DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 11th of August 2021 at 19:00 UTC.

In order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call today. However, all those in attendance will be noted in the Zoom room as well as the audio branch.

I would, however, like to note the apologies we've received from Priyatosh Jana, Marita Moll, K Mohan Raidu, Satish Babu, Maureen Hilyard, Amrita Choudhury, and Alberto Soto.

From staff, we have on this call Evin Erdogdu, Gisella Gruber; and myself on call management.

We have Spanish and French interpretation on this call. Our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and Paula and our French interpreters are Isabelle and Jacques.

We also have real-time transcribing on today's call. I will put the link in the chat so you can all follow along.

A final reminder for everyone to please state their names when taking the floor each and every time and to please speak at a reasonable speed to allow interpretation and to keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise.

Thank you all very much. And with this, I turn the floor over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Devan. I hope you can hear me. I'm now using the Zoom because my call just got disconnected as we started, so hopefully I'll be able to go back to the phone soon. But in the meantime, we've got our agenda on today's screen. Sorry, we've got today's agenda on the screen. Much better.

We'll start with a work group update with the Transfer Policy Review policy development process, the Intergovernmental Organization Curative Rights work track, and we'll have also the Expedited PDP on the internationalized domain names.

Today it looks like … Yeah, we'll also have the one on the temporary specification of gTLD registration data. Then we'll have our policy comment update after that.

And I know that in the work group updates we will have a presentation, hopefully, from our colleague Justine Chew. I think this [inaudible]. Maybe she'll be able to chime in.

So, policy comment updates, and then after that any other business. That's today's agenda. Let's see if there are amendments, and I believe there could be.

I'm hoping to hear … Justine, you do have a presentation for us, do you?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, sorry, I just joined the call. Am I [up early?]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, no, not yet. I'm just going for the agenda at the moment. I'm checking the latest version of the agenda. For some reason, your presentation hasn't appeared on it. So, I'm just checking for that.

Okay. Well, the magic will take place and I'm not seeing any other hands up, so the agenda is adopted, but Justine's presentation we'll slot somewhere in there, probably when we reach discussion on the IGO work track.

So, let's first look at our action items from our last call. Those are all complete, as you can see. I guess they're on the screen at the moment. If you have any comments or questions on any of these, please put your hand up. I am not seeing anyone putting their hand up, so no comments on the action items.

And that takes us swiftly to our work group update. We will start first with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process (the TPR PDP). And for this, our usual colleagues. Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka are on the call I believe. Let's have an update please.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hello. I'm here. I don't know whether Daniel … I can't see him on the attendees. But I'll give the minutes from the meeting in the working group yesterday. The first thing is that we've kind of now finalized the discussion of the old Auth-Code. That is now being called TAC. And in the working document for this meeting, I have added the two draft

recommendations that are the result of quite a many meetings discussing this.

So, there was nothing revolutionary there. The first recommendation is that we now should use the Transfer Authorization Code (TAC) instead of Auth-Info code. And the second one is the definition on what is TAC. It's a code created by a registrar to validate a generic top-level domain transfer request submitted by the authorized person.

So these are the two draft recommendations. I assume the other recommendation connected to the other questions in these sections of the charter will be reviewed when we are more into the first phase of the working group.

So, the next thing is that we now started the discussion on the losing form of authorization, the FOA, the losing FOA. We have in this call, previously in CPWG calls, have tried to explain what is the process for transfer of the gaining and the losing FOA.

There was in the discussion [mostly] between registrars is kind of coming up as an alternative that the losing form of authorization should be optional. In the present policy, it is mandatory for a losing registrar to send out the form of authorization.

My idea—and I discussed it with the rest of my colleagues—is that we should take it as a very easy [poll] because I think it's essential for the—at least for the PDP members, At-Large PDP members—that we have some sort of feeling what is CPWG preferences.

So, if possible, could we take the poll now?

DEVAN REED: Absolutely. I'm just pulling it up.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: So, this is … The question is very simple. Are you in favor of making the losing form of authorization optional? And again, the present policy it is mandatory. So, if you can answer that one—and the alternatives are yes, no, not sure. I don't know whether that … I think that is sufficient. Okay, please go ahead.

Are there problems for those who are co-host to vote? This is just—how do you call that in English? Help me here, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The temperature of the room we say, I think.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm just voicing my vote.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. You said no. That's okay. One other thing … Maybe have the result of this …

DEVAN REED: Right now, there are 15 votes. Do you want to give it a little more time?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. Just a few minutes. Also, one element in the discussion is that whether this form of authorization is some sort of second level of security. And security experts are not necessarily agreeing that this is another level of security, mostly because if there is a crime, if the control panel has been hacked, etc., most likely those who did the bad things will also alter the email addresses for the form of authorization, etc. It's not necessarily something that would prevent that one. But it is in the way a reminder that the registrant has initiated a transfer with the gaining registrar and the losing registrar sends out this notification.

The losing form of authorization as it is today is also a way to stop the transfer, even though you have a valid transfer authorization code. I'm curious to see the result of the poll, though. I think we can [start] into it.

DEVAN REED: It's showing on the screen.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. So, we have 27% saying, yes, they are in favor of making it optional. 47% saying, no, we keep it mandatory. And 27% is not sure. I think that's quite a strong signal that we will advocate to not make it optional but keep it mandatory as it is in the present policy. I will bring that into the discussion. Does someone else form the At-Large working group for this policy want to speak? Pease go ahead. Are there anyone here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Steinar, I see a couple of people. There's Chokri Ben Romdhane and Christopher Wilkinson. So, Chokri first.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: I have two questions to Steinar. I wonder what would be the impact of making the losing FOA optional. What will be the impact on the period of the transfer process? It will make the period more short or no? Another issue is whether there is a [legal impact] of the losing FOA or it's only [an acknowledge for registrant] that the losing registrar is accepting the transfer? So, I think we have to answer this question in order to answer the yes or no question proposed by our colleague, Steinar.

Another issue. I think what we have [that is challenging] in the transfer is the way how we are managing this losing FOA. I think that they are using the template or an e-mail template which would be sent to both registry and registrar in order to acknowledge [them] about accepting or refusing the transfer.

So, the question is—the main question is—to evolve a way of managing this FOA and not eliminating it or making it optional. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you for the question. I'll take your last one first. The form of authorization is some sort of a fixed template that is required to be sent out in English, but the registrar can actually add additional languages into the template.

In the working document for this meeting, I will put a link to the Google Doc for the losing form of authorization, the FOA. There you will actually see the wording.

The effect of not requiring to send out this is kind of indicating that the transfer process will take a shorter time, but this is not sure because to actually speed up the time, the losing registrar has to accept the transfer actively. But if there's no action being done, the transfer will succeed within five days, as long as the authorization—the TAC—is correct.

In my opinion, I don't see this as some sort of a legal document. It's a confirmation and acknowledgement from the losing registrar that the registrant or someone on behalf of the registrant has initiated a transfer. Please let me know if that's not answering your question. Thank you.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm here. Hello. Thank you. I confess I'm navigating this issue from the starting point of relative ignorance and I voted not sure. But in the light of the discussion in the last few minutes, notably I had not realized the no vote was a vote for the status quo. So I'm glad to shift my vote if the staff can do the calculations. But I shift my vote from not sure to no. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: That is noted. Okay, thank you. Any more questions? Also, the working document for this meeting, I made some bullet points from the discussion yesterday on this. The PDP working group will continue next week on the losing … I will give an update on the next meeting. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Steinar. Thanks for this update and for the poll. Hoping this is helpful for you and your colleagues, of course.

Now, I see Yrjö Lansipuro put his hand up. I believe it probably is, but maybe it isn't—I'm thinking it might have to do with the IGO work track.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yes, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Intergovernmental organization curative rights work track. Yrjö, you have the floor.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. Yeah, you guessed right. This has to do with the intergovernmental organization curative rights work track. Just by the way of interaction, as you remember, since February this year, I had been reporting in a piecemeal fashion about what's going on in the work track. The progress had been slow and I think my reporting has really been in bits and pieces. So now when we are approaching the end of the first phase of the work track—that is to say bearing the initial resort—we thought it would be good to give the CPWG sort of whole picture with background, even if it will take some time. And I'm very happy that Justine volunteered to put together a presentation. So, Justine, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Yrjö. And please do jump in if I missed a point or something is not clear in what I'm saying. The time of the day I'm struggling with. Okay, it's the slide up. Okay, cool. Thank you.

Well, as Yrjö said, this presentation, it's intended more to give folks a fuller picture of what the issues are, what the challenges we face, and where we're up to in terms of coming up with a proposed solution to address issues.

I'm also reminded that we probably get newcomers to the call every week, so we thought that we'd just give a primer on certain things that are undertaken, the PDP—in particular, this PDP. So if we go to the next slide, please.

These are the things that we're going to cover. Again, as I said, we don't necessarily have anything to get the CPWG to answer today. It's more

about setting the scene for the consideration of what's coming out in the initial report in early next month. But we will spend more time on some of these aspects.

So, the first thing is—next slide, please. Before somebody asks what IGO WT is, I'm going to tell you again. It stands for Intergovernmental Organization Curative Rights Work Track. Curative meaning that it is post event, post effect as opposed to preventive. And this particular work track covers only intergovernmental organization. So it does not cover international nongovernmental organization—abbreviation for that would be INGO.

This particular work track—so I'm going to use the abbreviation now, the IGO work track or work track. The IGO work track was originally convened in another PDP process, which is the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanism PDP Working Group.

So, why it's a work track? It's because it's not a full-blown PDP by itself. As I mentioned, it's convened under another PDP, so it's like a child to the RPM PDP Working Group. It's chartered as an addendum to the RPM PDP Working Group.

The more important thing is it has a narrow mandate. So, with the [inaudible] identifiers and what identifiers mean is, in fact, acronyms of IGO names. So, given some examples here, WHO, WTO, UN. So we're not talking about the full names themselves of the international government organizations which are reserved in some way. We're talking about the acronyms, so the abbreviations or actually more accurately the acronyms.

The narrow mandate has to do with one recommendation, which is recommendation 5 from the IGO/INGO Curative Rights PDP Working Group, so that the previous PDP that completed in 2018, I believe. This particular recommendation 5 has to do with the need to consider IGO jurisdictional immunity.

Now, this particular recommendation is one of five, so it's the fifth of five recommendations that were produced by the IGO/INGO Curative Rights PDP Working Group. But recommendation 5 was the only one that was rejected by the GNSO Council.

So, obviously, the other four recommendations were approved and have been submitted to the Board for consideration.

So, the reason why it's important is because this particular work track is only tasked then to review the implications of recommendation 5 and it's not meant to touch recommendations one through four.

Without going into the specifics of recommendations one through four, this effectively means—or the charter for the work track effectively means—that the work track is tasked with answering whether there is an appropriate policy solution that covers these four last bullets here, which is that it accounts for the possibility of the IGO enjoying jurisdictional immunity which does not affect the rights or ability of a registrant or losing registrant to file a suit in court. It should also preserve the registrant's right to judicial review of initial uniform domain name dispute resolution procedure or uniform rapid suspension procedure. So that's UDRP and URS. And it must recognize existence—or it ought to recognize the existence and scope of the IGO jurisdictional

immunity as a legal issue because jurisdictional immunity is a valid defense in the legal arena, and basically to have this legal issue to be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

So, what does that all mean? We will come to that further down the track, but that's the [inaudible] that we are tasked with for this particular work track.

Moving on to the next slide just very quickly. This is not … Well, only one of these boxes is of consequence to us, really. But I thought we should give it a full picture as we said earlier in the beginning.

So, three factors have been impacting the work track timeline and work scope. I spoke about the timeline issue a couple of weeks ago—maybe two weeks ago, I think, and the effect of this particular timeline issue is that the timeline or the delivery of the initial report as well as the final report as a consequence has been delayed … Well, the initial report and the final report are typical outputs of the PDP and this particular work track is no different as a PDP. It's just not a full-blown PDP.

But because there was a moratorium for this month on public comment proceeding launches because ICANN Org is migrating to a new public comment system, so they're putting a moratorium for August—originally, the work track was due to delivery initial report sometime in August. In fact, it was third of August. But because of this moratorium, we wouldn't have been able to release an initial report for public comment anyway. So, essentially, that delayed our timeline.

Administratively, it was necessary for the work track to submit a change request to resolve this not meeting the 3rd August deadline anyway. But

safe to say that the problem of the delay has been resolved. I believe that GNSO Council has already accepted the project change request. So, the initial report is now due on the 7th of September and the final report is due on the 21st of December. So the delay has only been about slightly over one month.

Now, in terms of the second issue—existential issue—I believe I also spoke about this about two weeks ago. As I mentioned earlier, the IGO work track is chartered as an addendum to the RPM PDP Working Group and that happened in 2020, I believe.

And because the RPM Phase 1 has been completed, meaning that the final report has been approved by the GNSO Council in January 2021 and in fact has been submitted to the Board, and because Phase 2 of the RPM PDP has been delayed due to a need to refine the scope of work, some folks in the GNSO take the position that since the RPM PDP Working Group isn't active now, that means that the … And the RPM PDP Phase 1 has lapsed so to speak, therefore the IGO work track is actually orphaned and therefore, orphaned work tracks under the GNSO operating procedures cannot exist. The operating procedures doesn't allow for that.

And consequently, that means that whatever work the IGO work track ends up producing cannot be considered by the GNSO Council, [it'll not be] approved.

So, there is an action being contemplated by the GNSO Council to adopt a solution, which is in effect to reconstitute this work track as an EPDP Working Group.

I think I've spent enough time on this particular existential issue because it's something for GNSO Council to work out. It's not really our concern, per se.

I believe, at this point in time, that the Council probably would approve the motion or the action to reconstitute the work track as an EPDP and that possibly could mean that everything that the work track has been chartered to do, been working on in terms of even initiating the membership, that would probably just be moved lock, stock and barrel to an EPDP.

Now, coming to the work track … I'm sorry. The third factor which is the work scope issue, what has been established by the work track so far is that the recommendation 5 in itself is cosmetic and therefore trying to come up with a problem statement from using recommendation 5 is also problematic. And what do I mean by that? We'll come to that in a bit.

And because the work track is chartered to find an appropriate solution within a very narrow niche, we find that the recommendation 5 in order to fix it or in order to address it, we might end up impinging on two of the other already approved recommendations.

So, because of this issue or because of this conundrum, the GNSO Council has to decide whether anything that the work track comes out with can be interpreted as adhering strictly to the charter or not, because if they … Say, for example, they say that no, the stuff that you're doing is out of scope, that means that whatever we come up with

is not going to be used or considered. So that has implications of the output of the work track. Next slide, please. Moving on.

So, I'm coming now to a scenario which … This scenario is actually one that was provided by the IGO participants themselves or the IGO members in this particular work track. So it's not something that we're making up. It's something they perceive as a real possibility. I personally think that it's obviously a real possibility as well.

So, the scenario here … And I should add that we, as At-Large, have not injected ourselves very actively or very heavily in the deliberations of the work track so far. We've taken more a stance of monitoring and making sure that balance exists.

And the reason for that is the issues … The key issue that the work track grapples with is actually kind of like a fight between the IGO and registrants. Of course At-Large has some interest in registrant issues, but we also have to look at the impact to the individual end users.

So, this scenario, which I said was provided by IGO and the IGO participants and also supplemented obviously by the registrant rep or the BC rep in this work track goes like this.

So, you have the IGO on the one hand and you have the registrant on the other hand. Let's take the example of a domain name. So, I'll just use IGO.com as an example just to illustrate that a bit better.

So, the situation is that the IGO finds that or considers that—discovers that—the registrant's registration and use of the IGO.com to be malicious, enabling fraud, and/or harmful to the public.

So, this alone—this problem alone—provides obviously plausibility of harm to end users and this is why At-Large should care about the outcome of this PDP. So, what can the IGO do about this?

But on the other hand, the registrant considers that their registration of IGO.com—or sorry, they consider IGO.com to be a valuable domain name. Okay. They want to exploit it commercially, they have denied that they've done anything wrong, they've not prohibited from registering the domain name. So, what can they do to keep the domain name? Therefore a dispute arises. So the dispute has to be resolved somehow.

In the scheme of things, in the ICANN world, there are actually prima facie three dispute resolution avenues. I say prima facie because two out of the three presently have impediments against the IGOs. So, I'll come to them in a little bit.

So, prima facie there is three dispute resolution avenues—one being the UDRP which is the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy; the URS, Uniform Rapid Suspension, those procedures. Now, these two procedures are DRPs (dispute resolution procedures) that are established by ICANN. They are meant to work as lighter, more rapid remedial avenues or forms of remedy for complainants against registrants who have been alleged to have been registered and used a domain name in bad faith. So these are alternates to court proceedings and arbitration.

Of course, court proceedings and arbitration are not created by ICANN. So that's a distinction.

So, coming back to this impediment that I mentioned, per the IGOs, the IGO has, technically speaking, just three options. The first option of

UDRP and URS is actually not real options at this point in time and this is where recommendation 5 comes into it.

What, in fact, the IGO faces is that they have challenges to actually access the UDRP and the URS and it is forced at this point in time to waive jurisdictional immunity, which is as I said before, a valid defense they ought to be able to use. And obviously they talked about cost of filing, but cost of filing applies to any party in the dispute and it's not unique to IGOs, so we won't worry about that too much in this particular work track.

Now, on the other hand, the registrant, they claim that—well, the UDRP and URS calls for … If you want to use the UDRP or URS, you have to submit to mutual jurisdiction. But I still have the right to go to court. I still have the right to go for arbitration. And I'm, in particular, disadvantaged against the IGO. IGO being a big organization. It has strong links to all sorts of entities, including UDRP, URS, service providers, arbitral institutions, that's what the registrant representative or the BC rep in this particular work track has argued in the deliberations of this work track.

So, what do we … And we're obviously in between somewhere, I guess. Or that's where we see ourselves anyway. So, what do we mean by these two challenges that the IGO has raised? I'll come to that in a later slide, a following slide.

But let's move onto the next slide first. Just bear in mind that there are two issues that have been raised by IGOs being accessed and needing to waive jurisdictional immunity.

So, let's have a look and break down recommendation 5. What does recommendation 5 actually say or what is the impact of recommendation 5?

So, recommendation 5 says that where an IGO has prevailed in the UDRP or URS proceeding and the losing registrant … Okay. The actual words are different but this is the paraphrasing of recommendation 5. We want to break it down into four elements so that it's clear, right?

So, it says that, in the first instance, if an IGO has prevailed in in UDRP and URS proceedings, then the losing registrant challenges that decision by filing suit in a national court of mutual jurisdiction. Then, the IGO successfully claims jurisdictional immunity in a court.

Then the fourth element is the UDRP or URS position then delegates the registrant shall be set aside, i.e. invalidated.

So, what is it that is problematic about recommendation 5? Note earlier on I said that the recommendation 5 is problematic in itself. So, what the IGO work track's understanding is … And leaving aside the aspect of access and mutual—waiving of mutual jurisdiction. Sorry, waiving of jurisdictional immunity. If you look at recommendation 5 in itself—the bit that is highlighted in blue, the element number four—that UDRP decision rendered agaisnt registrants shall be set aside.

Now, this is actually not right because it talks about IGO prevailing. Okay. So, if IGO prevails, then it gets a UDRP or URS proceeding in its favor.

Now, if the losing registrant goes to court to fight that or to try and overturn that proceeding and it loses because the IGO has successfully

claimed jurisdictional immunity, then that particular UDRP proceeding decision should stand. It shouldn't be rendered or it shouldn't be set aside. It would only be set aside if the registrant wins.

So, in none of these stages has the registrant won, so why should it be set aside? That is the problem in itself, which is why recommendation 5 can't really be accepted in the form that it is.

So, moving on to the next slide. Okay. Let me come back to the two issues of the access and immunity and explain why they are challenges according to the IGO group.

The first bit is the actual wording of the recommendation 5. That's what it says. So, if we just discard or disregard the bit about the decision being set aside, which is the bit that's crossed out, the structural text—so just leaving that side.

So, coming back to the two issues that the IGO faces, which is, one, that access; and two, it's the waiving of the immunity. So what does that actually mean?

Well, if you look at point number one where you see the one in the box, it talks about IGO succeeding in the initial UDRP complaint. But if we look at the current situation with UDRP and URS both together, access to both the dispute resolution procedures is on the basis of trademark rights. That's how UDRP and URS has been structured.

What that means is that if a complainant were to file or even to succeed—actually, more to succeed. If a complainant is to succeed in a UDRP or URS complaint, they must be able to demonstrate that the

domain name—the domain name in question, the identifier in the case of the IGO—must be identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has [rights]. Therefore, the basis is trademark rights. The complainant must have trademark rights over the domain name or the label that makes up the domain name. So, IGO, for example.

But the reality is that the IGOs may not have registered trademarks over identifiers. [inaudible] identifying the identifiers as meaning acronym matching the domain name.

This is because of the national state obligations under the Paris convention, which effectively means that IGOs may not hold registered trademarks in the identifier.

So, on the one hand, you're saying that, "Hey, IGO, you can use the UDRP." But actually we can't because they don't have the trademark rights which is essential to be able to succeed in the UDRP or URS.

So, in other words, the problem statement we've written becomes how may IGO complainants demonstrate rights in order to follow UDRP, let alone succeed in one.

Now, the second issue is the issue of immunity, having to waive immunity. The UDRP and the URS currently at this point also says that if you want to use those procedures, you must, as a complainant, agree to submit to mutual jurisdiction.

What is mutual jurisdiction? Simply means that having to submit to a court where the registrar is located or where the registrant is located. So

there's two locations that's applicable in the context of mutual jurisdiction, which is the registrar's location or the registrar's location. And we're talking about court here.

When we talk about court, then it goes into obviously different countries having different court systems and different judiciaries interpreting law in the way they see fit.

In some of these cases, in some of these jurisdictions, having to submit to mutual jurisdiction means that you have to waive jurisdictional immunity. But the IGO has jurisdiction immunity by virtue of its nature. And who are we to deny them the ability to use jurisdictional immunity as a defense unless they choose to waive it themselves? So, hence the problem.

So the problem statement rewritten for the aspect two is how do you recognize IGO jurisdictional immunity while preserving the registrant's right to file suit in a court of mutual jurisdiction? So that's a little bit tricky. But essentially we're saying in trying to preserve the registrant's right to file suit, that is currently what happens now. So that [inaudible] preserving [inaudible].

But we must also recognize that the IGO has jurisdictional immunity and therefore they have a right to use that as a defense. So, hence, how do you recognize the IGO jurisdictional immunity?

So, now that we've stated the problem statement, what is the IGO work track doing about coming up with a proposed solution to address these two issues? So, next slide, please.

So now I have to confess that I, even throughout the deliberations of the work track, the nature of the deliberations has been difficult—has made it difficult for us to pin down what the proposed solution is going to be because it was a moving target. Then it sort of cleared up for a little bit. Then it became a moving target again, which is why some things that were reported on earlier, mostly by Yrjö, may or may not apply now. So it was difficult for us to actually do a full-blown presentation like this earlier on. And even now it is a bit difficult because there isn't real consensus yet.

But nonetheless, we've come to a stage where we have to put something down into an initial report to go out for public comment. So it's kind of consolidated a little bit with parts that are still moving and subject to public comment.

So, coming back to the question of access. And remember—and I'm telling you this—the recommendations one through four in effect translate to being that we are not allowed to modify the UDRP rules and URS rules substantively. So that leaves us two choices in terms of coming up with a solution to address the access issue.

The first choice would be to try to amend non-substantively the URS [and] the UDRP non-substantively to allow access or use by the IGO. The second option would be to create a separate narrowly tailored dispute resolution procedure that's modeled on the UDRP or the URS, meaning to say carve out a UDRP or URS, especially for the IGOs.

Now, the work track having considered both options beside it, the first being the better one, which is just to try and propose to amend the

UDRP and URS non-substantively to allow access by the IGOs. And how do we do this?

So, we did this by looking at two aspects, which is, short form, call it the who and the how. The who refers to a definition of IGO complainant. Now, we're saying that we're going to give certain … We're going to recognize certain rights that the IGO has. So, what do we mean by an IGO? And in particular, what do we mean by an IGO complainant? We have to define that in order to allow the rights to be enjoyed by this particular party or this particular group of entities and not everyone else.

So, the definition of the IGO that the work track has so far come up with is covering this point, ABC. I'm not going to go into that. You can read that on your own. But it is having regard to the UN system.

I should just mention at this point in time that one of the work track members from the GAC believes that the limb B has to include also a receipt of admission, meaning to say that it should read something along the lines of an IGO having received a standing invitation or received admission to participate, blah-blah-blah.

So, the work track is still trying to deliberate, but the idea is we want to be clear about who we are recognizing as an IGO in order to enjoy special access to the UDRP.

And the how is the right to file. Remember I said that the access to the UDRP is based on trademark rights. Because IGOs don't have trademark rights, we have to adapt that particular requirement in order to do away with trademark rights, so to speak. And how do we do that? We provide

the IGO complainant that they may show rights in a mark by demonstrating use of it in conducting their public activities in accordance with their stated mission.

So, there's no longer the need for trademark. It is just to show rights in a mark by virtue of demonstrating use of it through public activities per its stated mission. So there's no longer a need for a registered trademark in order to access the UDRP or URS. So that's how we're proposing that this particular issue be overcome.

So, moving on to the next slide. Let me talk about jurisdictional immunity which is the second issue here. What the work track has proposed--and this is more the bit that's still up in the air because there's been disagreement within the work track on how we should approach this.

But in terms of addressing the jurisdictional immunity issue, the work track proposes recommendation two and recommendation two has three elements. So we're proposing it as a package.

The first element is to reject recommendation 5 because of what I talked about, the bit about setting aside of the UDRP or URS addition that comes back to this.

The second bit, 2B, is exemption from the requirement to submit to mutual jurisdiction when filing UDRP and URS. So we're saying that, if the complainant is an IGO, they can use UDRP or URS, but they don't need to submit to mutual jurisdiction when using it. This is only for an IGO complainant, which is the "special rights" I tried to allude to earlier.

The third element 2C, which is the possibility of binding arbitration after UDRP or URS determination. How it works is—how it's supposed to work—is that parties are able to opt for [inaudible] arbitration to resolve the dispute in finality.

What do I mean by that? I'll come to that in the next slide. I think it will be clearer. But suffice to say that there are two aspects within this particular element of the solution, which is still, as I said, hasn't reached consensus yet, which is the question of when arbitration would apply. Would it exclude the registrant from going to court then? And the second one is choice of law that would apply in the arbitration where there's no agreement between the parties. So, let's move on in the next slide. I think it becomes a bit clearer.

Once you remove the impediment for the IGOs to file or to use the UDRP or URS, then they should be able to file a complaint and at least attempt to succeed in a complaint. So that is step one. In this diagram, that is step one. By virtue of filing this complaint, then obviously the registrant gets brought into the UDRP proceeding. So I'm just going to use UDRP as an example, rather than URS, but URS is similar to UDRP.

So, here the, IGO files. The registrant defends. And the case is heard by—the complaint is heard by UDRP, either panel of one or panel of three. It depends. But that's not important.

So, what happens is the UDRP panel says, "Okay, I'm going to determine that the IGO wins." So that's the determination.

In the current situation, the losing registrant can go to court to also review the UDRP termination. It may not be exactly like this, but I'm just trying to explain conceptually.

Once the registrant … And they have a certain time limit to do this, which is ten days I believe it is, before the UDRP decision gets implemented.

So, between the UDRP decision being rendered, ten days after, if the registrant wants to challenge it, they can file a suit in court within ten days.

So, if they file a suit in court, then what happens is the IGO gets dragged in as a respondent or as a defendant or whatever you call it, depending on the jurisdiction. So they will defend by a certain jurisdiction or immunity, because as I said before, jurisdictional immunity is a valid defense.

So now if the court then determines that the IGO is immune, meaning I can't hear this because the IGO is immune—go away—then the registrant in fact can take the further step to go to arbitration. So that's how it works currently and that is what the registrants is trying to preserve, this pathway—this multiple pathway.

The IGO, from the IGO's perspective—and it's important to come back to the scenario that we laid out. The scenario that the IGOs have put forward is, "We think that this particular IGO, the registrant …" Sorry, the domain name registrant … "Has registered and is using this domain name in bad faith. It's causing harm and it's not in public interest for

them to keep doing this." So that is the context that we have to bear in mind and that is how it also affects the end users.

So, the IGO says that this harm—the question is: is harm being done? And we need to find a way to stop this harm being done rather quickly. So if we take the traditional route of UDRP, then court possibly and then arbitration possibly, it will take too long because all the while, although the domain name is locked upon filing a UDRP complaint, the registrant can still keep using the domain name. It doesn't affect the operation of the domain name. It only affects … The lock only prevents the domain name from being transferred.

So, IGO says, "Okay, I can file a UDRP. I will. But the losing registrant takes me to court." So that's another level of dispute resolution again. But I get to assert jurisdictional immunity as my defense and leave it to the court to decide whether they want to hear me or not—unless they want to hear the registrant's case or not. I should say that, yeah.

But in the meantime, harm is still being done because the domain name is still active.

So what the IGO is saying is that, "Can we find a better way or a shorter way to stop the harm?" And by this, we mean that the work track is supposed to come up with a shortcut, really. So, the shortcut is that when the UDRP complaint is determined and it's determined that the IGO wins, then the option is given to the losing registrant whether they want to go straight to binding arbitration.

So there's an element of consent because the losing registrant has to agree. So that kind of preserves the right for them to disagree which means that they can't take other routes.

But the thing is, with this particular shortcut, it is timeline based, so obviously the losing registrant has to agree within a certain time. It is a de novo review, meaning to say that it doesn't look at what has happened in the past. So it doesn't look at what decision has been made by whichever party or whichever, the panel or the court or whatever. It goes back to the beginning when you say that the parties can state their case from the beginning. And they can obviously choose the number of the panelists, and they can decide on the choice of law. So that is the concept of this shortcut fourth route, step number four.

But where we come unstuck is the registrant's argument is that if you make me take step four after losing the UDRP, even though I have the option of not accepting it, it's not really a choice, because if I do that—if I accept—then I lose my right to go to court. That's what they're arguing. So they don't like this [really].

And the second bit that they're concerned about, which obviously concerns the IGO as well, is the parties are expected to decide on the choice of law and arbitration. But what happens if the parties can't agree on which law it should be? Then what should it be? One party has said, "No, no, we should do this." And the other party says, "Oh no, we should do that," and the Work Track is all like, "Oh, okay [we will consider that.]" So, the highlighted in yellow bits are the parts that haven't been settled, so to speak.

So, moving on to the last slide, what can we expect? Let's move to the next slide, please.

So, I said before that the BC reps—the Business Constituency rep—has been pushing back on the possibility of binding arbitration because they think that it results in excluding the registrant's right to go to court. So, in essence, there's no consensus within the work track as yet, as I mentioned.

So, what's happened now is the work track chair has proposed to put for community consultation the initial report that contains description on the laying out of recommendation one and recommendation two, as I've explained. But the actual setting of it will have to confirm—Yrjö and I will have to confirm together with the Carlos and Vanda. We'll have to confirm it when the initial report is out for input, circulated to the work track for input.

What's happened now is next week's call has been cancelled. The work track call has been cancelled. The staff has been instructed to produce a draft initial report for inspection by the work track that is covering what we discussed, and to the point where even including the fact that there's no consensus in addressing this to areas that are still unsettled.

So let's move on to the last slide. Now, this is an unusual thing for us to do I guess. I persuaded my colleagues to try this approach. But in effect, as I mentioned, the At-Large participants have not really interjected very heavily into the discussion, but we have been looking from the perspective of end users the plausible harm that's possibly cost to end users in the scenario that is described.

So, what we've thought is to perhaps put a proposed mandate for this particular working CPWG to consider in guiding the four of us in the work track in terms of where we are, where we are headed, and moving going down the line also to position the ALAC's response to the initial report.

Just to highlight the mandate that's [sought] is that the goals of the ALAC or At-Large should be we focus solely on how best to alleviate end user confusion and/or harm to end users. So that's where the At-Large angle of end users come in, which is brought about by the use of a domain name matching an IGO's acronym is the subject of what the work track deals with. And especially where the DNS use is malicious or fraudulent purposes. So that's the scenario that we've made out earlier.

And we should base the formulation of any solution or recommendation by assessing actual facts or highly conceivable circumstances, meaning to say that there isn't a test case yet because, well, no IGO has been able to file a UDRP, so we don't know what actually happens. So we're opening the door. So we have to base formulation of a solution on the assessment of conceivable circumstances. That's what I mean.

The recommendation should, from our perspective, be to help ensure that both parties have, under the circumstances, have equitable access to the DRP and the appeal mechanisms … So the DRP would be UDRS and URS. The appeal mechanism—I've called it appeal mechanism—you can think of it as the courts or the arbitration. It should preserve the IGOs—or it should allow the IGO—to assert or to participate in the UDRP without having to show a registered trademark. So, we've addressed that and talk about that before. And they should be allowed

or at least they should be allowed to waive, but not forced to waive, its claim to jurisdictional immunity as a defense in order to participate in a court proceeding to resolve the dispute.

So, we're asking … Or we're laying out the pathway for us to continue deliberations in this work track as a guide, because as I said, we might not be … We're not able to be specific about how things go, but as long as we have this guide or this mandate, we will work within this mandate to achieve the goal that's brought on by the mandate.

So, I've gone on long enough. Yrjö, did you have anything to add?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Just thanks to you for explaining this in such a comprehensive and understandable fashion. So, now basically we are waiting reactions. I realize that time may be an issue. So perhaps if no reactions are available now, we welcome them in the coming days and weeks by email.

But I see actually Christopher's hand up. Christopher, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good evening. Thank you, Justine. Thank you, Yrjö. I have a few points which you may not find to be altogether constructive, but I have to say. First of all, IGOs typically are financed by public contributions and by charitable contributions from individuals. The cost of getting involved in any aspect of this complex system that has been so professionally and ably described to us by Justine, the costs are potentially exorbitant. I'll leave it at that.

Secondly, concerning the definition of IGOs, a good starting point would be the signatories of the original letter to the ICANN raising these issues which were sent by the United Nations IGOs and others at least 20 years ago. And I request that the staff should resurrect this letter so that we all understand that this issue has been on the table for at least 20 years.

In the chat, I've made quite clear that the original starting point in the title of this exercise that it is about curative measures is not acceptable to me. This is an issue which should have been dealt with by preventative measures, i.e., a list—a [no-go] area list—of the acronyms of IGOs. I've made this point in the chat.

And more generally, we have been, as At-Large members, have brought into an [inaudible] of a discussion which we should never have accepted in the first place. And I want the chair to make quite sure that the point is made to Maureen and the other members of the ALAC committee that the charters of working groups that we accept to participate in must be reviewed by this CPWG and the At-Large members. You cannot stick us with a charter which obliges us to discuss this particular issue and others on the basis of curative measures. That is completely unacceptable. We should never have accepted that charter in the first place.

Finally, on a detail. If this does go into the UDRP—and I fully understand the objections and difficulties that would arise—but let us be quite clear. The scope of the UDRP will have to be extended at least to geographical indications and why not to IGOs. But we should not have been put in this situation in the first place. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Christopher. Good questions and good points. On the first one, on the costs, yes, this is something that has been discussed by the work track, especially of course representatives of IGOs, like the World Bank especially have brought out that for one registrant, this is one case and they can perhaps afford to go to court. But international organizations may face similar challenges in dozens of countries and dozens of systems and so on and so forth, and that's why the IGOs are against even this idea of, first going to court and having the court to establish the immunity.

As far as the list of the IGOs is concerned, I don't think this is going to be a big problem. Actually, the GAC has a list of IGOs whose names, whose full names, have been protected. So, logically, that should be the guidance also.

On the other points, I think that they are on a different level from my position. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes, [they're dealt with.] For the members of this call, I have to declare an interest because, as a matter of fact, I have personally worked with at least four, if not five, IGOs in the course of a long career. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: And thanks again to Justine and Yrjö for tackling this. But I think that ALAC should have made sure that we had a better bargaining position to start with and never accepted a charter which referred to curative measures. It's very late here, so I'm going to leave the call now. Thank you all very much for a very constructive meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher. I'm going to jump in because we are very restricted on time now. We have two more people in the queue. That's Jonathan Zuck and Greg Shatan. And we'll close the queue after Greg because we need to move on. So, Jonathan, you're next.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess my initial reaction to this is that it falls a little bit into the same category of geo-names, where we have begun conversations about some sort of a notification system and it seems to me that that might be a way to go here. For an IGO to simply assert the right to an acronym just on its face seems ridiculous to me because it's an acronym and it can have so many other meanings, and to suggest that there's an innate right to an acronym feels hard to get behind given everyone out there in the world trying to come up with the most efficient domain name. It ends up being a content and DNS abuse issue whether or not that registration is being used for fraudulent purposes.

To suggest there's a block list that says that I can't have WHO.org or something like that seems ridiculous to me. I feel like it needs to be a notification system similar to what we have talked about in the context

of geo-names. Just my personal thought. That's a reaction to the presentation as opposed to well considered over time. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Next is Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely. Go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. I think that there are many, many subjects relating to IGOs and trademarks and UDRP that we could spend hours discussing. But this is a very narrow work track or work group and I think that talking about block lists and talking about things beyond curative rights are just irrelevant, frankly, to the current discussion. So, I think we need to concentrate on just what the point is here.

First, it's really quite rare for a losing party in a UDRP case to go to court to seek reversal of the decision. I'm not saying it doesn't happen but it's quite rare. So we're talking about some minor subset of that that would be IGO complainants that could potentially have to go to court, whether as a loser or the winner in the case.

I think Justine said there's almost no example of this happening. And trademark rights, IGOs do in fact have trademark—service mark rights.

Or many of them do. But it's not required … The UDRP does not require a registration in order to assert rights.

I think the bullet points here on the mandate sought really are just right in terms of trying to say what is the [standpoint]? What is the end user interest here in terms of essentially fairness? So, I think that the whole discussion about whether IGO acronyms should be protectable or not, that's really, in a sense, irrelevant here as well. You have to prove the bad faith registration and use on a part of the domain name registrant. It's not just a matter of just saying I'm asserting a right to ISO ahead of any other party. It's really rather specific.

So, that's my way of saying, more or less, that I think a lot of the previous conversation, though interesting, was unnecessary and really needs to just focus on what it is, the very narrow goal and sad history of this work track and try to get through it in a way that is fair and make sure consumer trust, consumer safety are really at the bottom line, minimizing end user confusion and fraud. So we're just looking to make sure that there aren't bums out there who are trying to solicit money abusing the name of an IGO, for instance, and that IGOs should have appropriate rights to go against a domain name registrant, just as any other proprietor of an entity has that same right. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Greg. Any closing words, Yrjö?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. Just to say that I agree with Greg, of course. I mean, this is a narrow issue. It's for us, it's an end user confusion avoiding issues. And even if there are perhaps not so many abbreviations, not so many acronyms for IGOs that could come into question.

But at the same time, if you will think that, for instance, WHO could be used anyway, sort of during the pandemic, we can understand that at least we can have catastrophic consequences for end users.

But thanks to all who took part in the discussion, and of course especially thanks to Justine for this presentation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yrjö. Justine, what time is it where you are?

JUSTINE CHEW: It's half past 4:00 AM now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's what you call dedication. Thank you very much. I think this needs to be appreciated, half past 4:00 in the morning. Goodness.

Right. We have to move on. We're very late on our schedule. But we don't have that much to discuss. There is still the Expected Policy Development Process and the temporary specification for gTLD registration data. And for this we have Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Actually, there isn't much to report on. We are still discussing the same items we were discussing on our last call. We have concluded discussing the public comments and last week there were some sessions with Melissa Allgood and this week we will start actually putting our deliberations. A first draft of the initial report has been drafted by staff. So that's about it.

We are meeting now two times a week on Tuesdays and Thursdays, so tomorrow we have a call. But nothing really new than what we discussed during our last call.

So, happy to answer any questions if you have. Most probably next time, I will have a presentation. I will put all the recommendations and I will take all the recommendations our position in relation to each of the recommendations and what is expected actually to come out of the discussions.

Also, we were discussing today in a small team meeting the possibility of having a minority statement in conjunction with other groups, like for example maybe the BC, IPC, GAC, SSAC maybe. So there is most probably we won't need to have a minority statement.

One thing we were discussing today, the possibility of … We don't know even if there will be any kind of agreement on that, but the possibility of changing recommendation #17 which says that registries and registrars can differentiate but are not obligated to … To change it to registries and registries are encouraged to differentiate but are not obligated to. So this is just a suggestion. We don't know yet if it is really supported by … It is supported by the GAC. We don't know if it would be

supported by other groups, like the registries and registrars or the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. But I would like to ask your opinion on that.

Honestly speaking, it doesn't change anything from the status quo, but it just points out that differentiation is something that is encouraged, which means is good to do. So, any thoughts on that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: Just a brief thought. I'm all in favor in taking a minority statement where we lead to … As I typed in the chat, it might be amusing if there are more signatories to the minority statement than there are to the so-called consensus report, which seems to be … As you were counting out the number of structures that could be signing onto a minority statement. I guess amusing isn't the right word. Frustrating, desperately sad, burning all of our time at the stake, whatever it might be.

But in any case, I don't think we should be shy about a minority statement where one is needed and I think we should … Especially where there is quite a broad cross section of those interested, I think it makes a larger point, frankly. Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Greg. So, you are right. And there are items like for example the standardized data elements, we are still discussing it. There is great

objection to it, though actually looking at what this data element is, it is actually consistent with previous ICANN policies in relation to the display of the data which needs to be in consistent form. But again, there is this kind of objection, though it has been pointed out that RDAP does have a feature that actually enables … It's already included in RDAP that enables a kind of differentiation but defaults to individual.

Currently, this field or data element or type is used by registrars and it's default form, which is individual, so you would find an organization but still you have this field as an individual.

So, my point here, implementation isn't really the issue here because there are some technical possibilities that already exist that would allow this kind of differentiation.

Also, if we look at what we are suggesting, initially we wanted the differentiation to be required. We wanted registries and registrars to always offer the registrant the ability to state its [type], whether legal, natural, or unspecified. But we recognize that this is actually not possible, and that no consensus could be possible if we insist on that.

So, our compromise position was to either that registrars would have this data-type field as an option to registrants, like if a registrant would like to fill it in with legal, natural, or unspecified, he would go ahead and do that. If he just wants to leave it blank, he can also do that. And even that, they do not agree to.

And GDPR does make this distinction between legal and natural presence, so it does make sense and it's only fair to offer the data subject what actually GDPR offers him. But again, we don't want to do

that. And when it comes to having just a data element where you're not obligated to use, even if you differentiate you're not obligated to use, they still do not want to commit to something like that.

And this is where we are stuck. Why are we in this altogether? Anyway, I'll stop here and thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. We've had plenty of occasions in this situation where we are rather upset, I guess, about the brick wall that this discussion seems to be hitting on so many occasions.

Greg, your hand is still up. I'm hoping it's not for another intervention because we're a little out of time and I'm quite concerned about this. Okay, thank you.

So now we just have one more and it's just an announcement, and that's for the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Internationalized Domain Names (the IDNs). The first meeting is today out of all things. And I think that we just got out of the three ALAC members on this. I'm not saying participants, but members. There's Abdulkarim Oloyede, who is on this call or at least he was on this call. Yes, he is. Abdulkarim, has the call taken place or is it taking place after the current call? I haven't given any advanced notice to Abdulkarim about this, so I'm not quite sure whether he'll be able to speak or his mic is not enabled.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Sorry, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead. Welcome, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: We had our first call today which was basically an introductory call. During that call, it was just basically we're looking at a charter and we're just having for us to look at the charter and what it's going to look like in the working group. We will have our next call next week and I think probably things are going to start shifting, taking shape next week. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Abdulkarim for this quick update and we look forward to the work starting on this. Now, we have very little time until our great interpreter team needs to go. We're moving onto the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks so much, Olivier. I'll go quickly through this. You'll see that there are two … A statement and also advice recently ratified by the ALAC. The ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP Phase 2 regarding the SSAD will be submitted to the ICANN Board in the coming days, so stay tuned for updates on that.

There was also an ALAC statement on the request for inputs on topics on the transfer policy review PDP charter which was submitted to that PDP's support staff.

There are upcoming public comment proceedings as always. So, seven upcoming in September, so please look at those on the agenda, including the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting, DAAR 2.0.

There's currently one public comment for decision. This closes in the coming weeks. It may be circulated again on the list to see if there is any interest.

Otherwise, that is the current activity. What's currently on the current statements table is [inaudible]. I'll turn it back over to you, Olivier and Jonathan. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Since we're short on time, I think we can just move forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Jonathan. And thank you, Evin, for this quick update. We're now in agenda item five and that's any other business. With something that's directly related to the public consultation, the public comments. And that's of course the new public comment feature that will go live starting on Tuesday, the 31st of August. There are links in the agenda for you to be able to play around with it. You can see the training sessions and step-by-step guidelines on how this new system will work. Behind the scenes we'll find out if there needs to be something specific for At-Large and for us since we are a

community that files a lot of public consultation. Oh yeah, that's the sort of thing that the ALAC has to do.

Are there any other other business? Any other points or anything else that I haven't mentioned about this public consultation feature, public comment feature? No? Okay. That then takes us to agenda item six and that's the next meeting that could be held in strict rotating time.

Let's have a look. When do we have our next call?

DEVAN REED: Hi, Olivier. Next rotating call will be on Wednesday, the 18th of August at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Devan. Are we clashing with anything crazy?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I think we might probably be clashing with the EPDP on IDN because that starts at 14:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Okay. Thank you for this, Abdulkarim. What we'll probably do then is to always schedule the Expedited PDP on IDNs early on so one can just say a few words before the call taking place whenever we have our 13:00 UTC meeting. It's a bit hard for us to then lose a slot completely just because of an EPDP. So, thank you for that. And that will be of course the first one. We'll see how it goes later on. So, 13:00 UTC it

is. With 13:30 the IDN. Oh dear. Well, let's go for 13:00 and see how bad it gets. Of course it's going to be the first meeting, so I'm sure you can be on both calls for the time being and then we'll see how we can rotate.

With this, it's 15 minutes past our scheduled end of time. Thank you for everything we've heard today. Thanks to our interpreters, for the real-time transcription that's being very accurate, and of course to our wonderful staff who prepared this agenda. So, wherever you are, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening. Jonathan, anything else to say from your part of the world?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, all good here. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then goodnight. Bye-bye.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all for joining. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]