Group, since our last meeting was a week ago. So, yeah, we're going to just jump right into it now.

Leadership is, I believe, supposed to meet tomorrow and we'll go over just some of ...

We've been trading some e-mails on some thoughts for follow up from the meeting last week with Avri and Becky and follow up items. So, we're not going to talk about those today, but we will talk about them in the very near future. And look out for e-mails on that subject.

Before we get started, though, let me just ask to see if there are any updates to any Statements of Interest. Okay, not seeing anything in the chat. Not seeing any hands raised. Okay, so great.

Today's agenda has a lot of topics on it, but you'll notice, as I'm sure all of you went through the materials, that there's not a huge amount of subtopics within these topics that we need to discuss.

In fact, on Topic 1, there's actually nothing that Leadership wants to point out. So, if there are any items on some of these topics that we don't go over as we do normally, we're going to ask for input

from the Working Group if there are any comments that you all think need to be discussed by the Working Group.

I guess before we get started, let me just also mention that Julie sent a reminder earlier today, for many of you, that comments on the revised drafts of a number of the sections that we've already covered are due by December 1st, which is today for some of you. And I don't remember if there was an exact time on that, but they're due. So, please do finish your review on them if you have not done so yet.

In addition, Leadership is going through all the action items to make sure that we are following up on the items that need following up on. You will have already seen an e-mail today from Cheryl and I about the predictability topic. There are some outstanding questions on applicant support. Systems was covered in the predictability. So, you'll see many e-mails starting to come fast and furious to get to the finish line on this.

Okay, Julie. There is that deadline of 2359 UTC, December 1st.

Justine, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Jeff. Just a point of clarification. The request for comment as to errors and omissions that you mentioned Julie sent, how would that affect anything that, say, Leadership is going to come back on improving or adding to or any action taken forward? Say, for example with respect to the discussion with the Board liaisons which affect any of the topics that have been included in this request for comments.

I hope I'm making myself clear. I'm just trying to word it properly.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Say, for example, the topic of predictability is included in this call for revised draft final report comments, but you have sent an e-mail on something related to predictability, and I'm understanding that there may be further e-mails coming forth which intercept with these topics that have been listed. So, how do we deal with that? Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Justine. Great question. Now you're seeing redline form, so those redlines will be accepted, assuming that there no objections, errors, omissions, and things like that. And then you'll see it again with the redlines just from anything that needs to, or that did, change as a result of these e-mails, which will include follow up on the Board topics.

You'll see these sections again, obviously, but we're going to try to limit the comments to only the redlines at the time. So, hopefully that makes sense. I understand your question. To the extent that the discussion last week has an impact on any of the sections that have already been sent around and they show up as redlines, then obviously you'll have the opportunity to comment again.

Jim, go ahead.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Jeff. Good evening. Just a question sort of on the working method. So, as we've been going through this, one of the things that I've heard often, "Well, we're going to have to take that to the list. We'll settle that on the list." But it seems to me that in some instances, that's not actually happening.

In fact, what's happening is either Leadership or staff is drafting edits that are then going into the final report. So, is that where it's hitting the list, and the Working Group is either up or down on that proposed language? Or are there, in fact, topics that we as a group are still going to have to hash out via the mailing list? Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Good question, Jim. So, the predictability outstanding questions from that e-mail that went around just a little bit ago, that is questions that we had to take to the list. So, we've noted, in the Action Items after every meeting, the areas that need to go to the list. And so, those e-mails are starting to go out now.

Of course, if you are aware of any subjects that would need to be taken to the list in advance, there's nothing stopping you from starting up discussions on your own without waiting for Leadership. But you're going to start seeing a bunch of e-mails fast and furious about those topics.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay, so the e-mails that are coming are the “taking it to the list” e-mails.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay. All right, great. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sure. And if we’re missing anything, do let us know. We’re doing our best, but our action log is taken from the notes that Julie sends around after the meeting. So, if we do happen to miss something, then please do let us know.

All right. Let’s start with Topic 1. And I think Topics 1 and 3 are in the same document.

So, actually on Topic 1 ... We’ll put it up on the screen, but there were no real comments that I think we need to address. You’ll see Leadership Comments in the notes, but I don’t think there’s really anything that we need to discuss other than there are some comments.

What I will say is that, no unexpected, there are comments on the timing of when to start the next round, and belief—or I shouldn’t say belief; that’s not the right word—but the thoughts of some of the groups on things that should be dependencies. But that’s not something that we’re covering here.

So other than that, there's really nothing for us to discuss as a group. So, let me just pause here just to see if there's anything that anyone in the group wants to discuss from this Topic 1: Continuing Subsequent Procedures.

Okay. I'm looking for hands. No? Okay. Then let's go to the Topic 3 which is Applications Assess in Rounds. And I'm actually going to pull up my version, too, because it's kind of small up on the screen. And I know there's probably a good way to fix that, and I know it's probably been explained like 10 times, but ...

So, there's not much in this area either. If you'll notice, there are obviously a number of groups that support the recommendations as written or say it's not ideal. There are others that don't have comments.

There are some comments here that we have as "Noted" because they are either repeated comments from the initial report or comments that we have certainly discussed several times before, which includes things like a .brand only track or just doing .brands on a continuous basis but rounds for everything else. Those were not adopted by the Working Group, but they certainly were discussed.

There's a comment. The first one I wanted to talk about, though, is the IPC comment. The IPC states that they ... Where is it? It's at the bottom.

It says, "IPC does not support policy recommendations 3.5 through 3.7 to the extent that they would preclude ICANN Org from pausing future rounds for not more than 30 days if ICANN

deemed it prudent or necessary to do so in the event of unforeseen emergency.”

And the Leadership was reviewing this and we could not find where that was stated or where the IPC got the impression that ICANN couldn't go through the Predictability Model or couldn't do what it needed to do in the case of an emergency. So, we just want to point that out. If there's anyone from the IPC that could help us find that specific reference, that would help.

Let's stop here for a second. I know it's sort of putting everyone on the spot, but this was in the Leadership Comments for about a week now.

Okay. Well, if anyone from the IPC is on here—I see Greg, and there are others—if you could just take note of that and maybe submit something around on the list to help us understand if there is some inconsistency there.

The next comment I want to go to is in the New Information. I'm also looking out for hands here. In the New Information, the NCSG states that we have a whole new world with COVID-19, and therefore we need to take into account the difficulties of the world, of the community, and commenters.

And Leadership's only comment to this is, obviously, there's a global pandemic out there and there are lots of impacts; but I think that we all probably think it's not likely for the next round to begin until late 2022 or 2023. So, while we appreciate this comment, I don't think there's anything here for us to address because we don't know what the world will really look like in two or three years.

Professor Kleiman, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thank you, Jeff. Hi, everybody. I actually wanted to comment on Minds + Machines comment, which you're probably getting to next.

But first, for NCSG, it's exactly what you said. We don't know what the world will look like in a few years. So, given that we've been in a pandemic that no one expected—and it's not going away, unfortunately, any time soon—I think we should be building that into (and this is what NCSG is saying) not just the next round, but rounds to come; that they take into account things that are happening in the world.

I hope the news will be better, but that they take into account that we make them as flexible as the world might need instead of fixed.

As long as I'm on, let me just point out that the next comment, Minds + Machines—major registry—pointing out that they're concerned about moving from one round to another without wrapping up the prior round. So again, another thing to ...

I think we're getting some really good, new information here about how we think about progressing from one round to another; not necessarily just when we start the next round—I think we're all ready to start the next round—but how we go from round two to round three, round three to round four, round four to round five.

And I think we've got a lot of good, new information and concerns here that we could easily build into what we're sending out to the Implementation Review Team. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Let's start with the NCSG comment, and then we'll go to the Minds + Machines one. What are you asking the Working Group to put into the recommendations, then? It seems to me that that's not necessarily really policy, but that will come down to implementation and execution as to when the right time will be. But I'm not sure that ...

Well, tell me. I shouldn't say I'm not sure. Tell me what you would like to see in the report that would address the NCSG comment.

KATHY KLEIMAN: If the language that we're looking at is the language that's in that top blue section, then I guess it would be—and thank you for asking—about that predictable cadence of future rounds also taking into account world events and other issues going on. I know that we're going to tie future rounds at some point ...

Well, let me ask you. How have we decided to move from one round to another thus far?

JEFF NEUMAN: "Thus far" meaning, in the report, what do we say about moving from one round to another in the future?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yes, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, we have a number of recommendations in there about a predictable process—and I think it's in this section—that's based on milestones, whether that's number of applications that have been processed or whether it is based on a time; but in some predictable way so that applicants do not feel pressure to apply in this first round knowing that there will be subsequent predictable rounds in the future and can have some sort of estimate as to when that would be.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Didn't we tie a future round, [X+1], to some kind of completion of the delegation of X?

JEFF NEUMAN: Now it wasn't the delegation, but it was the processing. Steve, correct me if I'm wrong. It is this section, or is it another section? I'm starting to get mixed up again with so many sections in my head.

And while Steve's checking on it, let me just go to Paul first. And then we'll come back.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Jeff. I just wanted to address your question about the IPC comment. I'm not speaking for the IPC, but I think this is what the IPC was getting at. If we go to the actual section,

Recommendations 3.5 or 3.7. In 3.5—and I had it up and now I've lost it. Darn it.

JEFF NEUMAN: It's up on the screen.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, okay. I had it on my other screen because I am old and blind. Perfect. Here we go. All right.

So, I think what it's getting at is, the way that 3.5 is written, there is no emergency mechanism here. Right?

“Application procedures must take place at predictable, regularly occurring intervals without indeterminable periods of review unless the GNSO Council recommends pausing the program and such recommendation is approved by the Board. Unless and until other procedures are recommended by the GNSO Council and approved by the ICANN Board, ICANN must only use “rounds” to administer” these ...

So, that talks about pausing it, but it talks about the mechanism being the GNSO Council recommending that to the Board and the board voting, as opposed to a real emergency shutdown for a short period of time.

3.6 is more vague on whether or not there can be a shutdown, but makes reference to the various reviews going on. And then 3.7, I don't really think is all that relevant to the IPC comment.

So, I just think the IPC was trying to see if we could get an explicit emergency mechanism, and a proposed one, in its comment. So, that's what I think it was getting at.

Greg's on the line. He's IPC guy, but also ALAC guy. He may have a better memory than me, but I think that's what they were trying to get at. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Paul. I think, yes. So, right. So, 3.5 deals with pausing, but don't forget that the Predictability Model has a bunch of things in there for introducing and the process to go through if there's a change in circumstances or things that would produce a pause to the program. So, I think if you look at all of that combined, plus just the inherent ...

Or, forget the inherent. The e-mail we sent around today on the Predictability Model, there is a provision in there about an ICANN emergency powers. So, if you go back and review all three of those—the Predictability Framework, this section, plus the e-mail that was sent around earlier, see if that addresses the concerns. If not, then perhaps we can put something in there.

And I see the comment—"but it's not always clear how these recommendations work together."

Okay. So, let us think about that a little bit and see if there are any tweaks we can put in there that cross-reference them.

And, Kathy, I was going to come back to you anyway, but Paul's got one more question. "Does 3.5 govern, or the Predictability Model?"

Well, 3.5 governs unless there's a change that's introduced through the Predictability Model. Right? So 3.5, 3.6—these are recommendations. Any of these recommendations can be changed by going through the Predictability Framework.

The Predictability Framework includes all of the GNSO procedures; not just the SPIRT that we've been talking about, but all the other GNSO processes. So, that's why I'm using the word "framework" instead of the "SPIRT team" or anything else.

Paul, go ahead. And then Kathy, I will get back to you once we get through this.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Jeff. Sorry, Kathy. Jeff, I think you answered a bigger question than the one I was asking, which isn't does 3.5 govern unless it's overturned by the Predictability Model process.

I think I was asking a much smaller, innocent question which is, if 3.5 lays out how the program can be paused and the Predictability Model also has a process by which is can be paused through emergency, and the languages are conflicting the way that they're written now, shouldn't we just build a bridge sentence in here saying, "... subject to the Predictability Model" or something like that?

Let these paragraphs cross-reference each other so that we don't have a situation where ICANN needs to pause the program for an emergency and somebody says, "Aha! You're violating 3.5." Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. That makes sense, and I think that was one of the tweaks that we'll look at, doing that cross-referencing. That does make sense.

Okay. Back to Professor Kleiman.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Coming off mute across the screens. Okay, so I think here, the tweak is fairly small, but it seems to relate to some of the wording that you and Paul have been doing; not the topic, but the wording.

So, this idea of pausing under certain circumstances. I think what NCSG is asking—and I don't think it's unreasonable—is that that pause, that flexibility ...

We've talked about it factoring in ICANN Org and processing and registries, but we should also factor in world events because the commentors are a critical part of this system as well, this infrastructure, that we're building to support the rounds.

So, if there is a world event that is a problem, or even a major regional event that is a problem, we will lose that ability as commentors ... The commentors may lose the ability to participate.

And so, again, just a short add based on new information and based on the world we're living in that the pause be flexible enough to include whether commenters can participate in the process that's affecting the rest of the world.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Okay. Thanks, Kathy. I think the concern is that that's like a loophole you can drive a truck through. And I think what we've heard time and time again is that nobody wants to see the 10 years go between rounds again; that a pause be subject to maybe some that, for whatever reasons, just object to having any new gTLDs and will come up with something in the world that provides that reason.

I think the burden should always be on those that would like to deviate from the program as opposed to those that want the program to continue. So, I think that's something that you might want to send something on the list about because the concern, again, here is that that takes away all of the predictability, obviously, for emergency situations.

I think there is a tolerance and understanding of that, but just to have something like world events, I'm not sure if that's ... That kind of goes against a lot of the recommendations we have.

Is there anyone else that wants to weigh in on this, too? I'm sure Kathy wants to respond.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Should I wait for others to weigh in?

JEFF NEUMAN: No one's raising their hand. So why don't you respond now, then?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. So, is 3.6 about pausing or is it about other things? Where do we put in extraordinary circumstances and that it takes into account that the timing of the rounds—again, with extraordinary circumstances—takes into account the needs of all of its participants? Because if we can say that, I think we're good.

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, 3.5 is the general rule of the “predictable, regularly occurring intervals without indeterminable periods of review unless the GNSO Council recommends pausing the program ...” etc. And I think we were going to look to cross-reference the Predictability Framework where it talks about emergency circumstances. So, maybe it's there.

We'll come back with the redline to that section. It doesn't say it yet, but we'll come back with a redline to that section, Kathy. Then you can weigh in and see if that covers it.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Let's see if the redline can cover extraordinary circumstances of the ones we are now, unfortunately, intimately familiar with. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yep. Okay. Going back to the Minds + Machines comments. So, we've had a number of discussions, and the reason why we have "Noted" there is because there have been ...

If you go back to notes from all of the discussions as to when to start the next round, there have been a number of discussions about what it means to complete everything from the previous round. And the Working Group settled on this indeterminate period and the other recommendations.

So, that's why we have it as ... It's not really new. It's just something that has already been discussed at length.

On the ICANN Org comments, a lot of these are clarification or confirming the meaning of certain words that we use. When we use certain terms like "Active," "In Contracting," "In PDT"—that all of those statuses that we mean when we include that wording exactly what ICANN Org meant in the 2012 round.

So, we're going through that now and confirming. I think it is meant to apply the same definitions, so we're just confirming that now.

If you look at number 3, which is, "Have we concluded that applications can be forced to close?"

The ICANN Org says, "Okay. Right now in 2012, we don't require anyone to withdraw an application." Even after another string has been delegated, ICANN has no mechanism to force closure of, or force the withdrawal of applications. And as a result, we have several applications that just nobody was either around to

withdraw, or they just didn't, even though those withdrawals would be entitled to some form of refund.

There are some applicants that have not withdrawn because they still see, perhaps, a dispute; like anything that's under independent review. Let's say even though there's one successful bidder for .web, other applications may not have withdrawn their application because it's still in independent review. So, we're not talking about those.

What we're talking about are the ones where strings have been delegated and they have not been withdrawn, or there's been a definitive decision not to proceed and the application, for whatever reason, has not been withdrawn.

Should we put a mechanism in place to force the withdrawal or, alternatively take that refund money that would be due to an applicant if they don't come forward and claim it and put it towards the same thing we discussed in a previous discussion; about excess fees would be put, for those purposes set forth in that section, basically to support the New gTLD Program?

Any thoughts on that? Is this something we need to come to some sort of conclusion on?

Perhaps a recommendation that says, "For any string that's been delegated, all applications that have not been withdrawn shall be closed and applicable refunds issued for the remaining applications." And if the applicant can't be found, then the money will go towards the ... I forgot the specific section, but the section

that we were talking about a week or two weeks ago with excess fees.

Thoughts on that? Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Jeff. I'm talking too much tonight.

So, there's a lot of strange possible outcomes here and we've seen it from the last round. So, I'm a little worried about building in an administrative withdrawal because something could be delegated but two parties could be suing each other outside of the ICANN processes. So, I'm a little worried about ICANN rejecting them.

Maybe it's that the applications are deemed withdrawn and refunds will issue unless somebody can provide some evidence of an ongoing dispute. I don't know.

I don't know really what the best language would be, but I think you know what I'm trying to get at—just that weird thing because the weird stuff happens in this environment. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Paul. I think I understand. It's not an absolute rule. On the situation I was talking about, "In the event of a string that has been delegated, all remaining applications for that string shall be closed unless one or more of the applicants comes forward with ..."

Yeah, what you were saying. I am not thinking straight of the exact words. But unless there's a reason not to, essentially. I think we can build that in.

Okay. So, I think those are the main comments from ICANN Org. You'll see some other written responses from Leadership in there. Look at those to see if you have any concerns, but let me ask if there's anything else on Applications Assessed in Rounds that we need to go over.

Okay, good. Let's then go to the next one which is Topic 5, Application Submission Limits. Is that what we're on? So, you guys already beat me to the punch there? There you go. All right.

On this one, these recommendations didn't change at all from the initial report, so you can see that there's overwhelming support as written for the recommendations. And there are others that say it's not idea but support it. And then a bunch of groups that just have no opinion.

We do have a comment from the NCSG which, essentially, is the same comment or similar to the comment that the NCSG filed in response to the initial report which was not adopted by the Working Group. And so, we don't see a reason why we need to discuss that again at this point. Certainly, if there's still disagreement, then there could be a minority report if there's consensus on this.

Okay. Any questions on this before we go to the next topic?

Let me scroll down. Sorry. I can't see all of the ... good. All right.

No comments? Then let's move on to the Application Submission Period which is Topic 16. I could probably drop this link in because I know that Steve and Julie are busy changing it over. Is this the right spreadsheet, I think? 15-18, yeah.

So, Topic 16, the Application Submission Period. Again, overwhelming support as written. There are some with no opinion. InfoNetworks had a comment in there thinking that the 13-week submission window was too aggressive. But it was the only comment, and we have discussed this many times.

ICANN Org came back with a comment very much like our discussion. If you all recall, we spent a fairly considerable time talking about, "Is it 12 weeks? Is it 15 weeks?" and somehow ended up settling on 13 weeks. Then we were saying, "Should we say days and months?" It was a very lengthy discussion.

ICANN Org has come back and said, "Hey. Rather than being so restrictive or limiting, why don't we just put a range in there to account for things like holidays or New Years or Chinese New Year, or whatever it is that comes up."

So, instead of saying 13 weeks, we put in—and this is just what Leadership is throwing out there—something like 12-15 weeks. And call it a day.

Questions? Thoughts? Comments? Anyone object to that, or do people think that that's an okay change and we can move on?

Everyone awake? All right. I will take silence for now as being okay with Leadership's suggestion. You'll see it in the redline. Thanks, Greg.

So, you'll see it in the redline. Obviously, if there are strong objections at that point in time, we'll hear it.

Okay. Let's then move to the next one which is the last one for today. Right? Yeah, wow.

Application Queuing. Okay. On this one, if you recall, we spent a long time negotiating a way to prioritize IDN applications without the general rule of "all IDNs are first, no matter what"; which would mean if there were a thousand IDN applications, that the non-IDN applications wouldn't have to wait six months to a year to have a shot at even being evaluated.

So, we came up with this formula, and the formula is (just to briefly restate) that there will be batches of—I think we said (wow, why can I not remember the number in there?)—500 applications. And that the first 125 in each batch will be IDN applications unless, of course, you ran out of IDN applications; and then the remaining 375 will be applications that are either IDN or ASCII.

So, all of the leftover IDNs that weren't selected in the first 125 of a particular batch will be put into the drawing for the remaining 375 spots. So, you will very likely see a number of additional IDN applications in the remaining 375 even though they're not in the first 125. Hopefully, that makes sense.

We did have a comment from an individual. I think we agree with their comment. Even though they say that they don't support certain aspects, I think the way that our formula works is actually in line with what this comment says. I think this comment thought

that only the first 125 would be IDNs, and the remaining 375 in that batch would be ASCII.

That was the best that we could make of this comment, so we think that it's addressed and it's not actually someone who disagrees with the recommendations. But I think if they understood—and maybe we can explain it better—I think they're in agreement with how we came out on this.

Does anybody have a different read on that comment?

All right. Thank you, Cheryl. I'm not seeing disagreement. Okay. Let's scroll down a little bit.

AFNIC did bring up a new mechanism that has never been discussed, which was creating groupings of applications: geographic, brand, and generic. Partially, this has been discussed in the sense of having a brand only round or a geographic only round, and I think that the Working Group did not adopt that.

So, I'm not sure there there's anything that needs to be discussed on this but let me just pause here to see if this is something the Working Group thinks we should take up.

All right. Paul's saying, "I would be happy to have .brands go first." Yeah. And I'm sure there would be others that would say, "I would be happy to have IDNs ..." Yeah.

Okay. Other than that, any other comments?

All right. The next comment is something new, too. The World Intellectual Property Organization filed a comment. We're not

100% sure what this means except that, I guess, what WIPO's asking for is that they would like to see a rolling period to file objections that somehow corresponds to the processing of the applications as opposed to, I guess, an objection window that's simultaneous with the Public Comment period.

That would be a pretty drastic change to the way it's done. I understand why they're asking for it, but I think the same could be said for anyone that wants to file Public Comments. And I think we've been very adamant on the point of having one predictable Public Comment period, which is the equivalent of having one objection period as well.

And I agree with you, Paul, that it's a very big ask at a late point in time.

Okay. Then the last two. So, the Internet DotTrademark Organisation Limited has a comment in here about prioritizing the application for variants of existing TLDs.

Because this deals with existing TLDs as opposed to variants of future applied-for TLDs—although we have some recommendations on variants—this is one of those that Leadership believes should be one of the issues referred to the potential EPDP that the Council's talking about now and is drafting the Charter so that the Council could vote on starting the EPDP early 2021.

And then the last comment is from ICANN Org, so our affirmation in 19.1 basically states that we affirm the way it was done in 2012 with the prioritization Draw.

ICANN wanted to know, does that mean every single detail is affirmed including things like the Draw has to be in person.

Then they asked a question, what if the rules and regulations change?

So, what Leadership put in here is, really, what we were affirming was the utilization of the prioritization Draw, not necessarily ever single associated detail.

If there are changes where they're still going to do the Draw but you don't have to be in person or you do have to be in person, or the law changes on details about how the Draw is to be done, then those should be discussed with the IRT before implementation.

Or if it's not something that's known until after the Guidebook comes out, that should go to the Predictability Framework to discuss those changes.

So, what we might want to do, therefore, is maybe do the affirmation with modification basically stating that it's the Draw that we are affirming; but the logistics of the prioritization Draw, other than as set forth by the recommendations that we have, can be decided by the IRT.

So, that's what Leadership is proposing to put into the redline. Does that make sense? Anyone?

Jaimie, go ahead.

JAMIE BAXTER: Yeah, Jeff. I think that makes sense that there needs to be flexibility on the implementation because if there was a requirement to be in person, the state of California wouldn't even allow that to happen right now. So, I think the flexibility point makes sense.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Jamie. It's a good point even with the current situation; and who knows what's it going to be like. Great. I think then we will put that redline language in that, really, the affirmation is for the prioritization Draw and that the logistics that are not otherwise set forth in other recommendations that we have can and should be worked on by the IRT.

Just to give you an example of another recommendation that we have in that section; talks about ICANN should collect payment for the prioritization Draw with the application fee so that you don't have to do two different payments if that's permissible. There are a couple other recommendations like that that we have in that section, so it would be the things that we don't have recommendations on that would be up to the IRT to implement.

All right. That is it with the topics that we have for today, which is great. We did it in under an hour. Is there anything anyone else wants to discuss? Any other business?

All right. So, we have a call on Thursday, and the time will be put up. Please note that the topics include Security Stability, Name Collisions, Universal Acceptance, and TLD Rollout.

In addition to the comments that are in these sections—and those are all on the Work Plan—please do review the notes and Action Items from our session on October 19th that had our discussion with the SSAC. Even though the SSAC didn't file formal comments, they did sit down with us and talk about their issues, so this is the particular session that deals with a bunch of those topics.

We will send around the notes with the agenda as well, so do look out for that. But if, for whatever reason, you are looking at this early, then don't forget to look at those notes from October 19th.

And, yes, congrats to all of those participating in the RPM Phase 1 PDP for completing the work. Great.

Anything else anyone has? All right, thanks, everyone.

And thanks for posting the link to the discussion notes, Steve.

And 15:00 UTC on Thursday, December 3rd. E-mails are going to be coming out, like I said, fast and furious on a number of topics. Please do review those and let us know if there are any strong objections.

As of December 1st, which is today for some of you, we are in the last three weeks before we send this out. So I'm looking forward, as I'm sure all of you are, to wrapping this up. So, let's make sure we hit our date.

Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]