OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. And apologies for the late start due to a few technical problems. But now we're set to sail.

And our agenda today is going to start with our work group updates, first with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg on the EPDP Phase 2, Justine Chew on the Subsequent Procedures. We'll then swiftly move on with the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu. And finally, we'll go for any other business after that. Oh. Sorry. I've missed one agenda point here. We've got the At-Large ICANN 68 talking points, which we couldn't do last week and hope we will have time to do this week.

So, that's where we are. Are there any amendments or additions to this agenda? I'm not seeing any hands going up. And I'll note that that closed caption icon has come on so that means one can show the subtitles and go and see the full transcript.

So, let's then look at the action items from last week. There were two of them and one is remaining unchecked. That's for Evin to work with Jonathan on circulating the draft for the At-Large ICANN 68 talking points. I have a feeling this is what's going to happen this week. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's an accurate feeling. We'll talk a little bit about them on the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super. Thanks for this. So, that's all the action items for this week. And I'm checking on the list of participants and not seeing any hands going up. So, we can then move to the next agenda item.

That's our working group update. As you know, we now have grouped all the work group updates into one agenda item. It doesn't mean that these are standard, standing items they could appear or disappear, depending on whether there are updates. We're told that there is an update from the Expedited PDP Phase 2. And so, I believe … Is it Alan who's going to provide us with us update and then follow with Hadia, perhaps? So, you have the floor.

Someone is speaking at the moment and not actually …

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Alan, your microphone is muted. I'm not able to unmute you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah! Sorry about that. And that's only part of the screen. That's only the top half of the presentation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, I thought that was all of it—EPDP current status. Thank you for the presentation. Let's move on.

ALAN GREENBERG:	No. The entire slide is not showing. The bottom half is missing. Whoever's displaying their screen needs to actually run PowerPoint, I think, or do something else. It is not a widescreen display. It is a regular-shaped display. And we're only showing the top two thirds of it. It doesn't matter on this one but the next screen it will matter. That's better. Thank you. Next slide, please.

You will recall, those of you who were on the call last week, I was somewhat optimistic. I'm no longer optimistic. I'm afraid. Where we are right now is the final report is supposed to be issued by the end of June. And we are currently doing the final review of all of the particular recommendations and aspects of the review.

The various ACs, SOs, and other groups involved in the EPDP have completed a large number of Google Docs, which allowed us to do edits of minor things and also "can't live with" items. The number of "can't live with" items is large. And there are, of course, many of them that are conflicting with each other. So, we're going to have to do that. That starts tomorrow.

We also have the items that were deferred—that is, they were supposed to be handled in Phase 1, were deferred from Phase 1 to Phase 2. The addendum to the final draft report said that they would be tossed back to the GNSO and the GNSO would decide what to do with them at some point in the future. There are a number of those—legal/natural, accuracy, email anonymization—which some on the group feel we cannot defer until the GNSO looks at it at some time in the future. And then, we had the issue of evolution of the SSAD, the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure. Next slide, please.

SSAD evolution is perhaps one of the key things. The concept is although the report is identifying a number of things which the SSAD will do right now in an automated fashion—a very limited number—and sets a number of service-level agreements and a number of other issues, it was well understood that these were going to have to change going forward.

So, the concept was born of having an evolution process put in place so that the SSAD could evolve, and grow, and change as necessary. It was supposed to address five main issues—service level agreements, automation and centralization … That's in square brackets because the group has never talked about centralization. It presumed that if anything was done centrally, it would be done fully-automated. And it's clear that that may not work.

An interesting anecdote is when blacklists started, there was a lot of problems with false positives. That is, blacklists would block a lot of sites. The reason blacklists work moderately well right now is they are not automated. They are not a purely mechanical process of looking at spam and deciding which domains to block. There's humans involved in making the decisions. And that's why they're particularly effective right now and don't do false blocking of things that shouldn't work. And some of us are proposing that the SSAD should do the same thing but there's a lot of pushback.

Third party purposes—that is, why can you make a request to access data that is not otherwise public. Financial sustainability is a really big thing and other miscellaneous enhancements. So, that's what evolution was supposed to mean. Next slide, please.

The staff proposed the evolution mechanism to be a GNSO guidance process, which is a GNSO process never used, which is designed to answer implementation type questions if, for instance, the Board tosses something back to the GNSO. It has been pretty well categorically rejected by us, the GAC, SSAC, the IPC, and the BC.

The reasons for our rejection are, number one, it's a GNSO process. We have no control over who gets on it and what the numbers are. And we could be excluded. We could be included in a minor way. The rules are not clear. And second of all, any recommendations that come out of the GGP have to go to the GNSO for their super majority approval, which means a single stakeholder group plus one person can block anything. And then, they have to go to the Board. So, it's a long, complex process, we have no say in the outcomes, and there's a good chance that for idealistic reasons, things could be blocked by a very small part of the GNSO Council.

A new proposal was put together. It was largely formulated by the chair. And it sounded like it might fly. And that was last week when I was being positive. Since then, we've had a number of meetings and it doesn't look nearly as good anymore. It's been pretty much rejected by the Registrars, Registries, and NCSG for a number of reasons, some philosophical, some practical. Next slide, please.

As you're aware, the SSAD initially will do a very small number of automated decisions. And with recent legal advice, it's not even clear those will be allowed. Many are willing … Sorry. The current proposal for the SSAD, with very few things, was accepted by many, including us,

because of the ability to evolved and the faith that it would be evolving. That is now in question.

Interestingly, some Contracted Parties have said that any change to where decisions are made is policy and therefore must go to the GNSO because all policy issues must be recommended by the GNSO. Curiously, however, the GGP, which they say is acceptable, is not a policy process, and explicitly is not a policy process. So clearly, they're not really saying that it must be policy. They're just saying it has to go to the GNSO but it's not policy. But if it's not policy, why does it have to go to the GNSO? It's a quandary that I don't have any simple answer to. And it makes me rather suspicious that it looks like, essentially, these are arguments to stop a process, not to find a solution. But that may just be me and conspiracy theories. Next slide.

So, without a viable evolution mechanism, the SSAD is dead. We may issue a report but it just can't work. It can't go forward. It's going to be a very, very expensive thing and all it will do is provide some logging and records of when requests are made. We could build a ticketing system for an awful lot less than we're talking about for the SSAD. For instance, if all we're doing is a ticketing system, we don't need all the authentication and authorization that we have put into this thing because all we're doing is tracking how long it takes for a request to come in.

So, it's not clear what's going to happen at this point. There's still some discussions ongoing. There are a few people who are trying to find a middle ground. I'm finding it rather hard to understand what that

middle ground might be but the skies may open and we'll have a solution. At this point, it doesn't look very positive, though.

There's a couple other things I could add. There are rumors that we may see action, both in Europe and the US, at a government level. But that's not likely to happen very quickly. There has been some talk that we need to go back and reopen the whole SSAD discussion and look at something closer to what we were discussing very early on that we discarded—that is where ICANN would have access to the data to make the decisions. I can't see how that can happen in a reasonable timeframe.

So, that's where we sit right now. We're attending meetings and we will keep on reporting and keep on pushing. But the camps are really strong in terms of who's on which side and the unlikeliness that either group will change radically. But maybe some miraculous answer will come out. Clearly, I don't know what it is right now. I don't know if Hadia wants to add anything quickly and open up for any questions.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. So, yeah. Just a quick note that I guess we, the GAC, the BC, and the IPC, we have indicated that if there is no mechanism for adding improvements to the implementation of the system, or in other words no mechanism to allow the system to evolve, then there is actually no deal there and that our agreement to this model was based on the fact that there would be a method through which the implementation could be improved. And if this method does not exist,

then we don't think that this model that we are agreeing to today is agreeable anymore.

The GAC has stated this clearly and, I think, also the IPC, the BC. And we actually agree to that, too, because from now we all can see that this system is not perfect and we understand why. There are a lot of unknowns to all of us and that's why we cannot make it perfect from the beginning. And that's why we need a way to improve. But if that does not exist, then what we have agreed upon does not exist, also. So, that's one point.

And then, just quickly about the addendum and the issues included there, like accuracy and legal versus natural. So, what we have now, that is legal versus natural will not be included in the report. So, no conclusion or recommendation in this regard would be recorded in the report. As for accuracy, a conclusion would be included that says that the EPDP will not consider this further and that the GSNO Council is expected to form a scoping team to further consider.

So, we haven't discussed this yet. And as Alan mentioned, we're still working on an evolution mechanism. And again, just quickly, the GGP, which is the proposed mechanism right now and it's the mechanism that is agreed upon by the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group and by the Registries and Registrars … The part of it that we do not agree to is that the final outcome or decision making for that group actually goes to the GNSO for approval. And none of the advisory committees actually have any say there. And because the GGP is an already established process, there is no room there to change anything, right?

And that's why we are proposing or suggesting to go with a new process. And all the advisory committees and those supporting the new process are willing to accommodate any concerns that the Registries, the Registrars, or the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group actually have.

So, I think there is more room for them to actually consider the new process because, as I said, we are willing to accommodate any concerns that they have, and address them, solve them. And that's not possible through the GGP because it's an already-established process. So, I'll stop here, and thank you, and give it back to Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'll note the SSAC is not being particularly vocal during any of these meetings. But the SSAC has a reputation for being consistent and they have made very strong statements all along the way that some of the same issues that important to us are important to them. So, we're likely to see a final statement that's similar to that. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. And it's really just a little clarification. And I'm fairly confident I know the answer but I wanted to double check. Just from your and Hadia's perspective … Hadia, to some extent, spoke about how with the GPP process, all of that is untested and, as you said, it's never been used. It hasn't been used yet. And there is discomfort and that makes sense to me.

But with the items that were carried over from Phase 1, that everyone believed would be done in Phase 2 and that are now being orphaned, you mentioned, Alan, that some parties were not happy with that being left in the hands of the GNSO. I just want to double check so I'm really clear. I gather you and Hadia, and therefore we by default, are amongst those parties. Or do I have that wrong?

ALAN GREENBERG: That was very clear in the statement the ALAC issued. Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just double checking. Thank you. We could—

ALAN GREENBERG: Our words were we did not believe these issues should be left to indeterminate future, when the GNSO may choose to take a look at them—that we believed they needed to be responded to quicker than that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, it's a matter of timing? Because that's what I understood from our statement that was put in. But I wanted to make sure it was just a timing issue. This is going to come up to Council in the June meeting. I want to make sure I have the right material to present it. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's more than timing. It's if. The GNSO has a full plate. They have lots of things. They have priorities. Will they ever have both the will and the time to charter a PDP on data accuracy, for instance? Or on legal/natural?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I just wanted be—

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Or on legal/natural, where two thirds of the Council says we should not look at it at all?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, it's about trust and timing? Thank you. I just wanted to make sure I had the right material to take to Council if I can make an intervention. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Christopher? Olivier and/or Jonathan, give us some guidance as to how much time we have. Christopher, though, is next in the queue.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. I'll be very short. And I'm glad you've just said that it's more than timing. I wish to say very clearly that I absolutely support the At-Large positions that have been described in this unfortunate episode.

I would go a step further. There are increasing instances where GNSO members attempt to refer issues to the GNSO Council in order to override the positions of other SO/ACs. This is a flaw in the ICANN structure. It was not the intention of taking power away from the Board to give it to the community, for the community then to give power to the GNSO Council. That, I think, needs to be looked at but of course, more generally.

Meanwhile, I think Alan and Hadia will see where best to go in the next few weeks. I also would point out that … This is a personal judgment but this whole process will have been watched carefully internationally. And it would be a great shame if, having made enormous effort to render the ICANN privacy policies compatible with international and local applicable law, that we come to this kind of impasse.

But thank you, Alan. You've done a great job. And I hope you can have the perseverance to stick to it for a little bit longer. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Christopher. And one more quick comment on Cheryl's question. When we say "timing," to someone who isn't looking at what the specifics are, that may sound like, "Oh. We want it done now instead of three months from now." But the real difference is will it be done in the next three or four months or will it go into another PDP, which means if the PDP ever gets chartered, it will be another two years plus. So, we're talking a huge quantum if it doesn't get done now, assuming it ever gets done.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no more hands. I'll turn it back to the next item on the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Alan and thanks for this, Hadia. I just had one very small question. Do you think that a face-to-face meeting would have been able to break the deadlock or the status quo that we've reached?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know whether it would have or not but it would have had a far higher chance than what we're doing right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Interesting. For those people that are following these things, and the effects of lockdown and online meetings, it's an interesting societal question. Right. Now, we need to move on. And so, thanks for this. And let's hope that you guys manage to find some kind of a solution. Otherwise, I just think that the SSAD is gone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, before you go on, Cheryl put in a comment, "Or a facilitated one." Maybe. But I give strong credit to our current chair, Janis Karklins, who has done a really good job of trying to intervene, and lay out paths, and find closure, and point out that arguments are not going in productive ways where they are. So, yes. A professional facilitator might

have done differently. But Janis has done a really effective job at doing this a lot of the time. So, just to put that on the table. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And so, now we can move to the Subsequent Procedures with Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Okay. We have quite a number of things to get through within the time. And I'm going to ask Olivier or Jonathan to just keep time for me, please.

The first one I wanted to get through is to settle the final question on community applications, or actually in the community priority evaluations, CPE. [inaudible]. So, last week we agreed … I noted general agreement on the approach that we will take moving forward with community applications and CPE. Okay. And can we move on to the next slide?

So, what has happened since last week is … I set this out last week as well, that it would be a two-prong approach. One would be that we make our positions known on the SubPro Recommendations, be it during this finalization of the final report or during the public comment period itself, depending on where CPWG wants to go with that.

But in the interim, also, we're working on 1B, which is to address in more specificity the details that are not entirely covered in the SubPro Recommendations. And this would branch into four different areas, which the first one would be greater community participation in

selection of the provider. Second one would be changes to the CPE process, which is not guideline-specific. And third one would be changes to the CPE criteria and guidelines, which will cover the actual guidelines in terms of what the CPE provider evaluator should do in the next round, regardless of who that entity or person is. And the fourth one, what we just mentioned on the dispute resolution process.

So, what's happened since last week is, I've tried to address this whole section on 1B in two documents. And the reason why it's two documents is because … Okay. I'll mention the two documents first. The first document is what are termed the At-Large Interventions on Community Based Applications and CPE. And the second document is the actual revised CPE Guidelines Proposal.

So, the reason why it's two documents is because the second one, the Guidelines Proposal, is something that a number of us have been working on for the last, I don't know, four to five weeks, I think. And that is … As I said, it really encompasses only the evaluation guidelines for the next CPE evaluator to use in the next round of applications, whenever that will be. But it's not the right place to raise issues that we have in terms of, for example, selection of the CPE provider. So, those sort of things are put into the first document, which is the At-Large intervention. So, that's the explanation of the two documents.

And the two documents, as they currently stand, as of today, is available on the agenda wiki. Next to the couple these presentations, you'll see two work documents, in PDF format, anyway. And these two are the ones that I have just spoken about.

In terms of one final aspect that we did not come to consensus on, or at least I didn't get a sense of a consensus, was … If we can move on to the next slide. It was the issue of whether we should be lowering the threshold to prevail in CPE. Next slide, please.

Okay. So, I'm bringing that up again. So, this is the issue where, in the last round of the current CPE Guidelines, it says that—sorry, the AGB as well—it says that to prevail in CPE, an applicant has to score at least 14 out of 16 points. So, there was a comment from a number of people, including the Council of Europe, which said that this threshold, 14 out of 16, is too high and it basically doesn't help a lot of communities get past this or get the benefit of CPE to actually secure a TLD.

So, we came to this question about the possibility of revamping the threshold—this threshold itself. But there was also the question of needing to balance whether increasing accessibility would then open the floodgates to abuse and stuff like that.

So then, there was a suggestion to look at, perhaps, data. And I tried to do that. If we can go on to the next slide, please. I tried to do that. And I have to say that it isn't conclusive one way or another because a lot of it depends on how an applicant actually structures their application or describes the community that it's trying to serve in the application for the TLD. So, a lot of it is subjective. It is also dependent on supporting information and data that is provided, either by the applicant, or which is maybe obtained through research, or through support, or in some cases, even opposition.

So, based on that, if we can just look at possible outcomes, which is … If you go to the next slide. So, remember that the CPE actually involved four criteria, right? So, the first criterion is community establishment. And this shows you, for example, .gay. In the last round, they secured full marks for community establishment. But somebody like .kids or the applicant for .kids did not. They actually got zero out of four here. So, in terms of … If we're talking about lowering the threshold, which is the total score out of 16, obviously .kids will still not prevail because they end up scoring 6 out of 16.

Now, in terms of making CPE more accessible to communities, we were looking at two approaches. One is to improve the chances of an applicant or a less traditional community—a less conventional community—to improve their chances of securing more points in each of the criteria. And the second aspect of it is to actually lower the threshold of the total score so that they can get past it or they can actually reach it. It makes it more reasonable to reach.

So, in this situation, we can see that .kids is not going to prevail, per se, even if we lower the threshold. And that's because of a couple things. One is the way they structured the application—the way they structured what they described as the community—and obviously, also, the way that evaluator interpreted that description. So, we need to have a bit more meeting of minds. So, that's an example of the first criteria.

If we move on to the second criterion … Next slide, please. Okay. Yeah. Let's go to criteria number two, nexus. So, here you … No. Yeah. Okay. So, criteria number two, you see that … Let's leave aside .tennis. Look at

.gay and .kids. .kids also scored zero out of four under this nexus criteria. But .gay also scored zero out of four. I suspect that if .gay had been able to appeal or challenge the decision or the determination of the CPE evaluator, they may have possibly scored two out of four here. So, that would have given them another two points and that would be 12 out of 16 that they would have gotten.

.kids, again, I think because the way they structured their community, arguably it could still be said that the nexus isn't established. And so, I don't think they would have gotten full marks here, anyway. It's probably a touch-and-go between two and zero, really.

So, moving on to the next slide. The next, criterion three is about registration policies. There isn't much controversy here, per se. It's a question of either you have all these four items or you don't. So, to get past this particular criterion, you would just have to have all those four things. So, there's no two ways about it.

And the last one is criterion number four—next slide, please—would be the question of support and opposition. Next slide please! I'm sorry. Go ahead. Sorry. Stop, stop. Okay. So here, .gay, I think they had a legitimate complaint in the sense that with opposition, the reason why they scored one of two is because there was a last minute letter of opposition by a group that, I believe, ended up being identified as a supporter of a competing applicant. So, there is a little bit of conflict of interest there, per se. But there were considered, somehow, as relevant opposition by the evaluator and therefore they got one point deducted out of two.

Now again, if they had been able to appeal and pointed to possibly sufficient conflict of interest on the part of that opposer, they may have gotten full marks, two out of two. So, in that situation, they would have gotten 13 out of 16, if they were able to prevail in the appeal. Now, 13 out of 16 wouldn't allow them to pass the threshold of 14 out of 16. So, there could be an argument to support the lowering of the threshold. And last week we talked about possibly lowering it to 12.

So, that's the situation that I am putting on the table. I'm not saying that would have been the case because we really don't know. We can't really prescribe what may not have happened. It's just an indication because someone asked to look at the data. And I'm giving my considered opinion on that. So, the question I would put back to this group is do we proceed with calling for a lowering of the threshold? Jonathan, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Justine. I remember the conversation last week was a couple of things. Alan raised some concern about a slippery slope. But I believe that what there was a rough consensus of … And we didn't do a call for consensus but I believe there was a rough consensus on the notion that if anything, it would be made more difficult as a product of negotiation and in the implementation team.

And so, I thought there was a consensus to move forward with lowering it to 12 as our starting volley, with the understanding that it might go up but that if we tried to negotiate with ourselves, it probably wouldn't come down at all in the future. So, that was the thing, was to ready

ourselves for some discussions that were going to be coming up but to start at the number 12 with the understanding that we might not hold to it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thanks for that. Yes. I sort of remember that you were proposing that approach. But then, we had Alan intervening and then Hadia, saying that we should look at data. So, that's what I've done. If, based on what I've said so far, there is support for this moving ahead with lowering the threshold to 12, then by all means, I'm happy because that's the only thing that's stopping me from sharing the papers that I've done. So, I'd like to hear a bit more input from others, whether they agree or disagree. Christopher, you're next in the queue.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Justine. And thank you for this data analysis of those few applications. It's really quite unique work because in several contexts, we have asked for more data to explain what happened in 2012 and very little has been forthcoming. And I really congratulate you on being able to dig this data out.

I would join the consensus, if that's what we've got, that you should reduce the threshold somewhat. A bit against my grain because from a statistical and economic point of view, as I mentioned in the previous call, it would be possible to be more subtle with greater granularity and that this all-or-nothing scoring approach doesn't suit me at all. I would like to see a wider range of options in the scoring. But I appreciate that from a negotiating point of view, it may be extremely difficult to move

forward on that basis because of the entrenched positions that we are confronting. So, I'm supporting you in reducing the threshold. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Thank you. Claudia's asking me what I need in the poll. So, I don't know. Perhaps Jonathan can give some guidance. I'm looking for, basically, number one, whether we proceed with the lowering of threshold and number two, whether we want to give an indication of how much we want to lower the threshold by. Those would be the two questions that I would like an answer on, if possible.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Justine. Can you please repeat the second question?

JUSTINE CHEW: The second question would be do we agree on lowering it to 12? Yeah. Let's work with 12. I think that's … Unless someone has objections.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's fine. If you want to keep going, Justine, I can text with Claudia to get this done.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Great. Thanks for that. Yeah. So, based on that, then in terms of the outcome, whatever the poll comes up with, I will include that into the two papers that have spoken about, which is the interventions and

also the CPE Guidelines proposal because that is the only thing outstanding in the two documents.

And again, I noted there was general support for the work of the small group that has been working on the Guidelines Proposal to share that document with other stakeholder groups, like maybe GAC. And I am going to put it on the agenda for the next ALAC/GAC meeting.

And also, I have mentioned that something will be coming from the At-Large to SubPro PDP Working Group on CPE. And this response is going to be it. In terms of how they react to it and how they take it up, I really can't say at this moment. Probably, Cheryl will have a better idea. But let's cross that bridge when we get to it.

So, in terms of … Do we have results on the poll yet? Or are people still taking the poll?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Justine, I'm just waiting a bit. We only have 11 who have answered out of 40. Actually, now we have 12. So, I'm going to give it a few more seconds.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. No worries. While that's happening, if I could just maybe describe the two documents a little bit more. If staff wants to just click on the second document, just showing the table of contents. Yes. Correct. If you scroll down to the lower half of the document. Yes. Okay.

So, as I said, this particular document, I have termed as the At-Large Interventions. It's basically covering things that are not suitably included in the actual guidelines that we've been working on—so, things like ICANN engagement of the provider or panelist, what we want see out of it, in terms of the criteria for what we look for in a provider selection process—shortlisting process—and even some input into the contracting that happens between ICANN and CPE provider.

Of course, I don't know how far they will go but that is what we have been talking about—wanting to have more community participation in things like CPE process, changes in the CPE process, which includes things like handling potential conflict of interest. That's not specifically something that should be addressed in the guidelines, per se. But it should be part of the CPE process and the negotiations with the CPE provider.

One major change that we're proposing is the elimination of a supplementary call for the document to support opposition. That is going to affect the process itself because we're basically eliminating one extra process that was created in the last round. And the effect of it is actually reflected in the second document. But the concept of it is described here.

The third one would be things like limited appeals and challenge mechanism because, as I said before, if the applicants had been allowed to appeal in the last round, they may have gotten a different result. And the reason for not having an appeal is because we didn't have the appeals mechanism in the last round. But part of the SubPro PDP recommendations moving forward would be to have a limited challenge

and appeal mechanism to address challenges to CPE determinations and also challenges to determinations by other evaluators, as well as appeals to objections.

Also, the actual changes to the CPE Criteria and Guidelines will touch on great flexibility in interpretation of "community." So, that's something that we've talked very much about. Also, the scoring, in terms of having each criterion and sub-criterion scored independently and there is no bias that's carried forward between the two.

Greater flexibility and clarity in applying sub-criteria and criteria, which talks about just breaking up the questions that need to be evaluated so there is no confusion as to when conjunctive of "or" and "and" applies, so that there is no confusion on the part of the evaluators to say that … If this particular item isn't met then the second item also not met or does it offer an alternative which still avails the applicant to a score of some sort?

And the last one is the threshold to prevail, which we've just taken a poll on and I don't see the results yet. But that is that. And the fourth one would be to touch on the dispute resolution process.

The third part of this document is something I offered to do at the SubPro PDP Working Group—is to look at whether there is an impact of our proposed reforms to the current version of the draft final recommendations of the SubPro PDP Working Group. So, I've done a bit of analysis there.

Okay. So, I see the results of the poll. So, it's looking good. 90% yes to both questions. Okay. So, we have strong consensus to move forward. I'm pleased to hear it because then a big load is taken off my shoulders.

And just coming back to the impact of our proposed reforms on the draft final recommendations, I don't see a negative impact per se, based on the wording of the draft final recommendations. But obviously, if this document goes to discussion by various parties, then presumably it could change the outcome of my analysis. But again, that's something that we can possibly take up as we progress.

Okay. How am I doing for time? Co-chairs?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You still have another five minutes or so because you started at 37 past the hour. So, you've got another five minutes or so.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Okay. I wonder if we should do metrics or GAC advice. Let's do metrics because that's probably more interesting. Can we have metrics?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Justine, the great the about Subsequent Procedures is that you seem to have a pyramid of topics to choose from and never running out of them.

JUSTINE CHEW:
Imagine the amount of time I spend on doing these things. Yes. Can staff pull out the presentation on continuing Subsequent Procedures and metrics and monitoring, please? It's the next presentation under "consensus building," item A. No, no, no. We're done with CPE. So, we're moving on to continuing Subsequent Procedures, metrics. If you go to the agenda page, look under—right after the three documents that I uploaded, there's a subtitle called "consensus building." If you can click on "Continuing Subsequent Procedures, Metrics and Monitoring." Yes. That's the one. Thank you.

Okay. Let's try and get through this in five minutes. Whoops. Okay. Moving on to the next slide. Yes. All right. So, in terms of continuing Subsequent Procedures, the questions really are—that At-Large have, anyway, or that have been mentioned in the past—is firstly, do we really need another round of new gTLDs? The answer to that, obviously, depends on who you ask. But in any case, the train is moving. It's chugging along and there's work being done to proceed with at least coming up with a policy for the next round—to apply to the next round. So, we're being carried along that way.

The second question would be what is the cost versus the benefit of expanding the DNS space and how are we measuring this? Which brings me to the metrics section.

And the third one, obviously, is if a new round proceeds then we really want the pre-requisites and the high-priority recommendations from the CCT Review to be implemented first. And I believe the third bullet, as it stands, is something that we are still standing firm to. Okay. So, next slide, please.

Thank you. All right. So, in terms of the continuing Subsequent Procedures topic, we're looking at … I think I need to look at my version because this is a bit small for me. Give me a second, please.

Okay. Much better. In terms of continuing Subsequent Procedures, the impact of affirmation one is that … They concluded that there's no compelling reason to not develop a systematic way of applying for new gTLDs and also that—this is a curious one or interesting one—that if SubPro PDP has taken the position that … They have considered the prerequisites and the high-priority recommendations of CCT Review Team but they believe that they're not obligated to agree with all of them. And to the extent that it did, they have considered and addressed them in the separate relevant topics that a particular recommendation applies to.

In terms of whether we want to push back on this, I leave it to the floor. I'm going to proceed on until I see a hand up or an intervention by anyone. Moving on to slide number five. Slide number four is just the details for affirmation number one. Slide number five is affirmation number two and affirmation number three. I've taken this together to say that—because they're basically affirmation … The second one is the affirmation of a principle from the 2007 policy that recommends that the program must continue to be administered in an ongoing, orderly, timely, and predictable manner. So, nothing objectionable, per se, there.

Affirmation three talks about affirming that the primary purpose of the new gTLDs are to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS. Okay. So, my comment would be these are very

high-level affirmations. They're objectionable, per se. But obviously, the devil's in the details.

Right. Moving on, metrics and monitoring. So, under the metrics and monitoring topic, which is a new topic that the SubPro PDP working group has created, would be that recommendation one talks about meaningful metrics to be identified, to understand impact of the program. And to review metrics, data must be collected at a logic timeframe to create a basis against which future data can be compared.

So, it goes on to provide some implementation guidelines, which is that metrics is collected to understand impact. Should be, broadly speaking, focused on areas of trust, competition, and choice. And they noted that the CCT Review final report had a series of recommendations regarding metrics and that the work for development of metrics should be in accordance with the CCT Recommendations currently adopted by the Board, as well as any adopted in the future.

Okay. So, it would appear that the responsibility for developing actual metrics to measure the impact of the program would fall to the implementation review team. So, my question to the group is does this sufficiently meet At-Large's call for metrics. And if not, what else do we need to say has to be specified at this point in time? Christopher, I see your hand up. Thank you. Go ahead, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. I have several interesting things to say, I hope, on this field. But I don't think we have time for them this evening. But on this specific point, At-Large will have to conduct a significant additional effort,

politically and in time, I'm afraid, to get this point on metrics through. There are significant numbers of people in the PDP who think the CCT Recommendations, as approved by the Board, are optional. The idea that we have put forward that the recommendations should be implemented before there is another round, I think that has not made any progress at all in the PDP. But that remains to be seen.

And finally, there is a view in the PDP that the New Applicant Guidebook should be relevant and, indeed, applied directly to all subsequent rounds. This is a once-and-for-all change in the Applicant Guidebook. The Applicant Guidebook is … I think that's totally unrealistic, given that there are very significant areas of policy which have been deliberately ignored by the PDP and will come back to worry ICANN in the future.

But enough said. We have to give significant political priority, including in the GNSO Council, to make sure that the CCT Recommendations are implemented before the next round begins.

JUSTINE CHEW: Jonathan, you're next. Go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Justine. I think the key to … I ended up having a discussion with Sebastien about this, I think in the context of ATRT at this point. But now, I've lost track. I think the key area of this particular issue around metrics is that it may require the collection of data at the start of the program and can't be left until such a time as you're trying to review it. And so, some addition about collecting the data necessary to measure

these metrics sometime in the future, I think, has got to be a part of this recommendation. Does that make sense?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just on that point, Jonathan, indeed, yes. And as Justine said, the IRT is currently being burdened with this task. The IRT is not remotely qualified or competent. This is a job for the staff. It's the job for a significant department on economics and statistics within the ICANN organization.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. So that could be a separate point about whether it's staff or not that need to do that. I think the community can play a role in determining in what good metrics represent. And there's certainly a lot of information in the CCTRT to make suggestions about that. But part of the problem is waiting too long to collect data because then you don't have deltas. If you're looking for improvement in consumer confidence, if you're looking for improvements in consumer trust, etc. then you're going to need to be collecting data from before a new round begins, as well. So, it's not enough to identify metrics. Processes need to be put in place to collect data prior to a new round as well.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Jonathan. Sure. I totally agree with that logic. The question, then, I have for you is … In terms of recommendation one, it implies that meaningful metrics are needed. And it also says that data must be collected at a logical time to create a basis against future data. So, do

we want to improve on that idea, to actually specify the time by which to start collecting data?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe. I think that, as we're going to end up saying so often, it's got to be prior to the launch of any new round. I think that's going to be the logical time.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. The way I see it is IRT is going to proceed the next round anyway. So, we need the IRT to do the work for all the planning and all the—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agreed. Yeah. It's going to proceed. But I guess the collection of data needs to precede the new round as well. That's what I guess I was saying. The identification acquisition changes the contracts to allow for the collection of data. All of those things are going to need to happen before a new round takes place.

JUSTINE CHEW: Absolutely.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's a small change but I feel like it's going to be a common refrain from the At-Large, which is, "Let's get our homework done before we launch into this this time."

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Well-taken. Well-noted. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just to say to Jonathan that I cut and paste what the ATRT3 final report says about CCT Review and specifically about what you were talking about, the framework of data collection. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Cheryl, you're next. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Justine. Here I am putting on my co-chair of SubPro hat. I'm just asking you all, are you reading recommendations, and implementation guidance, and working group rationale as a bundle? Or are you somehow looking at them in a unique and unconnected aspect? Because it is the intent that much of what I've heard about the At-Large view is indeed fitted in and not in conflict with what we have in our recommendation one.

                             And thank you for noting, Sebastien, that we in ATRT3 did pay particular attention to this. And that's also in keeping with what is coming out of CCTRT and, of course, what is being [booted] into SubPro as well. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Cheryl. Yes. So, Jonathan, did you want to respond to that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I confess that I have not fully read the report to make that determination. And we have, in American legislative practices, something called "legislative intent" that's sometimes referred back to. I think some things need to be explicit on the top line, that there are certain things that need to pre-requisites that's all. I'm sorry to be a broken record about it but my experience coming out of the CCTRT is such that I feel the need to be.

JUSTINE CHEW: No problem. I always get caught because in terms of … What Cheryl has said, in terms of reading the whole package as one, that is exactly the reason why I have details in the presentation. Now, in terms of doing it that way, then it becomes a distraction because I understand that people don't naturally listen to what I have to say when there's a lot of text on the presentation and people start reading. And then, it just become overwhelming because there's just too much text. So, there's always a fine balance in trying to capture both aspects of this problem, per se. Yeah. It's tough balance.

So, how do we move forward? Perhaps, if I can just go through the other two recommendations, because that it's already 20 past, just to get through this particular topic. And then, maybe we can revisit it at a later point when people have had an opportunity to digest the whole package as it is.

So, recommendation number two. Next slide, please. This one has to do with establishing metrics and service-level requirements for each phase

of the process, including review, evaluation, contracting, and transition to delegation. So, I believe what this gets to is that there has been claims, or there has been complaints, that we don't have enough data at various points in the chain, from getting applicants right up to delegation, in order to support proper decision making.

And therefore, this recommendation is trying to get at that, to press for the establishing of metrics and service-level requirements for each phase, and monitoring that performance, and, obviously, collecting data, and trying to derive key performance indicators to help the decision process.

Again, the question … It's something that's going to fall onto the IRT again because it gets into a little bit more detail, from a policy level, anyway. So again, the question is does this recommendation and the rationale that explains the recommendation, does it sufficiently meet the At-Large call for metrics?

Okay. And the third one, which is recommendation number three—next slide, please, yes—is the service-level monitoring for TLD operations. It's suggesting that ICANN must develop SLA monitoring to allow for more robust, ongoing monitoring of TLD operations and also to publish anonymized aggregate SLA monitoring data on a regular basis. Again, the details of it will be punted off to the IRT for development. The question is does anything else specific need to be raised at this point in time?

Okay. So, I'll leave those questions to the group. Perhaps, I'll put this back onto the agenda at some point in time and we can have a more

robust discussion once people have digested the actual intent of the recommendations, together with the implementation guidance. But if you have comments now, by all means, put it in the chat and we can pick that up later. With that, I will hand the floor back to the co-chairs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. And of course, thanks very much for your very, very hard work. I'm in awe when I see this and I wish I had the determination, knowledge, and ability to do such thorough analysis of the issues. It's really great because it does help, I think, many of us in understanding the issues a lot better and certainly brings a lot more informed discussion in our calls.

Let's move to agenda item number four now. And for this, we have Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. So, we're running a little close to time. I'll just be brief. You can see the executive summaries that are to be confirmed on the agenda of the recent statements that were ratified by the ALAC, including the AFRALO statement on the ICANN Africa Regional Plan. And there are a couple public comments out that the OFB Working Group will be discussing on their next call. Those have to do with the multistakeholder model and the Latin American Caribbean Regional Strategic Plan.

And for the current statements in development by the ALAC, there's an announcement just for the NCAP Study One ALAC statement. That has been circulated several times on the CPWG list. The draft statement has received no comments. So, Justine reached out to staff and Maureen today. And we think we will go ahead and launch the ALAC vote on this so that it can then be submitted as already ratified to public comment. So, just to let everyone know it's closing for comment today unless there are further comments.

And then, the ccNSO PDP 3, this public comment was discussed by Hadia and Barrack on a previous call. And it closes in a few weeks' time, on the 10th of July. And a draft is in progress for this one. So, I'll turn it over back to you, Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess I would just ask if there's anyone that's involved in one of these that wants to raise a point. But I don't think there's anything in particular that I feel the need to add. Okay. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. I just have a question regarding the statement on NCAP study. There is a statement that's on there. I haven't seen any comments on this. And the statement does close. The deadline for submitting the statement is the 17th, which is next Wednesday. Do we need to obtain closure on this, on this call?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which one? Say that again. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The Name Collision Analysis Study.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I feel like we have closure, based on Justine's previous recommendations, for a statement. I don't think there was any opposition to her plan. Her hand is up so, Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thanks, Jonathan. Yeah. I touched on the topic of name collisions and included the public comments for NCAP Study One and in that presentation. The group had decided on the direction for the statement. And I acted upon that and that has been up for more than a week, I think. I don't remember exactly. So, there wasn't any comments per se but it directly addresses what the group wanted so I don't necessarily see a problem with that. So, yeah. I think it's fine. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Justine. I think so, too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. So, what I thought, perhaps, was we could give the green light as a group to pass this on to the ALAC and the vote can proceed forward and things so they don't have to submit it late.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Is there any objection to forwarding this on to the ALAC? I'm not sure we need a poll for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's more of a consensus call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Justine, I think we pass it on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Well, thank you for this again. And we can then now go back to you, Jonathan, for the At-Large ICANN 68 talking points. You might be muted.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I think I'm here. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. You're back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Excellent. So, the structure of these talking points, this time around—it's always an ongoing, evolving, experimental thing—is to look at our general talking points and then also to list out sessions that are taking place, some of which are ours and some of which are others that are relevant places for those issues, and potentially represent places for intervention, except in the case of meetings that are closed and you

might just be monitoring, in which case it's an opportunity for just observation and perhaps reporting back.

So, on DNS abuse, the talking points are not new. The current levels of DNS are unacceptable and rising. Compliance needs new tools to combat systemic abuse. And no new round of applications until DNS abuse is more thoroughly addressed.

Some of the relevant sessions that are taking place at ICANN 68 include a plenary on DNS abuse and malicious registrations during COVID-19; DNS Abuse: Establishing an Acceptable Threshold; DNS Abuse, COVID-19, and End User Issues—that's Joanna's session; GAC DNS Abuse Mitigation, with the Public … My brain just … I forgot what the "S" is. But the Public Service Working Group is … They have two sessions and then there's a DNSSEC and Security Workshop. So presumably, when we have this session, we would be trying to take volunteers and make sure that we had At-Large coverage of each of these meetings. So, that's the structure that we're going on. Next slide.

Another ongoing issue is that of registrants' data. Our talking points is that want to protect the privacy of registrants but need to balance that with consumer protection. The current EPDP outcome is insufficient to protect individual end users. The relevant sessions at ICANN 68 include the GNSO Registration Data Policy and also the DNS Abuse, COVID-19, and End User Issues. Again, raise your hand if you believe there's another session that I've left out. I just did a quick scan of the schedule. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Just a question. In terms of we shouldn't move forward until all the CCT Recommendation are completed, that's under DNS abuse. But aren't we saying something broader about that CCT Review, in saying there are lots of recommendations in there and there lots of ones that aren't necessarily DNS but that are end user important.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Certainly. And I think part of the complexity of the CCT Review implementation is threefold. There were different rankings of which things were prerequisites for a new round within the CCT Review. There were some things that were accepted by the Board and we need to look into how those implementations are going. And then, some things were requests to consider or make a decision about and things like that. And some of those were, in fact, passed to the GNSO and, as Cheryl put in the chat, were considered there.

And so, I think we're going to, at some point, have to move away from, "Implement everything in the CCTRT before there's a new round" and narrow that down to what we think has yet to be done and become more specific about that. But certainly, there's issues around data collection that are particularly important in the CCT Review and there's issues around things like string similarity.

Many of those things are, in fact, addressed in Justine's and her small team's scorecards, where in many instances, she's actually comparing the recommendation to the recommendation in the CCT Review. And so, I think we've achieved that level of specificity in many of those instances because of Justine's rigor with this.

So, at some point, we might want to just create what's left to be done on the CCT Review. But I think it's not just DNS abuse and I think Justine's been rigorous about putting all of the recommendations that we've been evaluating together in the context of the CCTRT. So, I think your concerns are addressed but it's probably worth looking back holistically at the review report and seeing if anything fell through the cracks. Does that make sense?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. It does. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Mm-hmm. So, these were the big sessions that I think where the issues of registrant data might come up. Next slide. Remember, this is one of those policy meetings and so there isn't, for example, a public forum and other areas that we may otherwise bring these things up.

In Subsequent Procedures, just overarching talking points. The work of the SubPro Working Group is as yet incomplete. There's a lot that's being passed on to the Implementation Review. And there are also issues, as Christopher brought up, that have yet to be addressed at all. Somebody's unmuted themselves.

The DNS abuse concerns—there's supposed to be the word "abuse" in there—must be addressed prior to any new rounds. And I'm trying to find a generalized way of putting this but the At-Large remains concerned about indigenous and community participation in the new gTLD program. So, in my mind, that encompasses applicant support,

community priority evaluations, and geographic names. And so, there's this notion of economic imperialism that we remain concerned about.

So, the relevant sessions are the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group; the PICs and PICDRP Session that Holly is managing; the DNS and COVID-19 End-User Issues that Joanna is managing; the GAC Subsequent Rounds discussions—there's three sessions on that; and the new gTLD Applicants: Expanding The Circle session that Olivier is running.

So, there's a lot of this topic because the GNSO have identified it as something to try and maintain momentum on despite the complexities of the world we're living in, with respect to remote meetings and things like that. And so, while having Subsequent Procedures is not a priority for the At-Large, the fact that it is a GNSO Priority means that it needs to be a priority for jbgtus to address. Next slide.

More generally, there's this notion of Registry Voluntary Commitments, previously referred to as PICs. Our talking points on that is the work of the SubPro. Sorry. I hit "duplicate slide" and didn't put in the right talking points for this. I apologize. We're obviously concerned about private … Okay. Somebody's got to mute. Thanks. We're still up on the previous slide. Sorry.

So, on PIC, that talking points are basically that PICs, to date, have not been a successful tool to hold registries to their commitments. And so, that's a combination of how they're structured, how they're enforced, etc. And so, reform is necessary or a new model altogether needs to be

developed in order to find a way for registries to be held to the commitments that they make.

And so, the big sessions there are going to be the PICs and PICDRP sessions that Holly is doing as well as the GAC Subsequent Rounds discussions, some of which, when we get the agendas, will include PICs. And so, hopefully we can refine this further as it develops. Okay. Next slide.

Another big campaign-level issue for the At-Large is universal acceptance. Talking points here are 80% of websites are non-compliant. In other words, they don't accept either IDNs or gTLDs of over 3 characters. This undermines ICANN's credibility and again is something that we need to address. And we are in our comment on Subsequent Procedures in terms of having … We made some very specific recommendations there on universal acceptance.

The relevant sessions at ICANN 68, there is a prep session, which is Universal Acceptance Annual Strategic Plan, which is from the Steering Committee. And then, there is Satish's session on Aligning Universal Acceptance and International Domain Names with the Multilingual Internet: End User Perspectives.

And I think that might be it. Is there another slide? Oh. Yeah. And I threw this on at the end. Other things that fall outside of our focus issues right now but that I think would be of interest to individual end users is there's a session on the DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks and Challenges; and ICANN and COVID-19: Advancing Policy Work in the Current Environment. How do we keep

doing our work, given the current environment? And obviously, we're facing our own Zoom fatigue and everything else and so I think that'll be part of the conversations that take place.

So, this is the skeleton of the document that will continue to evolve up until the presentation on the first day of ICANN 68. Any questions? All right. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan, for this. And we can now go any other business. Not seeing any hands up. That means we only have to, now, check when our next call is going to be. Oh. Just one thing to mention whilst staff finds out when our next call will be. I'd like to point out the At-Large policy sessions at ICANN meeting. There's a second link to it there, for some reason. It's a new resource. You can have a look at that. When do we next call each other? Go ahead, Claudia. You have the floor.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Let's see. Just checking the calendar. One moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, it will be the 17th?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. So, we do have the 17th, next week, at 13:00 UTC but again, with no interpretation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: With no interpretation. Correct. Okay. So, 13:00 UTC next week on the 17th.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Claudia, do we have RTT?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: I'm not sure, Judith. I will have to check with Christina, who's in charge of that, and I will get back to you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. Because it's not the ICANN week yet. So, that's why I was wondering.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Correct. Yeah. We'll double check and reach out to you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: All right. Thanks.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Thanks, everyone. And thanks to our interpreters for remaining the extra 12 minutes after the official end of this call. I hope this has been an interesting call for you. Please check all the work that is in the subsequent procedures. There is so much to read and to learn from. And we'll have, as Jonathan said, plenty of discussions in the ICANN meeting relating to this. So, if you read the material, we'll be able to have an even better discussion, then. And with this, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. Goodbye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]