YEŞIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 6th of January 2021 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call.

We have received apologies from Bill Jouris, Vanda Scartezini, Yrjö Länsipuro, and from Cheryl Langdon-Orr; as well as from Maureen Hilyard. And from staff side we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, present on today's call and I'll also be doing Call Management. Our interpreters are Veronica and David on the Spanish channel. And Isabelle and Jacques on the French channel.

And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well please. And one last reminder is for the real time transcription service provided and I'm just going to share the link with you here on the Zoom chat. Please do check the service. And with this, I would like to lead the floor back to Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. And welcome everyone to this new year of At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group calls. This is the first one of the year in 2021, and I hope that you've had a good break during the holiday period and that you've stayed safe and healthy during that time. Mentioning this because I've had some friends that've not been in this

---

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.

situation. So, hopefully you've all managed to stay safe and continue staying safe in the current crazy pandemic that we're living at the moment.

Anyway, we've got some topics today on our agenda that are going to spring some reminder as to what we usually talk about. One is the expedited PDP with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. We'll have a short update on that. We'll have also a short update from Justine Chew on the subsequent procedures and then afterwards, Evin Erdoğdu and Jonathan Zuck will be taking us through our current statements and they actually are mostly related to the topics that we're already speaking about in the work group updates. That means that the whole call might happen to be rather—I wouldn't say short—but less long than we usually have it. Or, who knows, we might have some big discussions to follow on. There's any other business at the end of the call with the follow-up from the letter to David Conrad, the ICANN office of the chief technical officer related to Mozilla discussions on DoH.

At this point in time are there any amendments, additions, deletions to the agenda as it currently is? Not seeing any hands up, the agenda is approved as it is currently is on your screen and we go to our action items from the 16th of December—that feels like such a while ago—and there are three action items. The one that remains unchecked at least on my screen is for Evin Erdoğdu to circulate the Google Doc on the ALAC statement regarding subsequent procedures. Evin, could I just turn to you and ask whether that's in the pipeline or what is the status on that?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Sure. Thank you, Olivier. Yes. Thank you, Olivier. It is indeed in the pipeline. Actually, Justine had circulated the document on the Google list, and I may circulate it again after this meeting as the timeline has been adjusted. So, that's in progress. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much for this, Evin.

Keeping silent for a couple of seconds if anybody has a comment or follow-up on any of the action items. I'm not seeing anybody put their hand up so we can go to our work group updates.

And today—well, you can see on the agenda that there are three listed. There's the IGO work track with Carlos Gutiérrez and Yrjö Länsipuro and I think that's still yet to start. I just heard Carlos earlier—and Carlos, could you just confirm to us please that…

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ: Yes. Yes. Nothing new. We don't even—I'm not sure we have a date for the start yet. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Carlos. So that's standing by for the time being but as you can see, it's ready to roll. Now, the next topic is the expedited policy development process. And I believe that's Alan Greenberg who's going to provide us with an update, or Hadia. But I heard that it was Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan will start.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Very short, as reported last at some previous CPWG meeting, the EPDP did meet once in December. It will be meeting again next week for the first time. There are a number of homework assignments essentially to identify questions and comments on any of the documents that we'll be considering. And work is ongoing on that. We don't have anything to present at this point—at least I don't.

There are meetings being held with other groups within the EPDP that we are typically of like-minds with. And whether something will come out of that jointly or simply be part of the process by which we're considering things is not clear at this point, probably the later.

But there is work that will be ongoing and we should have something that will be sent out to the CPWG about the same time that it goes to the EPDP group. That is probably very late this week, early next week. More likely early next week. Or hopefully early next week.

The other things—there's a couple of links in the agenda that are worthy of looking at. As I'm talking, I see at least one of the links doesn't work anymore, at least on my machine it says, "Bad gateway." So, I'm not quite sure if the links need to be fixed or not. One of them is a blog

from the ICANN CEO and the other one is a document from the US Congress. Many of you know the US finally passed a COVID Relief Bill which included continued funding of the US Government at the end of last year. And it's included, in the implementation of it, instructions to the NTIA to, number one, continue to support making WHOIS type data available through the EPDP. And it's not a law but it's encouraging; it is a strong indication. So, that's not a surprise.

The second part which was somewhat of a surprise to some people— not to others—was there are words there that essentially say they should consider instruction or requiring US based registries and registrars to make information available. That presumably is not counter to EPDP but not in excess of what EPDP requires either, which of course are among the things that are being considered at this point.

Right now, there is over implementation of the EPDP. That of course could change completely with the new US government. But the words are there, and I think they came a bit of a shock to some people. In any case, work is proceeding, I have no other comment at this point. And Haida may have something she wants to add.

There is a meeting with some of our like-minded groups immediately following this meeting so there might be more to talk about afterwards, but we are today at this point where we are. Thank you.

HAIDA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Thank you, Alan. So, you actually covered everything. I would just quickly add to those who don't know that Keith Drazek, former GNSO council, is currently the chair of the EPDP phase 2A. And

we are currently discussing the selection of a vice chair. And as Alan mentioned, worldwide we see directions and governments talking about registration data and its importance and maybe issuing also laws and/or regulations in that direction. And as Alan already said, the US congress did pass a bill in that direction. And the bill also includes funds and expectations to how those funds should be used, which include actually registration data.

And in Europe, we have the European Commission adopting a new proposal for a revised directive on security of network information assistance. And also, this one goes in the direction of allowing access to registration data to those with legitimate purposes and for legitimate use. And this also pushes in the direction of seeing registration data as a public good and as a requirement for a certain stakeholders.

And also, with all those movements, we can see the importance of when we in phase 2 of the EPDP, when we said we need to have a system that can evolve. We need to have a system that, as legal clarity is there, can be adjusted and can move towards maybe more centralization. And we're already seeing those moves and those directions and that emphasizes the importance of having such a system. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. The floor is open for comments or questions. I'm not seeing any hands up—I do have a question myself. And that's to do with what Hadia mentioned here just now and the foreseeing the chance that the amendments or whatever, the decisions

of the report and so on might change with the changing environment and so on.

When one looks at the change in regulation in the US or potentially the change in regulation in the US or the demands [of what's been] put on NTIA which effectively is a moving of the goal posts in some way—either a moving of the goal post or a setting of some goal posts when there weren't some in the past—and the potential for changes in the European side, did the group—and I think there was some discussion—but did the group look at what would happen if the regulations and demands of the European side would be different from the regulations and demands from the US side? Was there some thought given on this?

I see that Alan has put his hand up. We'll go to Alan and then we'll go to the queue. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We didn't consider it explicitly but implicitly in ICANN's processes are we can't ask people to disobey the law. So, if a law's changed to require something to be done then we'll have to react and presumably there'll be another interim specification and another PDP that will have to address it. You know, depending on what the time frames are and things like that. But ICANN works slowly and if there are simply indications that things can be done but don't have to be done, then ICANN's not likely to hold another PDP anytime soon on this.

That's my personal opinion. You know, everyone is fed up with this as possible whether you like the results or not. So, another PDP which isn't mandatory required by law, not likely. If there are changes in the law

which force groups to do something, there already are carveouts saying you can't tell someone to disobey the law and we may simply rely on that, but ultimately, we have to change the policy one way or another. So, did we consider it and plan for it? Not really but all of our processes implicitly cover that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But if the law is different in the US than in Europe what happens?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're not likely to see a US law that says violate European law. You might see however a US law which makes sure that people don't do anything more than is required. And if the intent of the US is to make all WHOIS public again—not likely but let's pretend we're in the extreme that all WHOIS data must be public as was the position taken by the NTIA for longest time. Then they're likely to have carveouts for those subject to GDPR, but it wouldn't necessarily be wider than that. So, exactly how that would be implemented, your guess is as good as mine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll go to Hadia Elminiawi and then to Holly Raiche, since Hadia is one of our representatives there. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. So, I think one thing that we need to start considering is the consequences—and I'm talking about EPDP phase 2A. We were always looking at what are the consequences or risks for

making the differentiation in relation to natural and legal persons. And one thing we didn't look at, what are the consequences of actually not differentiating? And what are the risks that could accompany not differentiating? Because GDPR requires the differentiation, right, but we might see other regulations and rules also require the same. So, I think one area we need to start looking at is what are the risks of actually not following the law and not making [this differentiation].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Hadia. I think we lost—or at least I lost the last part of your sentence. All right. Let's go to Holly Raiche please. Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And I think Alan and Hadia have largely answered my question. But we're this far down the track and suddenly it looks as if there might be a slight turn in the road with this NTIA and possibly EU— it almost feels like a little bit of a back track. And I'm just wondering, is this going to have any implications for finalization of the EPDP 2A or is this going to change the outlook and the place we've got to so far? Just a sentence or two. Just wondering where EPDP is headed now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Alan? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. Well, phase 1 is largely implemented. There're still some modifications to it that were in the phase 2 report. So, that's a done deal at this point, it's policy. Phase 2, the SSAD, which did not get that much really strong support from the wider community, is not implemented and the Board may of course choose to delay implementation of that; it's a huge expense with a long timeline to implement. And the Board may choose to defer that or even defer a decision until there's more clarity going forward, so that certainly could happen.

Other than that, the world will unfold the way it does, and this is not particularly surprising—remember we have had comments all along, including from ICANN Org and certainly from us saying, "Hey, European law enforcement is hurting. They're part of the same EU governments that passed this legislation, why don't they do anything?" Well, they seem to have done something. The new initiatives that may be coming out of the EU address some of the concerns from both intellectual property holders and law enforcement and cyber security people.

So, we always knew that if they did something—whatever that means— it's going to take a long time. And these things take a while to unfold. So, this is not particularly surprising. But we're moving at glacial speeds which I guess for the overall earth is fast but from an Internet point of view is rather slow. So, it is what it is, and we will react as ICANN normally does. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for these wise words, Alan. Are there any other comments or questions from anyone? Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. I will just add a quick thing in relation to recommendations 1 to 18 of EPDP phase 2. In that regard ICANN Org is currently working on a proposed operational design phase that would become part of the policy on implementation. And in this operational design phase ICANN Org would assess the impact of the proposed policy recommendations in terms of risks, costs, resources, and timelines. And this will be subject to a public comment period after which the Board will start considering the recommendations. So, let's see what will come out of this design phase. And we will have an opportunity to comment anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. Thanks for this. Do you have any other updates, either you or Alan, on this topic?

I am not seeing either of you. So, thanks very much for this update. We can now therefore move to the subsequent procedures. Another long-standing topic which no doubt has continued its course. And for this we have Justine Chew now joining us. Justine, welcome, and you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Wishing everybody a happy new year. Okay. Well, just by way of a short update. Okay, Yeşim, I notice that you put it on the agenda list Wiki. I've just posted a couple of links that Yeşim has

also posted on the agenda for this SubPro update. Basically, there is the timeline. Well, let's go back a little bit. The PDP for subsequent procedures is, I can happily say, coming to an end soon. It's been almost five years. And the end is expected to take place the week after next on the 18th of Jan. And the timeline that the SubPro PDP working group is working towards now is you will see via the first link; it will be posted there on the timeline. And what has happened is the final report, the text [for it] has been frozen and the consensus call is happening now.

Now I have to say this is not the typical public comment that we normally participate in. This is the end process of a PDP by which the members of the SubPro PDP working group are now asked to participate in the consensus call. So, it doesn't involve the community via stakeholders. It involves only the members of the SubPro PDP working group itself. Okay. So those are the people that are participating in the consensus call. But what has—in effect, what can happen is, by way of my participation as a member of the SubPro PDP working group, I can make comments on behalf of the ALAC and in fact submit a statement that can be included in the final report of the subsequent procedures PDP.

So, that's what we've been working towards in the last five to six calls of last year. And based on that, we have come up with a provisional statement which is what you'll see in the second link in the chat, something that I posted in chat. And this is a provisional statement. The reason why it's provisional is because it's been developed based on the inputs and discussions that we've had in the last five to six calls of the CPWG where we have identified eight areas for which we would like to make a comment on for inclusion into the final report. And basically,

they touch on areas or recommendations to those areas which we have found to be either unacceptable which is quite few—just a few—or we have found to be short as in they're not as comprehensive as we would like them to be.

And these are the eight areas that we're covering in the provisional ALAC statement which is to do with: DNS abuse, mitigation, enforceability of public interest commitments, closed generics, and applicant support, auctions and private resolution, community priority evaluation, GEO names, and the ALAC standing and community objections. So, these are the eight topics that we've identified based on our calls in the last six CPWG calls, where we're making a comment. And the reason why it's provisional is because as I said, the PDP is now going to the phase of a consensus call.

So, depending on what happens at the end of consensus call where the co-chairs will evaluate the inputs derived from the consensus call and make a determination on whether some of the recommendations are going to be recommended or whether they've received full support or insufficient support or so forth, based on the GNSO policy process, we may need to tweak this provisional statement to include things that may need to be included.

I'll give you an example, which is CPE. Many of the CPE recommendations and implementation guidelines to do with CPE came after the draft final report was out for public comment. So, therefore many of these recommendations and implementation guidelines to do with CPE have not actually gone through a public comment process. They would be [derived later]. So, there could be parties or individuals

or members of the SubPro PDP working group who are opposed to some of these recommendations and implementation guidelines.

Now if it happens that the co-chairs after the consensus process declares that some of these or all of these are not going to be recommended based on no consensus position, then obviously we're going to have to adjust this provisional statement to say that whatever we want to be included and this provisional statement would become a final statement and it would go into the final report, basically recording what ALAC's opinion is on the topics listed. Okay.

And we also agreed that apart from an ALAC statement to be submitted as part of the final report, we have been developing also a parallel ALAC advice to the Board. You'll see this on the same Google doc as well—the earlier portion of it anyway. Okay. Well, both these drafts have been open or available for comments since 19 of December. So, that's where we are at now. And the consensus call will close on the 8th of January after which the results of the consensus call will be released on the 11th of January. And then the PDP working group will have a call on the 12th of January to discuss the designations. And any statements by way of minority reports are expected to be submitted by the 18th of January.

So, what's happening for us is the provisional ALAC statement will be finalized after the consensus call designations have been released. So, basically, I'm looking at the 13th of January to finalize the ALAC statement for ALAC vote on the 14th so that we can have it ratified for submission to the GNSO SubPro PDP working group anyway on the 18th of January. Okay? So, I invite anyone who has still got comments to make to do so on the Google doc, and I think we can have an action

item for Evin to circulate this provisional ALAC statement draft. That's it from me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Justine. The queue is now open for comments and questions. And I see Alan Greenberg's hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just one comment that there has been some discussion within the EPDP, and [it's been] mention here also, of what happens if there are any recommendations that do not have consensus? And there may not be, but the evaluation of consensus may end up with some recommendations having strong support for other things or even divergent opinions. Now, if those recommendations had had that position clearly expressed during the PDP, they wouldn't have made it in as recommendations. But they are now, and the leadership of the PDP has correctly interpreted the guidelines of what a leadership of the PDP should do is to evaluate the level of consensus.

What has changed is the GNSO council's reaction to how it treats "recommendations"—I put recommendations in quotes—that don't actually have consensus within the working group. Until recently, such recommendations were never approved and passed on. But for the EPDP, they were. And then it becomes a Board issue of whether to judge whether to implement that recommendation or not. So, that world is changed and there are some feelings in the PDP from across the

board that we should not be making recommendations that the PDP does not actually recommend, with the consensus of the PDP.

How that plays out, we'll have to see. At this point there may not be any recommendations that don't have consensus and the whole discussion will be rather theoretical. But we'll have to see where that plays out. That may require us to make additional statements or something like that to the Board. Or for that matter in our minority statement if it turns out that way. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Justine, any thoughts on this?

JUSTINE CHEW: Not really at this point in time. I'm not expecting any surprises per se. But in the event that there will be—in the event that there is surprises, we will know when the consensus call designations are released on the 11th, which is why I need the extra couple of days to finalize this provisional ALAC statement if surprises turn out. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Justine. And I am not seeing any other hands up. So, I guess the next steps really for this is for everyone on the call to look through this document, this provisional ALAC statement and include any of their comments as comments. Is that what you're looking for at this stage? It's been up there for quite a while already.

JUSTINE CHEW: As I said, this provisional ALAC statement has been available for comments since 19 of December. We might do a couple of tweaks here and there just to make sure the language is clear. But essentially, they relay what has been discussed by CPWG in the last six or so calls in terms of whether we are agreeable in totally or partially to some of the recommendations in these topics. So, I don't expect anyone to make any major changes, maybe suggestions on whether the text needs to be clarified in any way. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Justine. And just to note that this document, if you—and I've seen that a lot of people are on the document—if you click on it, it's actually in the middle of the Google doc. It's not the very beginning of the Google doc, you have to scroll down a number of pages. The whole process by which this is being built.

So, I'm not seeing any other hands up. Thank you very much, Justine, as usual for this excellent work. And we hope to see a few more comments until next week when you'll take us to the next stage for this.

We can now go to our agenda item number 4. And that's the policy comment update with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu. So, over to you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you so much, Olivier. This will probably be a little bit short actually. There've been no recently ratified statements by the ALAC since the last CPWG meeting but there are quite a few upcoming public

comment proceedings in the pipeline. And just as a reminder for us in the new year, we have a new formatted agenda with tabs. So, if you have the agenda in front of you, you can click on the month showing which public comment proceedings are coming. So, January has three upcoming and March then has four. So, currently there aren't any scheduled in February but that may change.

And then there currently no public comments for discissions but there are two current statements in development which have already been discussed but there may be some further comment, one being of course the ALAC Advice and ALAC Statement regarding SubPro which Justine just reviewed, but then also the priority 2 policy recommendations for ICANN Board consideration from EPDP phase 2. And this closes on the 21st of January, later this month. So, I'm not sure if there are further comments on that one. Otherwise, we've reviewed these topics. Thanks. Over to Jonathan or Olivier.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin, and happy new year everyone. I'm only speaking up to welcome you all back. I think that this is pretty streamlined and at a future meeting we will maybe dive into some strategic initiatives for the At-large and what our policy objectives for the year might be. I'm not quite ready to guide that discussion. And so I think that's all there is for this week to report. So, Olivier, happy to give it back to you. But welcome back everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Jonathan. There are no hands up at the moment. I was just going to ask one thing from Evin as she is tracking this closely. We keep on having this updated upcoming public comment proceedings. Are any of these blatantly being pushed back? Because I saw for example there were quite a few that were awaited in December, public comment proceedings in December, and we're seeing them again in January. So, I gather they're being moved back then?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yes. Yeah. Good observation, Olivier. That's true. Including the domain abuse activity reporting, DAAR 2.0. That was originally slated for December, but it's been bumped to January. So, that often happens in the pipeline. Thank you for noticing and pointing that out. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. Thank you for the reporting. I'm not seeing any hands up, that means we can move to the any other business part of our agenda. And I open the floor to any other business. And in the meantime, I'm mentioning the letter that was received by ALAC chair, Maureen Hilyard, from the chief technical officer David Conrad. And that's in response to the letter that was sent by Maureen Hilyard on behalf of the ALAC, speaking about the Mozilla DNS over HTTPS (DoH) and trusted recursive resolver (TRR) comment period that Mozilla currently has open until sometime in January.

And I believe that so the letter here that we have received also shows the response that the office of the CTO has sent to Mozilla. I'm not sure whether the group here having now seen the response—that was an

action item of course. So the CPWG asked the ALAC whether it was going to answer this and the letter was then sent to the office of the CTO.

Is there any further action that now the ALAC wishes to proceed forward with, or is everyone content with this? And I guess people will either comment in their own space individually or—it's an open question here, what do we do next on this one? And I'm not sure if Maureen is with us actually here on the call. I had—nope, she is not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Holly has her hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Holly Raiche. Yep.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Olivier. I don't think there's anything else we can do about—if you read the letter it's very close to the actual SSAC 110—I've forgotten which number it is—but it's very close to the actual SSAC advice. It's also very close to the briefing that we've had twice. There's not much new and I'm not sure that we've got anything to say except to thank David. I mean, do we want to—I can't think that we would want to say anything because the stuff that we'd want to say has already been said by David Conrad, really, I think, at least in my opinion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: May I ask staff to please share the comments that David Conrad had sent? ICANN OCTO comment to Mozilla. Then we can share that. Okay, it's in the chat at the moment for anyone looking for it.

Thanks for this comment, Holly. Indeed, yes, that seems to be quite similar to the input brought in by SSAC. Okay. Well, that's where we are today. So, thank you for following up on this. Now, I see no further action necessary. Any other other business?

Here we go, and here's the letter by the way. Sorry, the letter just appeared for a second. Here we go. Here's the letter that the office of the CTO sent to the Mozilla Corporation. Apparently, that comment period has extended. I'm not sure how Mozilla will take this, whether they're going to do what sometimes is done to have a count in the number of letters saying one thing and the number of letters saying another thing. I'm not quite sure how they will do this, but I can't imagine that a letter writing campaign with hundreds of people photocopying this and sending it to Mozilla will be any help at all. I often see this as being—the content is more important than the volume. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: No. Old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Okay, now I'm not seeing any hand up for the other business. So that means we can pretty much think of when are we going to have our next meeting?

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you so much, Olivier. So, for our next week's call, I would like to suggest next Wednesday at 20:30 UTC as 19:00 UTC will clash with the AFRALO monthly call. If that suits everyone?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not hearing anybody speaking against this time. So, 20:00 UTC did you say? Or 20:30 UTC?

YEŞIM NAZLAR: 20:30. Yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 20:30 UTC as you provided in the chat. So, 20:30 UTC and I see that, yes. Okay, so Hadia will be on the AFRALO call. Okay, so that will just be a follow-up then immediately after the AFRALO call. Okay, so that's when our next meeting will be. And we are a little ahead of schedule today which is great. So, again welcome back to everyone. And let's hope we have some good work in the rest of the year. And I wanted to check thank of course our interpreters for today's call and the real-time text transcription that has been as helpful as it usually is to help us dig more into what's just been said. So, thank you very much to everyone and welcome back. Let's make this a great year. Jonathan, anything you'd like to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I think that says it all. We've got a lot to work on ahead of us. I appreciate everyone's continued participation in the CPWG, and let's make it a great year.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks everyone. Good-bye.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]