YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call, taking place on Wednesday, 12th of October, 2022 at 16:00 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 from the Zoom room and on phone bridge [00:00:31 - inaudible] recorded after the call.

Just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Yrjö Länsipuro, Laura Margolis, Denise Hochbaum, Lutz Donnerhacke, and from Vanda Scartezini. We do have Herb Waye on this call observing our call. From staff side, we have Heidi Ulrich, Chantelle Doerksen, Claudia Ruiz, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call, and I'll be doing call management.

As usual, we do have our Spanish and French interpreters. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Veronica and David, and on the French channel we have Aurélie and Isabelle. Before we get started, another reminder is for the real-time transcription service we have provided on the CPWG polls. I've just shared the link with you on Zoom chat.

Please do check the service. The final reminder will be for everyone to please state their names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to your Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I hope you can hear me. Today we had a few problems last week with the bridge between ADIGO and the Zoom, so hopefully, it's going to work today correctly. Of course, I'm using the real-time text transcription if things go wrong and Hadia Elminiawi who's now our co-chair, will be able to take over if I get dropped out at any at any moment.

So today we have a full agenda again, and after our action items, we'll have work group and small team updates. You'll see it's a longer time than usual because, of course, there's been a lot going on between the Transfer Policy Review PDP, the EPDP on IDNs, and the two events. Well, the RDS Scoping Team [00:03:19 - inaudible] that are both followed by Alan Greenberg.

So we'll have some updates on this with documents that you can shift through in the agenda, and then after that, we will have our policy common updates with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia Elminiawi, looking at the various policy documents and policy advice pipeline that are currently-- sorry, policy advices that are currently in the ALAC pipeline. After that, we'll have any other business.

So at this point in time, would there be any amendments changes to the agenda? Any additions to the agenda? I am not seeing anyone putting their hands up. I just want to add one thing to the agenda and I'll do that immediately after this little memorium.

The agenda is adopted as it currently is on the screen, and our action items from last week are-- well, there's one that was remaining, which

was to confirm the CPWG call date to discuss updates on DNS abuse. That's still in progress. I know we've got quite a pipeline on DNS abuse. Any news on this, Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Olivier. Thank you. This is Chantelle. We chatted with some of the experts in the CPWG. It was agreed that we might want to move this to possibly the week of the 26th, and then to invite some of the GNSO folks to join us. That's still in progress, and we might have an update, hopefully, for you next week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much for following up on this, and of course, thanks to our GNSO liaison, we're working on being able to link all of these complex bits together. That's all we have on the action items, and I'm not seeing any hands up on this, so now, before we go for the work group and small team updates, I just wanted to mention the sad week that we have since we have learned the passing away of John Moore, a member of this community from the NARALO community, and many of you will know him as-- I used to call him Mr. Bylaws because he was extremely good at being able to rewrite so many of those documents that we follow and very good lawyer on these things, and unfortunately, he's passed away and he's going to be missed in this community, as I'm sure he's missed in many communities.

He was also very active in the Internet Society Community as well, and it's a very sad loss. So John, wherever you are, we are thinking about you, and I hope you are able to join us virtually from now on wherever

you are basically on this, but yes, terrible. It had to be mentioned. Thanks for all the work you've done and all your volunteered time for this community.

Now, let's hope we got some better news than this in the work group and small team updates, and that's what we will now have. The first update is going to be on the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. For this we have Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka. I believe it's Steinar that's going to speak to us today. You have the floor.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. Hi, this is Steinar Grøtterød for the record. Yesterday we had the first meeting after ICANN75, and we continued to discuss the proposal, the comment from the public comment period coming in from Leap of Faith Financial Services.

We spent the whole meeting at ICANN75 and also yesterday discussing this, and I'm a little bit surprised at why we spent so much time on this, but I think it's a little bit due to the fact that this kind of change, the common process of the transfer proceedings as it is today.

Their proposal is to start the process on their gaining registrar and not as it is on the losing registrar. The working group is pretty much in consensus that this is not a good way to do it, but we have to make sure that we respond back in a professional and decent way, and also take into consideration the few positive elements that this proposal brings to the table.

So then there's some administrative things. We are behind schedule, and this will cause that we will start by beginning of November at two weekly meetings. That will be hopefully getting on track by the end of this year. Also, there will be a proposal to combine phase one and two into one recommendation to the board, and not as it was planned to do the first step on phase one AB to the board, ICANN board and then go into phase two, but do this in in one lap.

This kind of delays, the process is a little bit slow, so we were talking about something somewhere in 2024 that this policy will be adopted and implemented, whatever it brings up. So that's my updates on this one for the meetings after ICANN75.

Just for the record, the last week was canceled due to conflicting meeting that was important for the majority of all work group members. I think it was connected to the RDDS stuff. I'm not sure about that. Anyway, questions? I hope you heard me?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Okay, perfect. Okay. if there are no questions, I'll take it back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this time. Oh, I see Sébastien Bachollet has put his hand up, so perhaps there is comments or there are comments and questions. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier, and thank you, Steinar. I just wanted to know if you have read the short article made by the [00:11:20 - inaudible] about ICANN to [00:11:23 - inaudible] bulk registration ban. I don't know if it's included with what you are doing or it's in totally other place, but I remember that you talked also about bulk registration and I wanted to know there are some link or not. Maybe I am totally wrong, but I prefer to ask the question. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes, thank you, Sebastien. Both registrations or both transfers in a way included in the work we're doing in the PDP. The recommendation so far is that we treat this as one by one, meaning that every domain name has to have their unique key, et cetera.

There are some discussions about that, whether that can be tuned for some volume with the same owner, same TLD, and all into there from one registrar to another registrar. Both registration as a problem is not being discussed and not in the charter for the inter-transfer PDP. I hope that answered your questions, Sebastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. It's Olivier speaking, and I'm not seeing any other hands at the moment, so thank you for this update, Steinar. I think that's enough for this week, and we can therefore move to our next, and that's the EPDP on IDNs.

Now, there is one thing though in that with regards to IDNs, there's another issue on IDNs with regards to Universal Acceptance. I know they're not exactly the same topic because they're different aspects of this. I've just been made aware that on the current statements, Universal Acceptance Roadmap for Registry and Registrar System to be presented by Satish Babu.

If we are to take the whole amount of time on the updates, Satish might not be here. I just wondered if, and that's really down to Justine and Hadia who are presenting on this, if we could host Satish's Universal Acceptance Roadmap for Registry and Registrar System as a plugin before your update.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: For me, yes. This is Hadia for the record. Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see Justine has also said, go ahead. Okay, thank you very much. Much appreciated, and sorry, I was not aware of this earlier, I know we should have addressed this earlier, but Satish, I guess you have the floor now and I think I've already told Chantelle, and so hopefully, if there's any slides and so on, that should be now available. Please, proceed forward

with your section on Universal Acceptance Roadmap for Registry and Registrar System.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Olivier, for letting me jump the queue. Can you please open the document, which is right at the bottom of the agenda? Yes, right there. Yes, so this is actually a document largely addressed at-- can we zoom it slightly largest so that we can see it?

Largely addressed at the registries and registrars. So far, we did not have a standardized systematic way of checking for Universal Acceptance complaint and also implementing the-- we're talking about the software used by registries and registrars for their operations, which as we'll see also, it is used by end-users and registrants also.

Now, universal acceptance of this software is an important thing and that will help us to manage IDNs as we go forward. Without Universal Acceptance implemented in these systems, it'll be very hard for us to scale up. So, the point number one is actually that the existing gaps are a big problem.

Point number two here is that this report provides us with some checkpoints where we can actually check on the complaints, whether Universal Acceptance is really implemented or not. There are 16 checkpoints identified where we can test and we can check and implement it. Number three, this report is targeted at the industry and insider operators, the industry backend providers, developers, and technical managers, and is a follow-up of an earlier report by a gTLD.

The report is highly technical. It has limited end-user of 11, I would say. It looks at the stakeholders use cases, protocols, even mandate to report, and then goes on to actually test two software applications using these checkpoints that have been identified. One is for registries, that is Tango, and the other for registrars, that's the Code Gateway Engine. Can you please scroll down?

The fixed-point refers to the fact that what are the kind of use cases that we are talking about? For end-users, it is DNS who is RDAP, then we have registry staff and registrar staff, who are managing an internal activity, and then we have registrants, who use the registrar web interface, the backend, and email service. Email is particularly vulnerable to the UA gaps. For registrars, it is similar, just that they have end users, they have their own internal tasks, and also registrants.

So in general, the end-user is basically for three well known protocols. That is a DNS itself, and WHOIS, then RDAP. So looking at the overall [00:17:55 - inaudible], my personal looking in it is that report is already identified deep and further, there are very limited end-user relevant for us to make comments on. So the first comment below says that since the end-user aspect that are limited, there is nothing very significant that can be provided as a comment on the code topics, but there are three or four points that we need clarity on.

The first is that the report has not rather just chosen not to consider the IDN variant. Now, IDN variant will make a significant difference to the way these software, which is used by registrars and registrants work. Now the reason for this could be that we are currently in the process of

developing software, sorry, policy for the top level and the second level of IDN, so that these are not completed.

So that may be the reason why the report has not considered them, but the report has identified this is a gap, and it has said that there will be a significant impact on the software when variants are considered. The reason is that for the first time, we have the same entity constraint, that the software [00:19:09 - inaudible] primary label and all its variants together as a set, which is completely new. It is not functionality that exists today. Can you scroll down, please?

Further down. Yes. The second point is about retailers. Now, given the fact that retailers are-- we see that there's a rising role for retailers, and they have not been mentioned in this report. Now, retailers use either standalone software for their operations or they integrate the api belonging to the registrars in their own websites. Now, in either case, they would also have to be UA ready. So that is another thing that we can clarify.

Finally, the report, perhaps it's not taken to account the continuing changes to the access mechanism for registration data, which is a completely different process. It's a moving target, so that maybe the reason why they have not considered these also. So, my recommendation, and I considered some of our team members also, is that we don't have to submit a formal comment on this report since it's largely very technical and oriented, not towards end-users or the general users, but mostly towards registries and registrars.

So, I'll stop here and I look forward to any guidance from the CPWG, whether we should write a statement on the report as a public comment, or we can bypass it. Thank you, and back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. Let's open the floor for any comments or questions on this topic. We have Bill Jouris.

BILL JOURIS: Yes. It seems to me that while we may not need a formal public comment, it is worth raising issues where we think more clarity would be useful to the authors. It may not need to be a formal public comment, but it's at least worth telling them that we see some potential confusion there. Thank you.

SATIHS BABU: Thanks, Bill. So I agree with you I think in the sense we have access to the UASG. I am representing ALAC there at the UASG as a liaison. So we can actually-- we can send them a formal message saying that this are the gap that we found, but we are not going through the public comment process itself. It's more like a private comment that we are providing them with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Satish. I'm not seeing any other hands up. So it's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I do have a question or comment on this, and then I'll give the floor to Siva after that. The stakeholders in the use

case is identified, as you mentioned, are very limited for end-users being DNS query, WHOIS query and RDAP query. However, these are the customers and they obviously or some of these are customers, because end-users, of course, might be people just out there, but others are the actual customers of those, I would say primarily the registrars and also any of the resellers, et cetera.

There might be some recommendations with regards to databases and with regards to forms, inputs in those registrars and resellers sales systems. Would that fit in this? Because you mentioned email, yes, but there is also-- so let's say you're applying for something, you've already got an IDN, you could actually have the whole process of applying for an IDN, but if you were already using an IDN as a return address for email, and if they ask for your website and you already give an IDN for your website, that needs to work too.

SATIHS BABU: Thanks, Olivier, for the question. So you're absolutely right. So the report actually details out the five words that the Universal Acceptance really implies. That means you accept and you validate, and you store and you process, and then display it. So those things are taken care the report, the very definition of UA complaints be that all those steps including receiving and sending of email, including, like, for example, you write on the browser, you type in an IDN URL, and the browser converted to something that looks like X and that is a Unicode.

So that's a problem because the person who typed in the address cannot see what it was really. So all those things are taken care in the

so-called UA complaints, [00:23:52 - inaudible] one of those things [00:23:53 - inaudible]. So there is no issue. If they become compliant according to this definition, then everything should work fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Satish. Next is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Thank you, Olivier. This software system that is being discussed by the Universal Acceptance Working Group, is it only focused on Universal Acceptance or does it also in the process of solving the Universal Acceptance problem, develop some form of unified system or an interoperable software backend system that is shagged by registries and registrars of all TLDs, geoTLDs, and IDN TLDs, and [00:24:51 - inaudible], ccTLDs, some sort of a system akin to the banking system for credit card transactions. Is it one such exercise, because there is something very, very interesting in the report. It talks about Tango and Accord gateway. Could you clarify that, or is it one focused on Universal Acceptance?

SATIHS BABU: Thanks, Siva, for the question. So now the point is that the registrars and registries use different kinds of software. Now, this particular effort is to standardize the assessment of Universal Acceptance complaints, and on which of the checkpoints where you have to implement these five different [00:25:48 - inaudible] that are there as part of the complaint.

So this is a limited thing, it only looks at Universal Acceptance, it doesn't go beyond. So the answer to your question would be that now the two software taken here as examples, so one is registries, [00:26:03 - inaudible] for registrars. So this is not by any means the full set of software used.

So the point is, each registry and registrar, when they have to assess their own systems for the complaints with the Universal Acceptance, they will have to check their own software, and they will have to persuade the writers of that software to make the changes required and then test it again.

So, the larger question of unified the way of handling all the different categories of domain names is not part of this, it's a very limited exercise.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Just to supplement a comment, if I may. If an exercise is undertaken to design a system that verifies or checks the status of the Universal Acceptance or its compliance, probably one of the ways by which the Universal Acceptance Group could go is to not only identify the core gaps and the variations and registration systems and the backend processes, but also come up with a solution, a common solution so that it'll have an impact by reducing gaps in Universal Acceptance.

When that is done, not as an objective, incidentally, some exercise would lead to solutions to areas of the problems that are caused by the lack of interoperability by different registrars by maintaining differences

systems and different forms, different form fields, and so on. So, it is just a thought that I'll put forth to the Universal Acceptance Working Group. Thank you.

SATIHS BABU: Thanks, Siva. So I'll take it back to the group, but as of now, it is beyond the limit of the group, because I see the point that you're trying to make, but I'm not sure if the Universal Acceptant Working Group itself can decide on that. Suddenly, if there is a system that you just described comes into being, then Universal Acceptant would be part of it definitely. That's all I can say, but I'll take this point back to the group. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Satish. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and we do have to move on. That means that we are now going back to our agenda item, which was the group updates. Of course, we will continue in the IDN with the EPDP on IDNs with the news of what we have.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So I think that's my queue. This is Justine for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And that is indeed Justine, yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Okay. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: By the way, for some reason-- yes, I just want to say for some reason, it doesn't actually show you listed. It says ALAC participants, but yes, just ensure that ALAC participant, she's going to do the presentation today. Over to you, Justine. Sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's fine. Thank you, Olivier. This is Justine for the record. I built the presentation anyway-- developed the presentation, so I guess it's up to me to relay it. What we're going to try and cover today is the principles or the basics behind what is called the hybrid model. Okay. I'll come to a little bit about that in a minute. Essentially, the question that we, and when I say we, I'm talking about the IDNs EPDP, and in particular the ALAC team that's on that particular EPDP.

We have been asked to consider the hybrid model as a way of dealing with variants or the role of variants in String Similarity Review. So what does all that mean? Hopefully, I can unravel that in the minimum amount of time that I've been given. So we're going to try and cover all these things that are mentioned in the agenda.

Let me go through the agenda to see. Moving on to the next slide, slide number three. Just a recap on what we mean by source label, or sometimes referred to as primary label. Also, allocatable and blocked variant labels. Now what you see in the chat here is an example of an output that is given by the root zone LGR, the root zone Labor Generation Group.

That is a tool that has been implemented and it works basically as an incorporation of all the labor generation groups that takes into consideration 26 scripts at the moment, I remember anyway. What it does is basically, if you feed in a particular source label like you see here as an example, what is highlighted in the yellow, then that LGR will return the full variant set that is associated with that particular source label.

So you see the example here that's given, there are 24 variants in the particular set, so including the source label, which is also a variant itself. You'll see that some of the variant labels are allocatable and some of them are blocked, marked by the red text you see. So what is meant by valid and what is meant by allocatable is as such, valid means that you can basically apply for and have that particular label delegated.

We are referring to the soft label in the [00:32:23 - inaudible]. Allocatable means that that particular variant that is associated with the soft label is available for requests and activation. So, that's important to understand because we are going to be talking a lot about allocatable and blocked variants when it comes to String Similarity Review.

Moving on. Next slide, please. So as I said, we are talking basically about what is the role-- the question to be asked is what is the role of variant, meaning allocatable and blocked variants in the String Similarity Review process? A lot of what the EPDP and IDN is meant to do is to consider the impact of introducing variants to the root.

So one of the things that is key to it is how do you determine string similarity in those situations? So what is the role of all these variants in

that process? Point to remember also is string similarity focuses on visual [00:33:37 - inaudible], and it's conducted by something called String Similarity Review Panel, and these are all part of the application process and also feature in subsequent procedures.

So what we have discussed in the EPDP itself is we looking at three possible levels of comparison, and you see there is level one, level two, level three, graphically, this is represented in the next slide, which essentially level one we're talking about all the primary and the requested allocatable variants.

Level two is primary plus all allocatable variants. Level three is primary all that plus the block variants. Logically speaking, if an applicant is going to ask for a primary or a source label together with certain allocatable variants, then logically speaking, all those in that particular subset would have to go through String Similarity Review.

So there's no question about that. The issue here is then should we also consider the other allocatable variants that are not requested for, and which is level two, and if blocked variant should also feature in String Similarity Review, which is level three? It is complicated in the sense that the possible permutations that we come up with including whether level two or level three applies, and you see this graphically represented in the next slide.

So we can go to the next slide. So you see that level one is a no brainer because as I said already, if someone's applying for primary and certain requested allocatable variants, then all of them have to go through the String Similarity process. If you go to level two, if we descend on level

two, then you can see that it gets a bit more complicated in the sense that there are more labels to go through to investigate for string similarity.

Level three presents even more variants for the tests, and the number could end up being exponentially large because some labels could generate up to thousands of variants. So the question then is what do we do? Do we take level two or do we take level three? There were two problems that the EPDP is grappling with, which is that there is actually divergence, a visual divergence in the opinions regarding the level that is more appropriate, or I should say that there was some level of divergence.

Then the second problem we had was the discussions earlier on in the EPDP were largely academic and based on abstract concepts. So what happened was the EPDP then set up a string similarity small group. So, we asked volunteers to help tech certain tasks that would help the discussion further along. If you go to the next slide, I'm not going to talk about all the tasks.

The small group had actually three tasks. I'm just going to focus on the second task which is the important one per se. There were a number of people who wanted for this small group out of the EPDP, seven members together, and we had also the staff, IDN staff support and also the GNSO staff support who also had certain language proficiencies.

So within the small group, we had people who were familiar with the hand script in terms of Mandarin, Cantonese spoken language, so Chinese as well as Japanese. We also had people who were familiar

with the Arabic script, the Bangla script, and obviously the Latin script. So again, don't confuse between spoken, the language and the script.

So script is the written form of the language, and one particular script can cover several spoken languages. So, for example, the hand script is what is used to write the languages of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. Here, basically the second task, which I mentioned was most important for the small group is to demonstrate, or firstly to find examples, concrete examples that have blocked [00:38:59 - inaudible] labels, which may be confusable with strings. Then to demonstrate how those examples would be compared against each other in the String Similarity Review according to the three levels that I mentioned earlier.

The idea is to showcase the impact and potential consequences of using either the level two or the level three. One thing to note here is that what was excluded from the small group assignment is that we didn't consider the implementation aspect of task two, and basically, so if the solution that were proposed were complex in nature to implement, then that maybe something that we need to reconsider.

That particular aspect of that factor wasn't a predominant thing in the small group when we were developing the examples and coming up with the recommendation. So that's something important to note. Having said that, what the small group then came up with is they came up with the hybrid model, and I was actually facilitating the small group as vice chair of the EPDP. The hybrid model basically is a mixed level approach. Can we go to the next slide, please?

A mixed level approach between level two and level three. The foremost goal of the hybrid model is to mitigate the possibility of confusing similarity, which may lead to two failure modes. One being the denial of service, and we're not talking about endorse attacks here. The second one being misconnection.

In coming out with the hybrid model, we considered quite a few things, including guidance or advice from various sources, including the RSCs that you see on screen, which basically advocates for restrictions to reduce confusion and other problems. Also, SEC 089, which says that basically consumibility cannot be considered in isolation from other issues related to security.

Then they go on to mention about things like fishing and social and engineering attacks, which are security problems for end-users. This is important when I come to the next couple of slides. Even the start paper also talks about trying to avoid including [00:41:44 - inaudible] that would cause probability of confusion. So what do we mean by denial of service, and what do we mean by misconnection?

The next slide gives you an illustration of what the denial service means, an example of denial service and the consequence. I'm being pressed for time here. So, all I will say is denial of service is equivalent for error. So basically, you've gone to a non-existent domain, and then you get a 404 error to say that it doesn't exist. The denial of service itself doesn't cost harm per say because you just get a 404 error, but it doesn't add to a good user experience.

So somebody who tries to look for a particular domain name after having seen it, and then maybe got confused as to the actual domain name, tries to look for it and gets 404 error. So it doesn't add to a good experience, per se. What is more important actually is the misconnection risk.

Which if you go to the next slide, please. The misconnection, again, I'm being pressed for time here. So the misconnection, if I can just elaborate on the potential consequences, would be that is definitely more of an issue than denial service, and it causes more harm to the end-user beyond this confusion and frustration, which is the denial service aspect of it.

Even if you arrive at the wrong site and even if the domain is legitimate, it can result in credential compromise and accidental exposure information. What was concerning to the small group per se, was that because you're basically being led to a wrong address or the wrong destination, then it could potentially be a DNS abuse factor, a vector.

It's same as if you think of fishing example, fishing is an example of possible misconnection, or a possible bad action out of a misconnection. So when the confusion is at the top level, then possibility of DNS abuse is much greater. Moving on to the next slide.

So this is the graphical representation of the hybrid model. When we talk about hybrid model, what we're talking about basically is to include level two and certain aspects of level three. The idea is when we talk about level two, we're talking about including all allocatable variants and not the allocatable variants that is requested for.

So in this example, we just take that, where you see the A2 and A3, the green box, regardless of whether they are requested for or not requested for, we think that they should be included in the String Similarity Review. So that's level two. We also think that the blocked variant should feature, so the blocked variants are the ones in pink, the two boxes.

That those should also feature in the String Similarity Review in terms of how it's compared. So you see the lines going with the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The point being that number one is you don't-- the hybrid model doesn't require you to compare block variants against the block variants. So the two pink boxes aren't compared to each other, but it would require the other boxes to be compared to the pink boxes.

The point being that, with this kind of comparison, and this is just one example, okay? With this kind of comparison, then you could potentially identify confusioningly similar strings as you see on the right, which is labeled as 2, 4, 4, and 5. The point being that if we didn't use this hybrid model, then these similarities wouldn't have been picked up, which then could lead to misconnection risk as well as denial service risk.

Obviously, misconnection risk is the higher risk because potentially bad things could happen. Yes, I'm aware of that, but I've only been given 15 minutes. I'm being rushed, so, this is the best I can do at this point in time. Going to the next slide, Misconnection involving block variants. So this is an example of where the block variants come into the picture.

Now, the thing is, end-users don't really know what is blocked and what is allocatable. They just know what they know. It could potentially be such that we think-- end user thinks that the block variant is the variant that they're looking for, and they go to that, but they get redirected or disconnected to a different source, a different destination, and then potentially bad things could happen.

Moving on. So this one is even probably hard to explain in a given amount of time, but this is essentially how we represent the hybrid model in terms of the actual practice of it in text format. The thing to note, just moving on to the last slide. The thing to note is we have been, as I said, we have been talking about this for some time, and the group took a long time, 13 weeks, actually to come up with examples as well as to settle on the hybrid model.

Recently, we have been in the EPDP itself, we've been asked to consider whether we agree with the hybrid model or not going forward in terms of using that for the String Similarity Review. Some of the groups which had reservations using level-- accepting some portion, some component of level three have actually come around to accepting the principle of the hybrid model.

These include the Registries Stakeholder Hroup, the NCSG, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, GAC, Registry Stakeholder Group. The most recent one is IPC. Although IPC, they want to have some exceptions. In fact, the registry stakeholder group also wanted some refinement, but the thing was that earlier on, we thought that we might have more objection to using the hybrid model.

So that's why we considered using a risk analysis or having a risk analysis exercise to try and come to a more agreeable solution. Given that most of the groups now have come around to who accepting possibly the hybrid model as a way forward, then we may not have to actually go through the risk analysis exercise at all. So, at the end of the day, as I said, we've been asked whether we agree to use the hybrid model as the basis for the String Similarity Review.

So, our little team, the ALAC team would like to know is whether we have the support of CPWG to use the hybrid model. So in essence, do you agree with the logic of the hybrid model as similarly explained now. So I think probably people have a lot of questions, so maybe we should get to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Justine, it's Olivier, I guess I'll let you run the queue yourself and you'll be able to answer the questions as they come in.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I don't see any hands at the moment. Bill, go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: I'm quite clear. Does the model envision revisiting some of the identification of variants that was done during the original IDN work in the light of further experience, if you will? I'm not sure how well those varying definitions will fit in with the risk factors that you're identifying here. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: I think if I understand you correctly, I think the answer is no, because we are just basically using the variant set that is generated by the RZ-LGR as implemented.

BILL JOURIS: Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. I guess the only concern that was related to the hybrid model was in relation to its implementation, because in some cases, the comparison would lead to comparing too many items. At some point, we did discuss this a lot during the meetings of the small group, but now the idea is actually to go for the hybrid model because it makes sense.

Then to put in the implementation guidelines, some notes or elements that could actually limit the comparison in relation to the blocked variants. I guess this is now actually why we support this model without the concerns that we had in the beginning. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thanks, Hadia. So as you see on the screen, I'm just trying to establish whether, we have CPWG's support to go ahead and agree with

the question of-- or agree with the use of the hybrid model going forward. I also wanted to note that any support that is given by CPWG will obviously have to be qualified and give some discretion to the ALAC team to consider the possibility of refinements or other factors that come into play as the deliberations in the EPDP goes along, which is as you said, Hadia, operational impacts, complexity in implementation, costs and benefit of the model.

I think it's interesting to note that some of these groups that had earlier reservations about the hybrid model have now come around and actually express some level of support for the hybrid model. Again, it may go through some refinement, but the principle of it is, is there, and I think a lot of people are supporting it. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. It's Jonathan Zuck for the record. What would be the primary reason not to support the hybrid model?

JUSTINE CHEW: Good question. Arguably I think the major argument has been put forward is that block variants will never be delegated, so why should they feature. That's the argument against level three. The argument against level two per se would be if the allocatable variant is not requested, then why should it feature in string similarity?

Again, I think those two arguments have been countered by this notion of the risk of misconnection and the risk of denial service. It could be exacerbated because of variants, the issue of variants, and not so much

just, one-one particular label. I hope that answers your question. Okay. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Justine. I just wanted to verbalize the end of what I put in chat earlier on, and that is basically very much excellent considering the pressure you are under, explanatory work you've gone through with this. I can't see a reason to not support the hybrid model noting of course, the discretionary aspects of the ALAC team within the EPDP, but it doesn't seem to be a downside to my very brief understanding and limited understanding of all of this for us to support it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Cheryl. I see some comments in chat. I'm hoping that some of my colleagues in the EPDP would be able to answer them because it's hard for me to follow the chats. GOPAL, I don't think your question is relevant because it's not a question of representing the LGR, the outputs of the roots on LGR.xml, no, they all are xml, and it's got nothing to do with the three levels that you, you asked about. Okay.

So were there any other questions that were not answered? Steinar says, "I don't understand why block variants should be tested in the String Similarity Review? it's not question of tested, Steinar, it's a question of being compared with.

So, the hybrid model suggests that we should still compare the block variants of one string to the primary, as well as the allocatable variants of the other string. We are strictly talking about comparing two strings.

That is essentially the role of the hybrid model. Perhaps you want to verbalize your questions, thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes, this is Steinar for the record. I'm just trying to understand here, because it's quite interesting. The blocked one are these variants that cannot whatsoever be registered on as top level domain, whatsoever. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, correct. You're right. I's not a question of being delegated or being registered. It's a question of, as I said, as I tried to elude earlier, the end user doesn't know whether it's blocked or whether it's not going to be delegated or not. The end user just thinks that it exists and therefore could still lead to potential misconnection risk or misconnection or risk of denial service.

So that is the aspect that we're trying to address with the hybrid model to minimize the risk of those two and it's basically to help present a good user experience and user experience as well as to protect them in the sense that, as I said before, misconnection could lead to bad results or bad actors using misconnection to do bad things.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: May I just follow up on that one? Also today, you type in something maybe not so often on the first level, but on the second level that ends up on a 404, because it's not a service connected to that one. If you type in something that is not been delegated or allocated on the first

level, you will most likely not receive a 404. I certainly don't understand why this something that is not existing can be mapped to something that is [01:00:52 - inaudible] that exists. I don't understand it, but anyway I'm going to take too much time on this. It's interesting.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Justine. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So does this increase predictability for end-users, and I guess predictability and consistency for end-users?

JUSTINE CHEW: That is one of the goals? Yes. That is probably the main goal for the hybrid model? The thing is, I have to say that, you I think it's important to note that the earlier detect the detractors of the hybrid model were concerned with you know, if something is not delegated or something's not requested for, something's not going to be ever possible to be delegated, then why should we factor it into strings [01:01:54 - inaudible].

But we were arguing on the basis of the end-users. So, we want to make sure that the end-users are protected in some way or they have a, you know, to at least help them have a good experience. So it's not about, and again, it's not about the-- the end user doesn't, doesn't know. We don't assume that the end-user knows what is blocked, what is delegated, that is the case, yes.

It is targeted towards making sure that end-users are protected as much as possible and also to have a good experience. Do we have time? I think we're running our time. Can I have some guidance on time because I would like to know if we still need to run the poll.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's still just Siva, and then I guess you can close the queue and go to the [01:02:58 - inaudible] poll.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Siva.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes, and the interest of end-users, these processes like name collision analysis, do they stop at the tail level or when a registry comes across a registrant tasking for a variant domain name? Is the registry expected to apply a similar process to see if there is any name collision in the domain name that a registrant wants to register?

JUSTINE CHEW: We're talking about top level, Siva. We're not talking about second level.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes, I understand that, but end-users are not nearly confused at the top level, but what matters to the end user is how a name-- is more

concerned about the name [01:04:05 - inaudible], and so have you thought about that at least? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: I actually don't understand your question. Sorry.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: If an applicant for a TLD, ICANN apply certain processes to see if there is some similar especially concerned with the variant characters that he applies for. After that, domain name is delegated. When a registry goes into operation, end-users start applying for domain names, and some of the domain names that they apply for will have variance strings.

When the end user applies for a domain name with a variant string, is the registry expected to follow a similar process to determine of that domain name will have, will collide with another domain name, with a different set of characters, similar characters, which is what would matter to the end user most. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm not sure that is a relevant question per se for String Similarity Review, which is what we are talking about here. I think partially the answer to your question is when we're talking about developing policy to ensure that the set of the variant always goes together. That is one of the recommendations that is probably coming out of the EPDP, but is not part of the, what do you call it, the String Similarity Review aspect of

it, per se. Alan. I'm supposed to cover the queue, but Alan, you have a quick question or comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I was just trying to give a slightly quicker and different answer to you. I think Siva's question is very relevant in the world of user confusion, but not relevant in terms of what this EPDP is looking at. So should there be another effort under SubPro or our policy in general to make sure second level domains are subject similar rules? Maybe, but that's not this PDP. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, this EPDP is going to be looking at harmonizing rules or practices under second level, and that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, my error and it is relevant. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. So the EPDP will be looking at second level policy, but as I said, that particular question is not relevant to what I'm presenting, which is the string similarity review. Okay. So I'm just carving out a little bit of what my EPDP is looking at it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think, yes, we're coming up soon as well. It's the straw poll, I understand.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Coming up soon is a straw poll.

JUSTINE CHEW: Oh, yes. Okay. Yeah, yeah. Can we go to the straw poll, please? So just a quick expression of support or non-support from folks here appreciated by the in small team on the EPDP. Of course, this is just indicative as all straw polls go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Justine, could you please just read it for those people? There are some people that might not-- I know that sometimes the straw poll doesn't work too well for some devices and also some people might just be on the phone rather than having a total sign., so the question is being asked here is, do you support the logic of the hybrid model as similarly explained, and it's a single choice question. Yes. No. Or if you're still unsure, then unsure.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks for that, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure who's checking on the poll. Is it just-- sorry, is it Chantelle, or who's overseeing the poll to see how many people have voted so far.

JUSTINE CHEW: I believe it.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: If I may. So, actually 60% of our participants already voted, and the results looks very clear. If you would like me to end up poll, I'm happy to.

JUSTINE CHEW: Did you say six?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: No, 65. Six, five persons.

JUSTINE CHEW: Oh, 65.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: It's 65% out of 47 participants, or?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: [01:09:34 - inaudible]. That's a good number.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Okay. Let me end the poll and share the results.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, we e have an indication for the ALAC team. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So for the record, is 73% in favor and 27% unsure, and there are no against, so that's quite a clear result. Thank you. Thank you very much. Is there anything else, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: No, no, no. I'll give the floor back to you. Taken up enough time already. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you so much for this presentation and for the poll. Very good. This is what this working group is all about, being able to have straw polls to provide some indication to our representatives on those working groups. Now, we have the RDA scoping team and, and here it says that there's no updates on that. However, on the SSAD ODA, the

System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, Operational Design Assessment, there's an update from Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, it's Alan Greenberg. I last reported indirectly, I asked someone else to present it, that we had a nominal deadline of the 10th of October last Monday to get a report to the GNSO Council so the council could, if the report was appropriate, support the decision to implement the WHOIS Disclosure System or whatever it would be called and pass that onto the board.

The group did meet four times since the ICANN meeting in Kuala Lumpur. We did not meet the deadline of making that decision. There was still a number of concerns on details of the system, and specifically some features which may or may not be needed for registrars to support it and for registrars to supported particularly, the implementation of API's application program interfaces so that people would not have to log onto the system to use it.

There was a general feeling that API APIs are needed, however, there was not a good understanding of whether in the timeframe we were talking about, they were implementable nor whether the requesters or the registrars would implement interfaces to talk to them.

So there are a number of other issues that are similar to that, whether, the requests could be submitted to registrars in email and again, not require logging onto the system, which is felt to be somewhat cumbersome. The hope is that we will be able to meet several times in the next week or two and come to closure on these issues.

The general feeling with a few exceptions is that this system will provide useful information, will provide a useful capability and should be implemented. But it's the details that we're not comfortable with.

ALAN GREENBERG: There was some indication originally that if we didn't meet this deadline, that the resources She's an ICAN to do the implementation, might be diverted somewhere t could be a significant amount of time before those resources were freed up. The current version seems to be a little bit more flexible, and that if we can get her request in through the GNSO council and the board we may slip a little bit, but we're certainly not going to slip a year because of-- so, there is a hope that the small group will come to closure within a small amount of time, and we will submit a revised recommendation to the GNSO Council.

Let me give you a pointer to the letter that was sent to the Gen O Council on Monday, which describes the current position, also pointed to in the agenda. So the hope is that we'll get it to the GNSO Council within the next couple of weeks, and that the GNDO Council can take action.

Hopefully immediately. The, the Geno O Council now has the capability of doing email votes. They used to just be able to take votes at meetings. So hopefully this could be subjected to an email vote between meetings or considered at the November GNSO Council meeting, and get it to the board expeditiously and hopefully get it implemented and put into the work stream process by ICANN Org.

I think that's pretty much all that I have to report at this time. Just to repeat that what we're talking about is something essentially equivalent to what the ALAC advised the board to do. Whether they're doing it because of our advice or simply because it makes sense, it doesn't really matter but it is a positive outcome of the whole SSAD process, let us say, I think that's all I really need to report at this point.

There are, I think, were seminars, I think they're all over now on presenting what the WHOIS Disclosure System is all about. But those are available for listening and watching. I would suggest anyone who has an interest in this topic to please go ahead and review them. The whole process has been worthwhile. Thank you. Any questions, if there are any? [01:16:45 - inaudible] Olivier, speaking, we can't hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I needed to unmute. Just some question out of interest. There were some alternative, months ago, some alternative models that were presented for SSAD implementations, and so on by, was it two different groups? Have these just moved to the side now, or is that a completely separate process?

ALAN GREENBERG: Proposals to my knowledge, were never really seriously considered by the original SSAD group, by this group reviewing the ODA, or by ICANN Org as far as I know. That doesn't mean-- they shouldn't have been, but to my knowledge, there has been no formal consideration of them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I don't see any other hands up. So thank you for this update. Very interesting to see that ALAC advice is being listened to, and of course, there might have been others advising the same thing as well, so we can't just think that we are at the center of the world, but it's great to see that things are going in the direction that we as a group, as a community appear to approve of. So that's good. Let's continue. We now have to go to our policy comment updates. For this, we have Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia Elminiawi.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you Olivier. This is Chantelle. I'm briefly going to go over the open public comments and look at what's ahead and then turn it over to Hadia for a deeper dive. Currently, there are quite a few open comments. As you can see on the screen in front of you, we talked about Universal Acceptance with Satish leading that earlier today.

The other one that Hadia will speak on shortly is the registration data consensus policy for gTLD, which closes on the 31st of October. Looking ahead to what's coming, I want to draw your attention to the final report from the EPDP on specific curative rights protections for IGOs. This is on the screen in front of you slightly above the open public comments as it's not open yet. It's supposed to open later this month.

This is a public comment on the final report that's being requested from the ICANN Board to look on their inputs, which will help inform the Board's deliberations as they consider the GNSO's adopted

recommendations. I'll stop there and I'll turn it over to Hadia for a deeper dive on the comments. Hadia, over to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. So Satish has already spoke to the Universal Acceptance Roadmap. The proposed amendments to the base gTLD registrar agreements, we have already spoke about this last time, and this basically speaks to the registrars using the RDAP protocol instead of the UA's protocol.

So the RDAP protocol supports internationalization, it has more security options, it has the ability to provide differentiated access to registration data. This speaks only to the operational part, it does not speak about the processing of the data. So I think we concluded last time that we don't really need to comment on this unless there's someone who thinks otherwise.

I will move to the registration data consensus policy for gTLD. Last time I spoke about GAC's concern, well, actually, I was not able throughout the week to contact any of the GAC people, and so I'm not sure that their positions still hold. So I would not like to speak to this today.

However, I would like to speak about a general concern in relation to the implementation, and maybe we can discuss this together today in relation to the implementation of the phase one recommendations. So remember when we embarked on the expeditive development process for gTLD we did not envision this happening in multiple phases.

We envisioned this happening in one phase where we would have the policies and also a disclosure system, but now we are looking only at the recommendations which set forward obligations in relation to the collection of the data, in relation to the transfer of the data, in relation to the publication of the data, and in relation also to the disclosure of the data.

So recommendation 10 specifically speaks to the disclosure of the data. So if registries and registrars are to implement those recommendations according to recommendation number 10, they will publish on their homepage a direct link to a page where the mechanism and process for submitting disclosure requests is detailed.

The mechanism includes the required format, means of providing response, anticipated timeline of response. The registries and registrars are required to respond to the disclosure requests, and they are required to acknowledge the view request within two business days and respond within 30 calendar days for normal requests and two business days for urgent ones.

So the question here would be, so if they actually implement those recommendations, they will be abided by this, what would require them to later adopt an SSAD or an [01:23:31 - inaudible], or like WHOIS Disclosure System?

By implementing EPDP phase one recommendations, they have a whole system which does not only include the collection and publishing, but it also includes a disclosure, I wouldn't say system, but a disclosure framework. So we could get into the details that are on the website,

but I would like first to discuss this part with you. Any thoughts? Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. There really is no conflict here. Clearly, if we implement the disclosure system that has been talking about, the registrars could choose to say that's the method to use, and that ends that. Or a registrar could set up their own method in competition with it, and unless and until there is policy that requires the disclosure system to be used or at least offered, remember, even if there's an SSAD, private requests are still allowed.

So the registrar must still say how to submit requests to them personally, or not personally, but directly to them bypassing any such system, even if the SSAD had been implemented as fully described. So the need to have instructions on how to deal directly with the registrar or registry does not go away, but if there is a system, be it the SSAD or the WHOIS Disclosure System, then that could also be used as an indication.

Now, the disclosure system is not policy, so, if we wanted to make it required, then we would need to enact policy. There are two possible ways to do that. One is a PDP, a very targeted PDP just at that issue, and the second is, it is possible that the board could somehow segment the recommendation in the SSAD and approve that recommendation alone and somehow make it apply to the disclosure system.

There is some question whether that is in fact possible or not, and it is in fact being discussed. So one way or another, one of those two would

have to be done if it were to be required to use those systems. Neither of those replace the requirement that the registrar have a direct pass as well. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. Yes, understood. The only fear, as I said that by this, they already have a whole system in place and there would be no need for SSAD or any other Light or Light WHOIS, and there would be and, as you mentioned then, that would require another PDP or another process in order to require registries and registrars to use that kind of disclosure system.

So generally speaking, going back to the recommendations, some of the issues that were put forward, one is in relation to section seven, which talks about the transfer of registration data from registrars to registries. Then data such as the registrar name, registrar organization, this kind of data could be actually transferred from the registrar to the registry but only if a legal base exists for that and data processing agreements are in place.

So it could happen, but it doesn't have to happen because nothing forces them or requires registries and registrars to enter into any kind of data processing agreements, or so again the thick WHOIS now becomes, I would say, non-existent. I don't know. This was not the intention of the EPDP team in the very beginning.

So we did not intend by any means to like cancel WHOIS, but in the absence of a requirement for registries and registrars to get into data

processing agreements, fake WHOIS by default does not exist. So, that's one point. Alan, please go ahead,

ALAN GREENBERG: Fred, I disagree with you. It was certainly the intent of some significant parts of the EPDP to cancel fake WHOIS, and the recommendation saying data can't be shared with the registry unless everyone agrees to it, effectively did that. So yes, it was the hope of some of us that take WHOIS would not be canceled, but it was very much the intent of other parts of the group that it disappear and they were unfortunately more effective than we were.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you for this, Alan. So let's go to another point in relation to the lock files. So the registrars must maintain lock files that confirm that a relay of the communication from the requester to the registered name holder email address has actually happen.

Those log files would also be available for lawful requests. However, the log files are required not to have any personal data. So in reality, how would this work? Any thoughts? Okay, so I see no hands up. I was thinking that maybe next time I would prepare a presentation with all the points that we can actually discuss.

Another point also is in relation to Section 12, and it's in relation to the retention period. So nothing in the policy prohibits registrars and registry operators from setting retention.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, I'm sorry, it's Olivia speaking. We are running a bit over time, so I'm a bit concerned about the clock ticking. It is past the half-hour mark, so we're in playing in overtime at the moment. We do have a few minutes though that the interpreters have provided us with, so that's fine, don't feel rushed. Just needed to say that we've got about five minutes,

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I can stop here, but it's basically that registries and registrars could request according to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement of 2013, they could request a waiver of data retention obligations. So currently, data needs to be retained for 15 months to satisfy the need of the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy. Again, they could request a waiver for that which would make this period less.

There is no need though for a waiver if they would like to keep the data for longer period, of course, justified longer periods. So that's again, another point that we could discuss. Then the other points in relation to the organization, field administration, contact, and technical contact, and when and how what the registries and registrar delete the organization field or actually publish it, having standards so that all registrars do it in the same way.

So that's also another point that we could be discussing. So, I'll stop here and I welcome any thoughts? Thank you. So I see no hands up, so Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Hadia. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Just a question that in the absence of comments from our community, what is the default on these that are currently under review? Would we recommend no statement or could we leave it for another week and say, well, for the time being, it's no statement, but if anybody thinks otherwise, then shout out, say it now or stay within the next week or so?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I would say let's leave it for another week and give people some time to read through and yes, and discuss it again next time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, Hadia. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and just to remind everyone, we try to be quite careful these days with regards to commenting on issues that really just affect end users and not just commenting on pretty much everything and anything, which I think I was guilty of a few years ago. So yes, it's quality these days, quality.

We've got the, yes, we've got a plus one from Jonathan Zuck, the ALAC chair. So that's what we are doing these days. Now let's then move to any other business. Let's open the floor for any other business. Once again, I'm not seeing any hands up from anyone. So, that takes us to our next meeting. Of course, there's a strict rotation, so Yeşim, please, enlighten us as to when we will be next meeting.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier. This is Yeşim speaking. So looking at the calendar, next week, we do have a NARALO general assembly, and in order to avoid that clash and also to rotate actually, I would like to suggest 13:00 UTC for next Wednesday, which is the 19th of October. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Yeşim. I believe that then allows for participants in the NARALO region to first have breakfast with the CPWG meeting, and then have a great day of NARALo events and discussions. It might be back to back, but there we are. So 13:00 UTC it is. Thank you very much.

That really is the end of this week's call. Again, thanks to all of our contributors on today's call, really fascinating, and of all the work that takes place to prepare these, it really is great, for volunteers to be so dedicated to this and I think very helpful to our community. Follow up on the mailing list as you all do. Of course, thanks to our staff.

The interpreters on this call have been fantastic, and of course, the real-time text transcription also has done very, very well indeed. So with this, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you are, but I just need to ask, Hadia, anything else to add?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, thank you. Thank you. Bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Goodbye.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]