YEŞIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday the 2nd of February 2022 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the 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.

And to go over the apologies, we have received apologies from Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Matthias Hudobnik, Vanda Scartezini, and from Dave Kissoondoyal.

From staff side, we have Gisella gruber, Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Yeşim Salam, present on today's call at the moment. And as usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation. And our interpreters are Lilian and Marina on the Spanish channel, Claire and Jacques on the French channel.

And one final reminder is [inaudible] as usual on the real-time transcription service provided. Please do check the service. I have now shared the link with you on the Zoom chat.

And my final reminder will be to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to Olivier. Thanks so much.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to today's Consolidated Policy Working Group Call. This is going to be an interesting call, as per usual. We will first start with our Board advice follow up that includes the advice that the ALAC has provided on the Subsequent Procedures. The Board has come back with some questions and Justine Chew and Jonathan Zuck have been working on some responses based on prior discussions in this group. And so today we'll see the final responses and hopefully be able to proceed forward with sending those over to the Board.

The next thing is, after that, the workgroup updates with our usual updates from the Transfer Policy Review PDP, the Expedited PDP on International Governmental Organizations, the one on IDNs, and the one on, well, the Registration Data Scoping Team which is not a PDP. But it's a scoping team.

After that we'll have our policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu, and finishing with two pieces of important business, although in AOB. One is the ALAC-GAC bilateral session at ICANN73, and the other one is the ALAC-GNSO Council bilateral session. And for both of these, we are searching for questions and topics to be discussed. So start thinking now and provide us with your suggestions toward the end of this call.

In the meantime, I should ask whether there are any additions or amendments to the agenda. The floor is open. No? I'm not seeing any

hands up. Usually when I say that, a hand goes up. But today it's not the case, so that's good.

We can therefore proceed forward with the review of our action items from last week. And there remain two action items. One is for Evin and Claudia to circulate, on the CPWG list, the Google Doc on the ALAC responses for the Subsequent Procedures. That's, of course, in advance of today's call. So this has happened. We'll proceed forward with the discussion in a moment.

The other one was for Satish Babu and the IDNs (Internationalized Domain Names) EPDP Team to present during the week of the first of February. And that will, indeed, be the case.

And as we are mentioning Satish Babu, I should congratulate him on being appointed Universal Acceptance liaison. So well done, Satish. Another huge amount of work coming your way, but great to see and great that you volunteered for that.

I'm not seeing any hands up for any of the action items, so we can proceed forward with the next Agenda Item, #3. That' the Board advice on the Subsequent Procedures. And for this we have Justine Chew and Jonathan Zuck. You have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          Thanks, Olivier. So the Google Doc has been circulated and we've gotten comments on it. Most of the comments are just language changes and some clarifications. Steinar continues to be concerned that we sound like we don't want a new round. I think that's, again, a valid thing to

point out, and so we'll continue to look at that language because that's certainly not the case.

But beyond that, most of the changes in here are about language. And so we appreciate the comments, and we'll make changes and submit it to the ALAC shortly.

Justine, I don't know if there's anything you'd like to add, substantively, to the comments. I've gone through them, but I didn't see anything that I viewed as controversial.

JUSTINE CHEW:                     No, I think it's all good.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Yeah. So thanks, everyone, for checking out the document, and we will whip this into shape for submission by the ALAC. And then I'm sure staff will post the final document. Thanks, everybody. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Thank you very much, Jonathan. And thanks to Justine. And congratulations to both of you for shepherding that process again. A huge amount of work. And hopefully we'll continue that good dialogue with the Board that was engaged after we sent those huge pieces of advice from the ALAC last year.

Let's move on. That's well expedited. We're not moving to our workgroup updates already. And the first one is the Transfer Policy

Review Policy Development Process. Now I'm told that there was no call regarding this PDP this week. So there isn't an update unless anybody from, well, Steinar wants to jump in and so on. But I don't believe so. So I'll assume that there isn't an update on that. We'll look forward to it next week.

The next one after that this the Expedited PDP on the Curative Rights Protections for Intergovernmental Organizations. And for this, we have Yrjö Länsipuro and Justine Chew.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Hello. We may be close to a compromise on the EPDP on IGOs. Just to reiterate, the problem—as I have been reporting many times—is that an IGO is successful in a UDRP procedure and then the Losing Registrant wants to go to court. Which they have the right. But the IGO says, "Wait. We have immunity." And then there is a situation that is sort of unsolvable.

Now it seems that we have found a formula which enables us really to have our cake and eat it, too. That is to say, it enables the IGO to agree on a Mutual Jurisdiction before going to the UDRP procedure with the registrant. But at the same time, not to give up, not to waive, their immunities and privileges.

And what happens afterwards is that if the court throw out this case, then there is still a possibility for an arbitration. This is to put it in a very short and simple language. The actual text is far more complicated, and that's what the staff is working right now on after our meeting on the last meeting on Monday.

So as I said, I remain pretty hopeful that we can actually solve this problem that has been, I've been told, for 14 years. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for the swift update, Yrjö. And let's open the floor for comments and questions. I see Justine Chew has put her hand up. Justine, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I am less optimistic than Yrjö, but I would love to be proven wrong. I think in the PDP, we are talking in circles and it gets a little bit frustrating. But parties seem to still say that there is a window for compromise, and I'm hopeful that that will happen, obviously. We're kind of standing by sight, looking at things from far or above. But, yeah. So let's see. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Justine. Let's see. We'll definitely be seeing this in the near future, finding out what's going on. Let's have a look if there are any other people in the queue. And at the moment, I'm not seeing any hands up.

So Yrjö, is there anything else on this?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: No. I fully agree with Justine. Of course, this is perhaps ... I mean, she's a lawyer. I used to be a journalist. So there are different ways, but

**EN**

basically I think that both of us are saying that there is a window to solve this problem. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Okay. Thanks very much for this, Yrjö. Now let's move swiftly. We're now looking at the Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names. For this we have Satish Babu and his team, Lianna Galstyan and Abdulkarim Oloyede. And Satish is going to go through this deck of slides that we have. And as I mentioned earlier, congratulations, Satish, on your new appointment. And I guess the floor is yours now.

SATISH BABU:   Thanks very much, Olivier. Thanks again for the good wishes. So the EPDP on IDNs has been making some progress. So we will share this with you and we will take back any guidance that CPWG may have on these issues back to the EPDP. Okay, before we start I'd like to request my colleagues to step in if I go wrong somewhere, to please interrupt me and correct me.

In the last presentation we made to CPWG, we had covered charter questions A1 through A3. We are still under the Topic A of the charter which relates to Consistent Definition and Technical Utilization of the Root Zone LGR.

So if anyone wants to refer to the previous discussions, we will put the link to the previous document and the presentation in the chat. Please refer to the link if you want to take a look.

So in this presentation, we'll be discussing the A4, A5, A6, and A7 questions which lead to different aspects of the Root Zone LGR. A4 relates to the situation if a particular script is not yet incorporated into the Root Zone LGR but there is an applicant who wants to apply using that script. In particular, we're talking about the variant TLD labels of the script which is not yet available in the root zone.

A5 is about the issue of the large number of combinations and permutations that is often associated with variant labels because we have a tool now [that will] be able to predict [the] allocatable variant. And in some cases, we have a very large number, and is concern that when viewed from the prism of the security, stability, and resiliency of the root zone, we should not allow large numbers of such variants. That's A5.

A6 is about what happens if the Generation Panel updates the Root Zone LGR, thereby rending one or more of the existing TLDs invalid. What should happen in that case?

A7 is about single character ideograph/ideogram. This is a very [inaudible] only applicable to perhaps a very small number of scripts. But still, we have to discuss this question.

So these are the questions that we'll be covering in the next 10-15 minutes or so. Next slide, please.

So, what to do with variant labels for scripts which are not there in the Root Zone LGR? The question is, how should applications for variant TLDs or existing gTLDs whose scripts are not yet integrated into the Root Zone LGR? So the SubPro earlier said that if a script is not there in the

Root Zone LGR, then the application can still be accepted and it can be processed up to but not including [contracting]. And we have to warn the applicant that there's no guarantee ever of delegation and there could be additional evaluation costs. So the question to the EPDP was whether we should extend this guidance from SubPro to variant labels also. So we did an analysis of the data. We analyzed what had happened in the ... So what was the situation so far? Were there any such violations. Were there any such applications where the script was not there, etc.?

And what we found was that, from an analysis of the existing records, all existing gTLDs and ccTLDs are either in scripts already integrated in the Root Zone LGR or will be soon integrated shortly. That is, by mid-2022.

Therefore, after discussion we found that it is unlikely that there will be any issues around this because we expect that most of the scripts are already there or will be incorporated shortly. So the proposed answer that the EPDP arrived at was that since all scripts of all existing gTLDs are already or will be shortly accounted for in the Root Zone LGR, this is a moot question. Meaning this question does not stand ... We don't ever discuss this at all because [it has been covered already]. So that is A4. Next slide, please.

A5 is a little more involved because of the fact that this is about numbers. "Should there be a ceiling or other mechanism to keep the number of activated variant labels small?" The "small" is in double quotes in the sense that what is small is a question that has troubled us quite deeply. We'll come to that.

"Should there be additional security and stability guidelines developed to make variant domains manageable at the registry, registrar, and registrant levels?" All different levels. So there is actually an implication of the numbers of these variant labels on the registry, registrar, and registrant operations.

So the context is from SAC060 Recommendation 14 and Technical Study Group Recommendation 6 wherein the general tone is that the more variant labels "allowed to be delegated," the greater the challenges for their management at the registry, registrar, and registrant levels. Next slide, please.

So as an illustration—I think we have seen similar slides earlier, also—this is a case of a real example of Root Zone LGR output. Meaning the tool's output. For a single label, we'll just call Original 1, that original label has given rise to various variants which are of disposition "allocatable" or "blocked." And you can see there are quite a few allocated [inaudible]. Next slide, please.

So we therefore had a consultation with SSAC which had actually given early inputs and writing to the EPDP. So we discussed with them as to what caused them to take this approach, whereby they said [they looked very] conservatively to minimize, make sure that the numbers were as small as possible. Whereas, many other members of the EPDP felt what is the problem [in increasing] the numbers to what the language community wants or let the market decide because there's a cost to each of these. So with that, we kind of ...

But we'll see that the final result, [the moral] is that we should be conservative and we should have sufficient policy guidance that will ensure that the numbers are automatically restricted.

So in the discussion with SSAC, what SSAC pointed out was that, for them, there is no such thing as variants because each label is independent. Whereas, the variant is more a language construct than something which is an attribute of the root zone. And therefore, for them, these are all independent labels. The volume of labels does not automatically create the stability or security risk by itself. But if you look at the third bullet, it says, "But foreseeable manageability challenges with permutation issue at the top level, exacerbated at the second level, so therefore it is advisable to keep variants to a minimum."

To keep the discussion short, we had difficulty in defining what is small and what would be the minimal number required. Should there be a ceiling? So the net result was that we fell back. We [can afford] to fall back on the discussion as to how should we demonstrate the necessity and the degree of widespread use required because these are language community's issues—or the script community's issues. Next slide, please.

So we then looked at the actual data once again, and we found that although ... First of all, not all languages have this problem of a large number of variant labels. In fact, only about six or seven languages have this problem, and these are Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Greek, Latin, Myanmar, and Tamil. And of these which have the problem of variants, except for Arabic, the other script communities have already created

mechanisms to limit the number of allocated variants as a built-in safeguard.

So this is not a universal problem, and this is perhaps confined to Arabic and maybe one or two other languages, at best. So as of now, we are just looking at Arabic.

So, who and how to decide on ceiling? And should we allow the market forces to keep things in check without any ... Because any ceiling, it was pointed out, would be kind of arbitrary and, therefore, artificial.

Now this is a proposed answer and this text is not fast and concrete. It can still change. The proposed answer is:

Due to permutation issue challenges, it make sense to keep the number of activated variant labels small. Any permutation issue at the top level will become much worse at the second level.

It is difficult to determine who and how to decide on ceiling. It may be artificial.

Safeguards built-in at the GP LGR or Root Zone LGR may provide some level of protection, as some of the languages have shown us that they have, themselves, restricted.

Perhaps, better of placing burden on applicant to—quoting from the text—"clearly demonstrate the necessity for activating the string" by providing evidence of clear demand for and "demonstrated widespread use of the variant labeled as part of the additional guidance."

So we may need to develop additional guidelines which make these things clear. So fundamentally, we are saying that this is an interplay of what the language community wants and the practical constraints or considerations of the stability of the root zone. Next.

JUSTINE CHEW: Satish, I think you should pause for questions [inaudible].

SATISH BABU: Should we take questions [inaudible]? Okay. So maybe there is one more slide with A6. No, this is the next one. So we can cover the questions for A4 and A5. Are there any questions at this point?

SIVA MUTHASAMY: Yes, if I may.

SATISH BABU: Sure, please go ahead.

SIVA MUTHASAMY: Yeah, you were talking about—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, there's actually a queue. I'm sorry. There's Jonathan, Hadia Elminiawi, and then Siva. So let's start with Jonathan.

SATISH BABU:                          Olivier, I think ... Please manage the queue. Yeah, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Jonathan, you have [the floor].

JONATHAN ZUCK:                    On the last question, I'm confused. What is the case for limiting the number for the ceiling? What is the problem that that's attempting to solve?

SATISH BABU:                          Right. Thanks, Jonathan, for the question. I will attempt to answer it. My colleagues can add on to the answers. There are two aspects to this. The first is the security, stability, and resiliency of the root zone which the SSAC was very concerned about. So they felt that if you open up ... Suppose we don't have a limit. Then at the top level, if there are, say, 5 variants for a single label. At the second level, that may become 50 because the fact that there's a multiplier effect in place. So to have so many labels come up, the SSAC felt that it could pose problems of security and stability. That is one side of it.

The other side of it is that these variants, although they are independent labels as far as the SSAC is concerned, they are supposed to be variants, which means they are a part of a single label, administratively, for the registry and all the three levels. Now anything that you do in a registry with this one label has to be done ... The same thing has to happen with the variants millions, also. So therefore, there is an administrative cost to building up this bunch of variants.

So these were the two main issues that were brought to our attention. My colleagues, if they want to add on anything to this, they can add on right now.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you, Satish. And actually, I've raised my hand to address this point. Satish, you provided a great answer, but I raised my hand to address it and also to provide an answer to what Jonathan just said.

So if we're talking about allocatable variants, there are two points here. One, could we actually put a ceiling number? And the answer is no. There is no number that we can say, "Okay, three is good" or "four is good" because it depends on what I'm going to explain.

And then the other issue is in relation to the guidelines regarding other allocatable variants. So two points arise here when we talk about the guidelines in relation to the allocatable variants. One, how many? The variants need to be manageable by the registry. And as Satish mentioned, one of the issues here is that each variant is actually a separate top-level domain that the registry needs to manage. And when we consider this point, each entry should be able to decide how many IDN TLDs it can actually manage. So I think we leave this part to the registries.

But there is another point here. And the other issue here is related to the DNS stability and security. And I would, here, also talk from an end user perspective. And if you have two IDN TLDs that will lead to users' confusability, that does not promise a very much stable or secure DNS

ecosystem. Also, if you have confusion ID TLDs, that can lead to some form of DNS abuse. And that's, again, a security concern.

So we cannot put an upper ceiling, but we need to consider those two points. One of them, I think, it is up to the registry to decide how many TLDs it can manage. But the other issue, which is related to users' confusability, I think it's a community issue. Again, you cannot put an upper ceiling because this will differ from one label to another. But it is something that needs to be considered. Thank you. In my opinion.

SATISH BABU:    Thanks, Hadia. So is there anything that my colleagues/team members want to add on for this? Otherwise, it's back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Then it's over to Sivasubramanian Muthasamy.

SIVA MUTHASAMY:    Satish, you were talking about different positions from the market and the language community. In what way does it differ and what is the degree of differences between these two positions? That's one question.

The other question is, why does SSAC have a completely different position on this altogether? What is the summary of their position? Thank you.

| | |
|---|---|
| SATISH BABU: | Thanks, Siva. So the language community [versus the history]. Now this is the first time we are doing variants of IDNs, so we don't have anything to examine the past records. So all we are discussing currently is what would happen if you took this position or that position. |

Now SSAC is very consistent. They have been saying what they've been saying all along, which is that there are certain aspects that we have to consider when opening up to variants in terms of its impact on the security, stability, and resiliency of the root zone. Now they have been very consistent. They have stuck to their positions in our interactions with then because we have raised this point saying that, "What's your problem? [Let the registries] do what they want, what they can."

So in fact, they have even suggested that ... I mean, their basic position is that, no, they don't think that's a good idea. You cannot start [and then] say, "[That's okay]. There's no ceiling. You can ask for any number of variants." And then you try to be strict. Their point is, you start with one. And then if there is a demonstrated requirement by the language community that this must have this one variant, then you have one plus one. And that is the way they see this developing.

Now, there is something positive there in the sense of we're taking the cautious approach because rather than completely open up—whether on the basis of market or on the basis of language community's request—it may be ... In order to have a more cautious, precautionary kind of approach, what they propose may be a better way to get started.

Now subsequently, when you get to get started and you have some experience, then maybe we can open up for a more relaxed way to kind of look at variants. But currently, as we're getting started, the debate is whether we should start with an open kind of a thing or you start with a restrictive kind of model and then look at the experience on the security and stability. Anand then you can kind of open up.

So that is where we are in the debate. But the Registries have pointed out that, "Look, we should be allowed to manage our own kind of, whatever we can manage in consultation with the language communities. And the applicant should be allowed to kind of function." But this is the other side of it, that SSAC feels that we should be more conservative, at least to start off with. And then maybe we can open up.

So I'll stop here and maybe any of my colleagues can respond.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:     Thank you, Satish. I totally agree with everything you said. However, in relation to Siva's question, I don't see the SSAC having a different view than the community. And I would ask him, where does he see the difference? Because I don't see them actually saying something different than what we are saying.

SATISH BABU:     Back to you, Oliver. And I hear some noise on the line.

| YEŞIM SAGLAM: | Satish, we were trying to locate the beeping sounds and it looks like it's done now. |
|---|---|

| SATISH BABU: | Right, Yeşim. |
|---|---|

| SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: | It was Olivier. |
|---|---|

| SATISH BABU: | Well, Olivier has dropped off. Okay. So I think I can continue with the A6. Are there any other questions before we get into it? |
|---|---|

| JEFF NEUMAN: | Yes. |
|---|---|

| SATISH BABU: | Yes, Jeff. Please go ahead. |
|---|---|

| JEFFREY NEUMAN: | Yeah, thank you. So I guess, here's the problem. I'm one of the different views in the working group. I'm representing the IPC in there. The issue is that ... Well, let me go back. |
|---|---|
| | The SSAC has said that there are no technical security and stability issues with putting additional variants into the root. So that was their starting point. But then they started to opine more on policy and |

basically made the point that, "Well, it will be difficult for registries to manage. It will be complex for registrars, and it may be complex for registrants." And then that's where they came up with their whole conservative principle.

But from my personal point of view, I don't believe that's what the SSAC should be opining or giving advice on. Or if they give advice on it, it's not something that the rest of the community has to take which is on the same level as advice that they give based on true security and stability of the root.

So with that in mind, I don't think it's good policy to ever try and protect registries or registrars from themselves. In other words, what they're saying is that registries are going to ask for more variants than they can handle. They're not going to be able to help registrars to manage it. And there's not going to be good messaging for registrants to help them manage all of their variants in the permutations.

So my proposal was to take it away from this restrictive, arbitrary rule just saying that registries can't have them to registries being required to demonstrate to evaluators that they can handle it and to come up with criteria by which to measure whether a registry can responsibly manage multiple variants at the same time, which would include a plan for educating registrars as well as educating registrants and also end users.

So there could be a high bar, and that's fine. But to just automatically have a rule just to say that you can only have a certain number, to me is just ... It's not good policy. It's never good policy. And especially if there is a demand for those variants. And the whole principle of "let's just do

one and then see how it goes and then we can always amend the policy to have more," I mean, look at the last time we launched a new gTLD round. It was 10 years ago. And ICANN is not a very fast organization to learn and then move on quickly.

So for all of those reasons and for those that want to listen to the SSAC call, which they admitted that my proposal made sense—or I shouldn't say SSAC, sorry—the members from SSAC that were on that call because they don't speak for SSAC. So again, it's just, I have a problem with putting arbitrary limits that are intended to protect entities from themselves.

And then a last point to address Hadia's question of, well, if we have multiple variants, there's more chances for DNS abuse. In theory that could be correct, but that would be against what SubPro had recommended which was a same entity principle. Meaning that, at the second level, it should be the same entity that is assigned the name and all of the applicable variants at the second level. So the likelihood of ...

I mean, if someone's going to commit DNS abuse with one name, they're going to do it with all of them. They're not going to do DNS abuse for one name and then legitimate uses for the others, if they're even allowed by the registry to use multiple variants for different purposes. So that's making a lot of assumptions, but right now the SubPro policy which was accepted by the GNSO, the fallback is that it's the same entity rule. If that changes with this EPDP, then we can come back and revisit. But I'm not concerned about DNS abuse in this particular context. Thanks.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Jeff. So [we heard a bit] of your position and you have been quite forthright. Now we have to balance these issues. And this is just my personal opinion. I see that Abdulkarim has pointed out that, "The issue of security was raised from the onset as far as I know." And therefore, he feels that we should be more conservative about the DNS abuse.

Of course, you're right. There are less chances of this because of the same entity constraint. So I think CPWG can examine these different aspects and let us know how we can take it forward. What would be the kind of ...

And [inaudible] has the comment also, "Is this a problem from the other way around?" That means if you started one and gradually expand, will that cause a different set of issues? I'm not qualified to answer that, but from what SSAC was trying to tell us in that—not SSAC—SSAC members who came to this meeting. They didn't think that there would be any such issues if you started conservatively and then kind of opened up slightly. So this is what I understand.

Yes. Jeff points out that SSAC has said, and we have also put it in our presentation that there are no direct stability issues because this is just another label and the root zone is capable of adding on more labels. Right?

So at this point I would like to move on, because we will be taking a lot of time otherwise, to A6. A6 is about what would happen if there's an

update of the Root Zone LGR by a GP, particularly a language community a script community. Now, why should this happen?

Now there are dependencies. It's not as if the GP is completely autonomous. They are in turn dependent on the Unicode layer and the IDNA2008 layers which are subject to change. Unicode keeps on coming out with new change, and IDNA also can change. Although we have been informed that these are very guarded changes, they are also, themselves, very conservative in changing.

So the GP proposal is always subject to public comment. So if there's a situation that there is a new version of a particular Root Zone LGR that has been released, there's a public comment process for that. But if, in the process of adopting this new Root Zone LGR, it invalidates some of the existing strings, then that would happen?

So the point is that we have been informed that it's a very remote possibility. If you look at the history of what's happened in the past, this is not likely to happen. But if someone like this happens, then we have to grandfather that particular TLD which has suddenly got broken because the Root Zone LGR has changed and it [is already being used].

So again, this is still a work in development. It is not the final text at all. So the first point is that the GP has to call out the exception and explain why this should happen because all of us agree that this should not happen. Each of the Root Zone LGR versions should be backward compatible. But if backward compatibility is broken on a particular version, the GP then the IP have to explain to use as to why this has happened.

The relevant registry and ICANN Org—sorry about the typo; it was not I*, it was ICANN Org—impact on registry operations, registrar, registrant, etc. We need to kind of examine. And when you say "grandfathering," different people seem to have different opinion about what is grandfathering. So therefore the EPDP discussed this and came to the conclusion that somebody has to actually put down, define what is "grandfathering." So this is the proposal response for A6.

And finally, the last one. Next slide, please. So the last one that we're discussing is about single character TLDs. Now there are different parts of the question. Should we allow single character IDNs for limited scripts? How do we identify eligible scripts what mechanism or criteria? What mechanism or criteria can we use to identify a list of eligible characters as a single character TLD within eligible scripts?

So historically, some languages have this ability to have single character potential TLDs. And these are Han script, Chinese, Japanese, [Korean]. These have been identified as suitable or appropriate for single character gTLDs.

Now this answer is not complete because we have not been told why. Historically, ideographs/ideograms kind of represent an idea rather than a sound. So therefore, it makes sense that they would be considered for a single character gTLD because it's, again, a concept that is being represented.

So, some questions have been raised in the last EPDP meeting as to why do we only look at these. Are there anything else? So the issue is not closed, but we are converging to the point that only these three are

most likely to be the ones that can use single character gTLDs, and we are to see how we can identify which characters [will be]. So that's, again, the work of the GPs.

So therefore, single character TLDs will be allowed for this limited set of code points, for this limited set of script languages. So that's very good. Next slide, please.

So this is the end of it, so we can take some more questions on the last two points if there are any. Otherwise, back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you, Satish. Let's go to ... I see, still, Siva and Hadia. So Sivasubramanian.

SIVA MUTHASAMY:     Hadia was asking me why I was saying that SSAC has a different opinion. It's just that I wanted to be clear about SSAC's security position. She asked me that question.

SATISH BABU:     Right. So Hadia, would you like to respond or is it okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Hadia Elminiawi?

| | |
|---|---|
| HADIA ELMINIAWI: | Yeah. Thank you, Satish. And also, I think it's my turn anyway to speak. Again, Siva, from my point of view I don't see the SSAC saying something different in relation to allocatable variants and in relation to what Jeff has mentioned in that regard. So I agree that having a certain number does not work because it will always depend on the IDN label applied for and the entity managing those labels.<br><br>I also agree that each registry should be able to identify how many variant labels it can manage. And generally speaking, I also agree that issues like DNS abuse and user confusability are not huge concerns. Nevertheless— |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you, Hadia. Let's go to Justine Chew next. |
| JUSTINE CHEW: | Thanks. I think you cut Hadia off, but anyway ... Look, Siva, if I could put your question into perspective. I think people are a little bit confused as to what we say when we talk about security and stability. Okay? Where SSAC is coming from is stability and security at the root.<br><br>So what they said was that it doesn't matter how many variants you introduce into the root because each of them are considered as separate TLDs. The root of the server or the computer doesn't know that this is a variant of that. As far as they're concerned, one is a TLD. The other is also a TLD. They're not related in that respect. The variant positioning is actually imposed by what this in the RZ-LGR, the Root |

Zone Label Generation Rules. And that's determined by the script communities.

So it is up to the script community—for example, the Chinese community that uses the Han script. They come up with rules that say, "This particular TLD is tied to this particular TLD, so therefore they are considered as variants." And how that rule perpetuates is in the tool that Satish mentioned. And using that tool, it will generate a list of variants, what is considered a variant of another. And you had seen the table that represented the Arabic example.

It's not a technical issue from the perspective of security and stability to the root. It is a security and stability issue that comes from the perspective of end users. So when somebody goes to one TLD and they didn't know that it is a variant or they expect it to be a variant of something else, then those two connected TLDs should act accordingly. All right?

So again, from a SSAC's perspective, in the root zone the root doesn't know that and there's no way to program that in the root. So it is up to the registries and the Registrars, and downward to the registrants even, to figure out a way of how to relate variants together.

So that is the level of complexity that we're dealing with, that SSAC is trying to raise to our awareness. So three TLDs could generate up to something like 81 variants. So if you make all 81 variants allocatable and redelegated, then you are trying to link 81 TLDs together. And the numbers increase exponentially when we get [inaudible] variants and downward to the second level.

So that is the complexity that we're grappling with. In the EPDP itself, we did grapple with the issue of whether there needs to be a ceiling. And from my perspective, it is a prudent approach. But the difficulty of working out how you define a ceiling or who decides [on a] ceiling, that is something that even I can't answer. I don't know who can answer, really. So from that perspective, it may not work. It may not be a great idea.

So from my perspective—and this is speaking personally, I'm putting on my individual hat—we can define what the ceiling would look like and we can define, perhaps, even what a small number of variants to be activated would look like. Then we push it back to the Registries or the applicants and ask them, "Why do you need this variant? How are you going to make sure that it doesn't introduce confusability? How are you going to manage from the registration down to avoid confusion, to avoid incidences of potential for DNS abuse and all of those things that end users care about?"

So we are asking for input in terms of what questions do you want the applicants to answer in order to be able to substantiate their claim or their request for a variant. Thank you.

And if you have any input, please, by all means present it to us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. Unfortunately, I'm not sure if there's anybody else in the queue right now.

SATISH BABU:               No, there's no one in the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     All right. Thanks, Satish. Back to you if you have anything else to add.

SATISH BABU:               Right. So we will keep the CPWG updated on this because the text is still somewhat tentative on the last couple of points. And as we have more consensus within the EPDP, we'll be back with more details. And if CPWG has anything as guidance for us, please pass it on and we'll be happy to take it back. Thank you very much and back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much, Satish. And now we're going to go to our next Agenda Item, and that's our policy development updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:              Thanks so much, Olivier. Just running through the agenda here. There are recently no ratified statements by the ALAC since last week's CPWG meeting, but there are updates for the upcoming public comment proceedings. You'll see on the tabs there, there's one each for February and March, and then later on in August. In February, there will be a Root Zone Update Process Study. In March, a follow-up NCAP Study 2

**EN**

Draft Report. And August would be an update to the GNSO Operating Procedures. So stay tuned for those.

And we've also invited the NCAP Discussion Group co-chairs to hopefully give a presentation to the CPWG in the coming weeks.

So currently, there's just one public comment for decision closing in March. And that is the Name Collision Analysis Project Study 2 documents. So stay tuned for updates on that.

And otherwise, current statements in progress, there are only two being shepherded by the Operations, Finance, and Budget Working Group. One to be confirmed by them, but the other on ... The ICANN Draft Operating Financial Plan and Budget is nearing completion, and that will soon go to ALAC vote later this week.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Jonathan if you have any updates. Thank you so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. I don't think that I do. We're looking forward to that presentation on NCAP to get everybody's head wrapped around that. But I don't think we have anything else to address today, Olivier, so you get off easy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. That was very swift, indeed, from you. I'm not able to see the screen at the moment if there are any hands up. I gather there aren't any. But I also gather that I have zapped the

Registration Directory Service Scoping Team that Alan was going to speak to. I'm not sure whether he has any update for us, so I should just make a quick side jump over to the RDS Scoping Team.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Thank you, Olivier. No, I had to miss the meeting last week and I haven't listened to the recording yet. That's later today. So I have nothing to report at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Let's move on swiftly to our next Agenda Item. And that's the one about Any Other Business. We have two in that agenda, and the first one is about the ALAC-GAC bilateral session that is taking place at the next ICANN meeting. And Joanna Kulesza has asked that we have a moment to discuss some ability to make discussion topics. So just discussion topics, etc. Let's open the floor. And perhaps Joanna would be able to speak. I'm not sure if she's on there.

JOANNA KULESZA:           Yes I am, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    You have the floor.

| JOANNA KULESZA: | Thank you very much. Just briefly, I did put this request on the mailing list and we did receive some feedback. Just to recap, we are planning for the usual bilateral between the GAC and the ALAC. We're trying to do a topic scoping exercise, as per usual. The GAC liaison has requested that we identify the topics that are of relevance currently. On the list we received from the GAC are standing items that include DNS abuse, Public Interest Framework, the EPDP, and SubPro. The question is whether all of these remain relevant and we want to put them on the agenda. |
|---|---|

Additionally, earlier today, Roberto suggested that we might want to add Universal Acceptance. And with Satish kindly accepting his liaison role—congratulations, Satish—that just might be one of the topics we might want to add.

And another issue is the pending white paper on DNS abuse between the GAC and the ALAC. We would be looking for members of a small drafting team. There have been meetings between the Public [Safety] Working Group of the GAC, between the co-chairs of the Consolidated Policy Working Group. I believe we have touched upon it during the last public meeting with, for example, Cheryl agreeing to participate in that small working group. We've received feedback on the mailing list from Steinar who I believe would be a much welcome addition to the drafting team.

It is indeed probably recommended for the group to be kept relatively small, so any suggestions on how to best select the members or possibly recruit volunteers on this call would be most welcome.

There is a DNS abuse plenary planned where the At-Large, unfortunately, will not be actively participating. But this white paper just might be our opportunity to chime in to the discussion. This plenary will focus on the EU Commission Study on DNS Abuse. I'm happy to share the link to the final report which will probably also inform the white paper.

So I'm going to stop here. I think that covers most of the elements of my original e-mail. I also welcome Justine's wonderful suggestion of a format for the scoping questions which she had proposed for the GNSO plenary if that is something we would like to follow. I'm also happy to do that. I'm going to stop here and hand the floor back to Oliver, indicating that Justine's hand is up. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you for this, Joanna. I'm, again, still unable to see my screen. The Internet isn't that great on the move. So if there any hands up at the moment.

JUSTINE CHEW:    Yes, my hand was up. Thanks, Oliver.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Justine, you have the floor. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:     Thank you. Thank you, Joanna. Yeah, I was actually going to suggest to folks here who—if you don't mind drawing from what I did with the GNSO one—folks that would like to propose a topic, they should actually try to frame a question around it so that it's easier for people to understand where you're coming from and what you're trying to achieve with GAC.

The second point that I wanted to make was, in terms of Subsequent Procedures—and this is more for Joanna's reference, I guess—I suspect that has gone down the order of priority in terms of discussions with GAC. And we left it at the point of a "let's see what happens" kind of situation. What we can do is, once we have settled the ALAC responses to the Board's questions on Subsequent Procedures, I can extend a copy to my colleagues in GAC—the topic leads for Subsequent Procedures—and then perhaps see where they want to go with it in terms of the ALAC-GAC bilateral. Would that be a useful thing to do, Joanna?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Joanna Kulesza?

JOANNA KULESZA:     Thank you very much. Yes, that would be most useful. Thank you. I'm happy to follow your lead. I find the format impressive, and I think it's very clear and it's a good practice example we could follow. And indeed, it makes sense for the liaisons to make sure that our outreach policy to other communities is consistent. So I'm happy to work with you on that in most details.

I do reactivate the request for issues unless you suggest, Justine, that we might want to coordinate these as well, ensuring that both of these narratives are reflective of one another. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much, Joanna. Is there anybody else in the queue? I' not hearing anything, so I gather there isn't anyone else. So now the next topic on Any Other Business is the ALAC-GNSO Council bilateral session.

Justine, do you have a few words to add to this?

JUSTINE CHEW:     Yes, please. Thank you, Olivier. Could staff bring up that Google Doc, please?

So the call has been made to the CPWG list for topics for ALAC's consideration to raise with the GNSO Council. There's a bilateral meeting planned for the 9th of March at this point in time. I didn't actually get any topic suggestions, so I came up with some. And I would love for people to provide some input on this, whether there needs to be some reordering or adding or subtracting to it.

And in terms of the first one on SSAD, I would ask for Hadia and/or Alan to have a look at this and help frame the background and questions or any goals that they wish to pursue with GNSO Council on behalf of ALAC.

And I think the rest of it is quite self-explanatory. It's, hopefully, not too long for people to go through and read and to make comments. And I

would ask staff to just remind us of any deadlines that we need to meet in terms of settling the list and [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: If someone's speaking, we can't hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, I thought that I had dropped off. Justine, have you finished? I think I didn't hear the end of your sentence.

ALAN GREENBERG: She finished.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions on [this]?

ALAN GREENBERG: You have three hands up. I don't know [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: You've got three hands up. Hadia, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]. Thank you, Jonathan.

| | |
|---|---|
| HADIA ELMINIAWI: | Thank you, Jonathan and Oliver. And thank you, Justine, for actually coming up with the list of topics. I'm definitely happy to contribute to the Operational Design Assessment of the Standardized System discussion. |
| | But I raised my hand, actually, to ask would you like to take over topics or discuss topics like, for example, the one raised by Domain Insight about ICANN implementation to policies? Do we want to discuss such topics and would it be all right or appropriate to do that? Thank you. |
| HEIDI ULLRICH: | Hi, Olivier. Justine has dropped from Zoom, so I don't believe she heard that question or is able to answer. Thank you. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Oh, deal. Okay, thank you. And I'm also into this strange situation here where I ... Okay, I'm no longer [blind]. So that's good. But I'm just about to leave EURALO and go into APRALO. Changing continents. |
| JONATHAN ZUCK: | Yeah, Justine let me know that she lost her Internet connection. So she won't be back on. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Okay. Let's go through the queue— |

JONATHAN ZUCK:          So, yeah, the queue is only relevant if they're not questions. If they are statements, then we can go through it [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    If they're statements. Yeah. Well, let's have Alan [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:          So next in the queue is Sébastien.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    I thought it was Alan.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:    Thank you very much. Thank you, Jonathan and thank you, Olivier. Hard to run the meeting from two different continents.

Taking into account what Hadia said, I would very much like not to point to a specific issue written by a journalist, but be more general. And maybe the best way is to ask also the OFB to see what topic could be put on the table. For example, we are in this working group talking about the budget and finance, and there may be a topic which could be interesting to discuss with the GNSO. And the more generic topic, the question of prioritization, could be of interest.

I don't know when will be in discussion with the GNSO, if it will be before or after the meeting name, Cheryl Langdon-Orr Policy Topic, on this same prioritization issue. But if it's after, it will be great. If it's before, we will have to be prepared. But I just want to be sure that we

don't just take policy issues, but also OFB issues for this discussion with the GNSO. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much, Sébastien. I'm not back with Internet. Next is Alan Greenberg. If Allen can hear me. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Sorry. I was unmuted and muted myself and then started talking. I'm of mixed opinions on this. This is the first GNSO-ALAC meeting that we've had in many years. Perhaps there's merit in keeping it friendly and noncontroversial. On the other hand, there's a lot of controversial things going on.

The one that Hadia mentioned—I think, it was Hadia—on the article that was just written pointing out that ICANN hasn't implemented any new policy since 2016. And one could go further and say not only have they not implemented a policy, but there's a record of not enforcing policies that had been implemented. That's not a particularly warming statement. And since we are talking about GNSO policy, it is potentially relevant.

Another look at this, perhaps the same question, is on the EPDP Phase. The GNSO was very happy to approve the SSAD recommendations as they came out of the PDP, basically saying, "The PDP did its work. We don't think they violated any rules, therefore we're passing it on to the Board" without really looking at the fact that there was significant

opposition. And there were a lot of concerns raised with it. The Board, on the other hand ...

Well, the Operational Design Phase, and by implication the Board in the way they're asking questions, are now in fact looking just at that. That is, there were a lot of problems with it. Is it really wise to implement it as recommended? And the GNSO is in fact talking about, "Well, maybe not. What should we change to make it more practical?"

There's a very strong difference between the position that they're taking now in response to the ODP, it would seem, and the position they took when approving the PDP. And maybe these are things that we have to discuss. Maybe this is not quite the time for it, but there are a lot of things that just don't look very good and I think, ultimately, they're going to have to come to the surface. I'm not sure this meeting is the place to do that if we're trying to establish a new rapport with the GNSO Council. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much, Alan. Justine Chew is next.

JUSTINE CHEW:     Thank you, Olivier. I'm so sorry. I lost connection to my Internet some time back, so I missed probably 99% of what Alan was saying and anyone who spoke before him. But I will definitely go and listen to the recording.

As I said, I was seeking guidance in terms of whether there can be any position for the short term that can be raised at ICANN73 between ALAC

and the GNSO Council. Open to suggestions. I did want to point out that, yes, GNSO Council is now taking the position of, "We need to do something" in a very simplified description. And it has established a small team to try and break down the SSAD ODA to see what it should do, I suppose. And an invitation has been extended to the ALAC reps, namely Hadia and Alan, if they want to participate in the small team. So I think Hadia has volunteered. So I don't know whether Alan wants to or not.

But I think there is scope for discussions. It's just a question of how we approach it and whether we need to go all out in one go or we need to do it gradually. I suspect gradually would be the better approach. And you would understand that some of these things actually possibly go back to other issues that we can talk to GNSO Council about, such as the continuous improvement of the way GNSO works, whether there's going to be any changes to the PDP 3.0 or their operating procedures. That sort of thing. Which is a more long-term conversation that we can have with the GNSO Council. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you, Justine. Next is Sivasubramanian Muthasamy.

SIVA MUTHASAMY:     Yeah. Not to be misunderstood, Hadia and Alan are exceptionally good representatives of ALAC and very good participants, well-informed participants. But the underlying question is, why would the working group or the Council name particular participants as acceptable rather than keep it open for ALAC to designate two participants? Again, I want

to emphasize that I'm very happy with Hadia and Alan and I'm very respectful of them. But why does GNSO prefer to do that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you, Siva.

JUSTINE CHEW:     If I may answer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Does this require an answer now or is that a question that you want to ask the GNSO, Siva?

SIVA MUTHASAMY:     Yes, I would like to ask the question to the GNSO at an appropriate meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     If Hadia has an answer, let her speak, please. Not Hadia. Sorry, if Justine has an answer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     It's Justine that might have an answer. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW:    Yes, thank you. GNSO has a way of operating just like At-Large and ALAC have a way of operating. So it is what it is. And we can slowly break down silos. Not necessarily, as I said … We don't actually have the capacity to go all out at one point in time. But we can make little inroads, and as was suggested, that would be the way to go. For example, as I said before, they have extended an invitation to the ALAC reps to join a small team to look at the SSAD ODA. So I think that's a great gesture.

And the reason why they extend it to the ALAC reps is because the ALAC reps are the ones that are the most knowledgeable within At-Large about the SSAD and the ODA. Presumably, they're the best ones to be able to analyze the ODA. We can't have someone fresh with little background stepping in to do the work that's needed for this kind of task. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much, Justine. I see Alan Greenberg again. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you. Just a follow-on comment on that. I suspect that if Hadia or I could not do it for one reason or another and the ALAC chose to say, "We have someone else who really understands these issues and we would like to have them participate instead," that's something the ALAC can do and the GNSO may or may not be receptive to it if that is, indeed, the case. But I don't think that is the case right now, in any case.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you, Alan. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW:     Yes, I don't believe that is the case now because this is a small team of the GNSO Council. So it's not an open PDP the way you understand, or the way Siva might understand the discussion are held. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much .And I do not see any further hands in the queue. So I think that topic's probably close. Obviously, the call for topics is still open. Alan, you have put your hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Yeah. Just one more brief comment. The GNSO has had several meetings recently where … Sorry, there were meetings of the GNSO Council where they also invited GNSO-appointed people to the EPDP. There were several meetings where the GNSO council met but also invited reps to the members of the EPDP, but only those appointed by the GNSO. They have been subject to strong criticisms from a number of us for not allowing the other reps to speak equally. Just because we're not part of the GNSO done not mean we don't have input on this. So this sounds like this is an attempt to fix that, and I think we should be grateful not critical of it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this, Alan. And Justine, I guess the only thing one could ask you is when is the deadline for this? Do you need it ASAP?

JUSTINE CHEW:           Well, there is a deadline. I can't remember what it is. But as I said, it's actually for Alan and Hadia to respond. Hadia has already responded. I'm just trying to figure out whether Alan has done the same in the chat. But it's just a matter of letting people know that this is happening and we'll see what happens out of it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Thank you, Justine. And I'm told that Alan has indeed responded as well. So that's all there. All right. I think that we're dong through with that topic.

And the last question, I guess, is are there any other topics than the ones currently listed? Any further questions or topics? No? Okay, well I guess the only thing I could ask is that this is probably the first ALAC call that's chaired from one continent and moving into another continent, as I'm currently on that bridge between Europe and Asia in Istanbul. But in the meantime, we should look at what our next meeting is. And for this, I should ask [inaudible].

YEŞIM SAGLAM:          It looks like we have lost Olivier. Oh, there you are. Thanks so much, Olivier. So as we are rotating, the next meeting should be next week on Wednesday at 19:00 UTC. However, I do have a question for Jonathan.

Jonathan, I see that there is an SO/AC chairs call at the same time, so you might be attending that one with Maureen. So the question is, shall we book next week's call at 20:00 UTC or keep it as it is at 19:00 UTC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    Maureen generally asked me to attend those calls. I don't know what the specific agenda is. I guess I don't want to disrupt everyone else's schedule just for me if Olivier will be available. And I'll just determine when I know the agenda of the other call. I'd be happy to have the conflict resolved, but I think happier to make sure that everybody else could make the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you, Jonathan. Well, I'm absolutely find with the time next week. So we usually rotate with 19:00 UTC being the evening time. And of course I'm mindful of those people that cannot attend the current timing because of the problem that the earth is still round.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    Sure. I guess the question that Yeşim was asking is whether it could be an hour later even. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    That's fine with me. I guess it's fine with most people? I think an hour is a little difficult, but an hour later is workable for most people here.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    All right. Well then let's go ahead and try to do it at 20:00.

YEŞIM SAGLAM: 20:00? Okay. So next call will be Wednesday at 20:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim.

YEŞIM SAGLAM: Thank you. And back over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you very much for this. So I'd like to, at this point, thank our interpreters for having lasted the whole length of the call, and also our real-time text transcriber. And, of course, everyone who has provided updates today. And to you all who have participated.

See you next week. And until then, keep on bringing those suggestions for the ALAC-GAC and the ALAC-GNSO meetings on the mailing list or indeed on the web pages, on the Wiki pages that are designed for that purpose. And until then, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Good-bye.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**