
YESIM SAGLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to APRALO Policy Forum call taking place on Thursday, 6 April 2023, at 6:00 UTC.

On our call today, we have Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Bibek Silwal, Satish Babu, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Aris Ignacio, Priyatosh Jana, Udeep Baral, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gunela Astbrink, Shah Rahman, Ali AlMeshal, K Mohan Raidu, Samik Kharel as well as Winthrop Yu. We have received apologies from Naveed Bin Rais and Nabeel Yasin.

From staff side, we have Gisella Gruber, Athena Foo, Alaxys Liu, Nitin Wali, and myself Yeşim Sağlam. And I will also be doing call management for today's call.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Shreedeeep. Thank you very much.

SHREEDDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Yeşim. Welcome to the APRALO call. It has been quite a busy day for the community or for ICANN76 meeting. You know, with the UA Day a lot of things are happening, so a lot of work is also being done. So now, let's start today's APRALO Policy Forum. Today we have a general update plus EPDP on IDNs update by Satish Babu. So, Satish, you have the floor. Please unmute your mic.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Shreedeeep. My apologies that I am on the road today. My audio may be slightly choppy, and I might have to leave after this presentation is over. But thanks for the opportunity and next slide, please.

I'm going to cover these three points: ICANN76, some high-level developments and At-Large discussions, and a little bit on EPDP on IDNs. These are actually three picked from the larger list, so apologies for missing out some of the items. And I'm also aware that some others like Cheryl and Holly and Maureen are covering some of these points, so I'll skip through the very fast. Next slide, please.

ICANN76 was organized in Cancún, Mexico. Over 1,200 participants attended in person and 800-plus virtually. Several major announcements and discussions took place. The DNS abuse was discussed in great detail. The future of technical Internet governance. The biggest thing, of course, for us is the next round of generic top-level domain applications. The next round starts [inaudible]. We will see that in a little more detail. ICANN Board announced the commencement of a search for a new CEO. And the UA Day was announced during the meeting. Next slide, please.

The next round of the new gTLDs is a big thing for us. Out of the SubPro developed the ICANN Board adopted 98 of the total recommendations, 38 have been kept pending for the GNSO further discussions. And ICANN Org was tasked with delivering a comprehensive implementation plan by 1 August 2023. The plan is to include timelines and also the [disclosed] requirements. Next slide, please.

Now there are some dependencies that have to be completed before this can happen. And these dependencies have to be closed by 15 June, which is the last day of ICANN77 in Washington, DC. The first is a plan that is agreed upon by the ICANN Board and GNSO Council on the 38 pending items. Those items that have temporarily been kept pending. A working methodology and Implementation Review Team workplan and timeline, again agreed between ICANN Org and GNSO Council.

Then a Council project plan and timeline for policy work or an alternate path on how to handle closed generics. Closed generics has been something that we have been discussing. And [generally we see that] a number of things that we've been discussing the last several months kind of fit this whole next round.

And finally, a project plan from the EPDP on IDNs identifying all charter questions that will impact the next Applicant Guidebook and doing this while ensuring consistence with ccPDP4 which is the GNSO Council work on IDN variants. Next slide, please.

Now we come to some of the discussions in ALAC and At-Large. A bulk of the discussions that took place were in SubPro, again, because of the fact that the next round is kind of looming large in front of us. ODP/ODA, ALAC supports the ODP work but have queries and concerns on the ODA. I'm not getting into details yet. I do not consider myself as an expert in this particular thing. I'm sure between Cheryl and Holly and Maureen and others any doubt that you might have can be addressed about this.

Applicant Support Program is something that Maureen is also working on. And the general position that At-Large has taken is that, again, from the benefit of what happened in the last round, that the program must benefit all as the previous round had the criticism that it only benefited large companies in the developed world. Diverse communities should not be discouraged or impeded from applying for a TLD. The program design requires metrics to define and measure success. And the last one is particularly important. ALAC must have automatic standing to file community objections.

Then the next item was auctions. At-Large took the position that we propose that Vickery auction model which is a particular model where all the bids are submitted in secret and then they're opened and the person who bids the most gets the contract but at the amount mentioned by the second largest. So it's one of those things that is considered more efficient as an auction model. Next.

[Continuing more with] SubPro, the public interest commitments and the registry voluntary commitments. At-Large has taken the position that these must be legally enforceable and enforced by ICANN Compliance. As you can see from the name, it must be voluntary commitment. PICs are also voluntary. So there is no mechanism to ensure that they were enforced.

Closed generics, At-Large is in favor of a closed generic test which requires that the TLD satisfy a public interest test and does not run counter to the broader global public interest.

On geographic names, geographic names must include the broader community and not just governments. Next.

Now DNS abuse is a big thing that different parts of ICANN are discussing. And some of the points that At-Large discussed is one that the data accuracy remains critical to identify bad actors. The contracts, the Registry Agreements and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, need refinement to ensure that they have more teeth to deal with bad actors. Contracted parties should be incentivized to adopt a more transparent minimum compliance standard. And contracted parties should adopt general business practices such as KYC especially with bulk registrations. Next.

Right, so IDNs and universal acceptance. At-Large formal position was that these are critical to individual Internet end user equity. And IDN variants can support better individual Internet end user experiences but not at the expense of security and stability of the root zone. And IDN variant management requires careful adjustments to relevant domain name lifecycle processes and policies. Now this means that definitely many of the contracts have to change to incorporate variants. Next.

Transfer review policy, the [inaudible] said that processes and policies must make the inter-registrar transfers and change of registrant updates simple, safe, and secure. Registrars are obligated to inform the registrant about the transfer process in an understandable way. And finally, the initial draft report has come out, Phase 1(a), and overall At-Large agrees with the proposed recommendations in general. Next, please.

This is Cheryl's area. The Holistic Review Terms of Reference are important to frame the expectations, limitations, and guardrails since this is the first post-IANA transition ICANN-wide review. The ALAC is concerned at the delay initiating the Holistic Review as the original start date was the first quarter of 2023. And At-Large remains supportive of the Holistic Review and will continue to engage in each key phase of implementation of the review process. Next.

Now a little bit on the EPDP on IDNs, the current status. We have come to the end of Phase 1 after about two years of discussion. Phase 1 is actually all about the top-level domains. Phase 2 is actually about the second-level domains. In both cases, it's about IDN variants. Normally we had meetings on Thursday, like today, but because of the holiday season we cancelled today's meeting and had the meeting on Monday. And that was the last meeting on Phase 1.

We have come to a broad agreement on almost all the topics. Now we haven't had time to discuss some of these in detail in the CCWG.... So we are recommending that the Phase 1 report will be handed over to ICANN in a week's time as far as next steps. And it will be put to public comment by the last week of this month. And ALAC inputs, we recommend that we discuss with the CCWG and then submit it through the public comment process. Of course, the ALAC team on EPDP IDNs will be helping this [particular] process, especially in identifying any contentious areas that from an end user perspective we need to raise.

And overall we have recommendations, rationale, and implementation guidance about 60 items. This is fairly substantial and a lot of reading has to be done to make sense of the whole report. Given the fact that

the subject matter is also complex, this is going to be a challenging thing for the At-Large when the report comes out for public comment.

That's it from my side. If there are any questions or comments, next slide please, I'll be happy to help out. If not, you can [raise a doubt] any time in this call. There are others who can help out with the answers to that. Seeing no questions in chat or no hands raised, it's back to you, Shreedeeep.

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Satish, for the update on ICANN76 and the IDNs and EPDP. It was quite interesting. Thank you for your support and for your update as well. So now if there...are there any questions? Okay, so there are no questions, so now let's go to the next part. That is the policy forum and its practice by Holly. So as we all know, ICANN77 is all about the policy forum, and we wanted to understand what the policy forum is all about. So today we have Holly, and Holly will update us about the policy forum. So, Holly, you have the floor. Please unmute.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thanks very much. What I want to do today is just go into a little bit more depth into a couple of the major policy issues that are up for decision. To go into a little bit of background as to what they are and why we put the positions that we do. And then go on and talk about the second part will be to review the timetable for the operations and finance working group and how we are going to go about looking at the budgets that are involved.

But first, I'm just going to look at current policy issues and talk a little bit about the background of each of those so that everybody has a little bit of a better understanding as to what the issues are so that when it comes to a vote you actually have a bit of an understanding about what the issues are from the At-Large perspective.

I'll start with the transfer policy review and remind people this started way back really when the EU adopted the GDPR, their privacy legislation. Up until then it had been possible to access the WHOIS data, which WHOIS is actually all of the registrant data. So in transferring either by the registrar or by the individual registrant, it was possible to check with the parties as to whether this transfer was something that was requested or not.

But once GDPR came in—and if you remember, this is 2016—the problem was immediately that personal information should not be available except under certain circumstances and to certain parties. So one of the many changes that was required was to look at the transfer policy which the CPWG has been doing and understand how the parties can check up on each other to verify, first of all, that the registrant wants to transfer or that the registrant agrees to the transfer. And then, with the new registrar or reseller, they can confirm the request and, in fact, there can be some kind of check back that the request has been made. And finally, when the process is about to be taking place that, in fact, the registrant is aware that this is taking place and has an ability to put their hand up and say, “I didn't request this change.”

So what we're having to do is look at the policies and work out with the existing systems in place who can still contact whom and under what

circumstances. So I don't want to go into all of the arrows, because if you look at the chart that we've agreed to, there are a lot of arrows as to who contacts whom. But what this final policy has done is to say there can be verification between the existing parties, there can be confirmation between the new party and the new registrar or reseller and the registrant through a particular means. But at some point before the transfer takes place, a notification this is what's happening so if the registrant didn't request the transfer, that it's being somehow requested for by a miscreant, that it can be stopped.

Now what I really don't want to do is to go in, but I would suggest that all of you have a look at the policy from the viewpoint of in light of the fact that the public information no longer contains information about the registrant, what steps have to be taken and are there sufficient timelines so that the registrant can be verified as requesting or notified in time to say I didn't request a transfer?

I hope that's actually explained that a little bit better. But if you're looking at a policy issue, the policy issue from the At-Large community is to ensure that the transfer can be verified, that the request can be verified even though the data about the registrant is no longer publicly available. So you're working with what contact information is available and how we make use of that to ensure from a public interest ALAC perspective the transfer is requested and has been completed.

I would talk about the EPDP2 in one final respect. Satish has already talked about it, but one of the—and I realize what I should do. EPDP is the policy development process that was put in place in 2016 to actually

speed up the consultative process, and that process has had to deal with a lot of issues.

One of them, and this ties in with the transfer policy review, is to look at what systems are in place for someone to get access to personal information of registrants. The idea is that there will be types of situations or individuals who will need access. Clearly, law enforcement agencies, those sorts of people would automatically get access, but in what circumstances should others?

So what is being worked through is to develop some kind of standardized access or disclosure process so that nonpublic information, because it is no longer public information, can be made available in certain circumstances.

Now this has been a discussion for some time. Some of the discussion has been slowed down because—and I won't say what it stands for—the NIS2 is another document that has come out from the EPDP or is coming out from the EU. And that will make clearer the circumstances in which certain categories of individuals will have access to data. And that may address some of the problems that arose once personal information of registrant data that was available is no longer available. This may deal with that. But this is an overriding issue of do we need and if so, what does it look like, to have a standard access system and how is it developed?

Third was mentioned by Satish. This is the registrant data service review. And because of the reviews that are happening, this has just been put on hold because there is a lot, as you would have seen from

Satish's presentation. There are discussions about registration data, so we won't talk about that.

Closed generics was another thing that was mentioned by Satish. And for those who have forgotten what closed generics is about, it was an issue that was raised with the introduction of the new gTLDs way back when. It would allow an applicant to acquire a generic word as a new top-level domain. So it might be Amazon acquiring .book or KFC acquiring .chicken. Something that is a generic term acquired originally just for the use of the new registry, and it would be used for that registry's purpose.

The GAC in particular but with a great deal of support particularly from At-Large and others said wait a minute. This raises a lot of issues. And what was put forward by the GAC and adopted and supported by ALAC was the only people who should be given closed generics would be those in the public interest. So for example, it might be that .doctor becomes a closed generic because it is in the public interest that there be some kind of control over the parties who use .doctor or .dentist.

We had a lot of discussion as to what is meant by "the public interest" in that context. When it went to the Board, it was one of the Board's concerns. What do you mean by public interest? What are the tests for public interest? And in fact, what the Board did was to say we're going to actually just pause on the allocation of closed generics because we need to understand what is meant by public interest, who makes that decision, and what the rules will be.

And that's still an area of controversy. We actually supported that public interest test, we being ALAC, but a lot more has to happen in terms of how it's defined. Who makes those decisions? What would the rules be? So it's an open question, and when we talk about moving forward with the second round, this is one of the issues that the Board has said has to be addressed and resolved before we move ahead with the next round of new gTLDs.

Finally, DNS abuse, and this is something that Maureen is also going to talk about. DNS abuse has been something that ALAC has been talking about for a very long time. If you go back to the CCT review chaired by Jonathan Zuck, there were a lot of findings out of that report and it's worth people reading that report if they haven't.

But there were particular suggestions about DNS abuse, about understanding the parties involved, understanding the role that Compliance can play in identifying those miscreants, defining what is meant by DNS abuse. And the registrar and registrant's definition in includes four elements, well, five—malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam when it's a delivery mechanism or other forms of abuse.

We were very pleased when back in 2021 PIR, the Public Interest Registry, funded the DNS Abuse Institute that has been in place now for a year. I certainly suggest you read their annual report. Go to their website. I should have put that down, sorry. Well, just Google "DNS Abuse Institute." Because the year that it has been in place there has been a lot of work in terms of working with registrars and registries on what steps need to be taken to combat DNS abuse. And Maureen's

going to talk a little bit more about DNS abuse, but let me go to the next slide, please.

Okay, OFB commenting. Now this is the annual cycle of comments on the development of the various budgets. And if you remember, you've got the main...well, first you've got the IANA budget and then you've got the ICANN main budget. The process usually starts between January and March looking at—and this is the ICANN planning--looking at trend identification.

Between April and July, this is where public interest and public input are sought. And we will be, probably the next policy forum if not before, we'll be calling on all of the five RALOs to look at the results of ICANN planning's outcomes this year from their strategic outlook trend.

From July to November, and it's usually August/September, then we start to look at the IANA budget. If you remember IANA being the old, well, it's now PTI. But their budget, and they seek comments, public comments.

We'll be certainly seeking comments by end of November/December. The ICANN plan public comments are open generally, and that's when we start to seek public comments on the budget.

And then of course February/March starts all over again.

So we will soon in this timetable probably be looking first at the trend analysis impact assessment. The outcomes that before then, in probably August/September/October, then looking at first the PTI budget and then the ICANN budget. Next slide, please.

Okay, just a reminder. From the total revenue of ICANN, the top little bit—and it's only a little bit—is the PTI/IANA budget. That comes in first. And then the things that are looked at that are of interest to ALAC and the RALOs are the ABRs, the CROP, the new grants program, the SFICR funds. So there are lots of things to look at or funding to apply for.

In probably starting, maybe we'll talk about it in six months' time, I think that would be right, possibly less, to say this is part of the ICANN budget. And in fact, we should be participating in comments on the budget but also alerting the RALOs to start applying for ABRs and CROP funding that comes out of the budget. The grants program was announced last year. There was not much detail, so we're actually going to hopefully know a lot more about the grants program as well as use of the SFICR funds. Okay, and next slide, please.

The other thing when we talk about budgets, we talk about money. But we also make comments because the ICANN budget has a separate section on the operating initiatives on how much is allocated for particular initiatives and what will be done in the coming year for those initiatives. So we have been making specific comments about those Board comments on what they will do asking, why are you doing these sorts of things? What are your tests as to the effectiveness of the money that you're allocating?

And so if you look at, say, our comments from the last budget, they give you a really good idea of the kinds of comments we make not just on the numbers but looking at what is allocated within the ICANN budget for that year that actually supports the things that have been identified as ALAC important.

Generally, the initiatives that have been found by our tests is, number one, in the two times that we've actually asked people the first operating initiative of importance is basically evolve and strengthen the multistakeholder model, which is us. And that's the diverse and inclusive participation in policymaking, so of course that's the first initiative on the surveys that we've done.

Second is evolve and strengthen ICANN's decision-making process. When we get the operating budget for—and this is the August/September—for the budget, the ICANN budget, again we have to look at the operating initiatives because they're not necessarily the same from one year to the next. So again, we'll probably be surveying people and saying, what are your top initiatives? And then those are the things that we comment on when we comment on the budget. Okay, those are two areas.

Our next slide is thank you and questions. Next slide, please. Okay, happy to take questions on any of the policies or on the annual cycle of commenting on the IANA and ICANN budgets. Okay, “of the current policy issues, which [remits] the highest budget attention?” They list the operating, and this is [inaudible], when you look at the discussion—and it's always the budget for the specific year so it will be the ICANN budget for FY25—that's when you see the discussion on the operating initiatives.

They do not rate any one of them above any of the other. They list all 11 and what they plan—well, 11 last year. I don't know if there will be 11 or 12 or 10 this year. But they list all of them and what they plan to do. So the prioritization comes, at least for ALAC, comes from the surveys

that we do to say amongst the ALAC and RALOs, what are, say, your top three initiatives? And then those are the initiatives that we comment on.

Okay, any other questions? Okay, Maureen, it's over to you.

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Holly, there is a question by Ayesha.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm not sure. Is it a question? Will be attending ICANN as a Fellow.

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Oh, sorry. It's a comment, I guess.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I think it's a comment. So Amrita is really happy, and I think that's lovely and I'm very glad. I'm sure that Amrita welcomes that. Any other questions, happy to take. Otherwise, it's over to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Is that okay, Shreedeep? Can I just jump in now?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I guess you can, Maureen. I think Shreedeep is....

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Oh, yes, Maureen. You have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you. First of all, I'm just going to do a little two-minute spiel, but I just wanted to add on to Holly's presentation about the important policy issues that the Consolidated Policy Working Group and the Operations, Finance, and Budget Working Group are concerned about. And it's really handy for everyone to really get a handle on what is going on in those two working groups, especially for ICANN77 which is of course the policy forum, as Shreedeeep mentioned earlier.

The policy forum is actually going to be quite different from other ICANN meetings that we hold. For example, there's no opening ceremony. There's no meeting with the Board. There are things that don't happen at ICANN77 because what actually does happen is that it's a time for the working groups to get together and talk policy issues. So that's what the difference is going to be. If you happen to be at ICANN77, there's not going to be all the hoopla that normally happens at an ordinary ICANN meeting. It's going to be real policy business. But I wanted just to highlight that first of all.

What I did want to raise with you was that you may remember that I introduced the DNSAI online course that I put together. And I put it out to the members of the forum, and thank you so much for your comments. And I had a request at the end of March from the Internet Society of Bangladesh, also another one from Hyderabad, but the Internet Society of Bangladesh followed through because they wanted their members to know more about the Domain Name System Abuse

Institute, the DNSAI, that Holly mentioned that actually is really gearing itself for really supporting end users in trying to combat DNS abuse.

And I just wanted to say that there was a bit of a mission because this is my first attempt at actually getting an online course out without...I mean, it's on a website and so what happens is that I have a registration form that people have to fill out. And then when that's completed, that registration form, I can actually gather information about who is interested and they can download the course and do it.

And one of the things that I'm actually providing for people who actually complete the course and get back to me, I will also send them out a completion survey and they will get a completion certificate. Because I don't have a learning management system as such, I can't get records of their scores and everything. But then again, it's not really supposed to be a test.

It's supposed to be raising awareness and getting people more informed and educated about what the DNS Abuse Institute is about and how you too can support the work that they're doing by reporting any incidents of DNS abuse. They want to hear about it, and they will make sure that they contact whoever you got your domain from, to the registrar, they will contact them and say, hey, this is happening. Do something about it. They will help them do that. That's one of the good things about the institute.

One of the things that so far, I'm so thrilled about it, but so far we've had 49 people who have registered. This is just in the last three days, 49 people who have registered. And 95% of them are from Bangladesh.

Interestingly, 91% of those people who are registered are male, so I'm hoping that the ladies are going to respond soon.

Interestingly, 65% of the people who have registered are actually doing the course from home. So it's giving me interesting information about some of our users. And 75% of the people who are doing it are aged between 30 and 50, so a middle aged group who are interested in this course.

And 71% do not have English as their first language, and I do impress on them that I'm really, really sorry, at the moment this is only in English. And I'm just so pleased that so many people are doing it when 71% don't have English as their first language.

One of the interesting things is that 50% heard about the course through their ALS, and 20% heard about it from friends who were in the ALS. So that's also really good to hear that the ALS is a network and getting information out that is important to ICANN. So I'm really pleased about that.

Another interesting thing too was the fact that 63% said that they had completed an online course before. But they also said, 71% of them had actually heard of ICANN Learn courses. So I would say that most of those people who have completed an online course may have completed an ICANN Learn course. It wasn't something that I asked specifically. I just wanted to know if they had heard of ICANN Learn courses.

So it's been really excellent for me to be able to get that kind of information back from people who are actually doing a course. And I'm

sending this course out from the APRALO Policy Forum because I think it's really important that we are seen to be supporting the work of ICANN and an important issue like DNS abuse, as both Satish and Holly have actually mentioned.

So in a few days, I'm going to be sending out the course completion survey for those who have registered so that when they do finish the course they can complete the survey. And it will give me hopefully some additional information that I'll be able to provide as feedback on the interest in this course.

But one of the things that because this is just an interest and when I've got spare time I'm working on this project, I'm actually closing it and restricting it to the Bangladesh Internet Society for this month. I may open it up again for another area that may be interested. Please let me know if you are, but I may have to stagger during the year because I just won't have time to do all the admin stuff that needs to be done in relation to it.

But I was just so excited, I just had to tell you. So thank you, everyone. And I'll keep you updated as to how we're going with it. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thanks, Shreedeeep. Any questions?

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI:

Yeah, thank you, Maureen. Thank you, Holly, for those presentations as well. Now if anybody has any questions, please unmute yourself or raise your hand. Any questions regarding the courses or anything? I will take

that as a no and say now let's go to the next point of the agenda. So we have AOB. Are there any AOBs? I don't think there are any AOBs.

If you have any comments and suggestions regarding APRALO Policy Forum, if you want any specific topics to be discussed or any specific speakers, do write to us. Do write to the discussion email list as well.

So now can we have the poll, Yeşim?

YESIM SAGLAM:

[inaudible] So here is the poll question: How was today's meeting? Excellent, Good, Okay, Needs Improvement, or Bad? Please cast your votes. I'm just going to wait for a couple more seconds, and then I think we're good to end the poll as 72% of our participants already completed. Okay, I will end the poll now and share the results, as usual. Okay, so back over to you, Shreedeeep.

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI:

Okay, thank you, Yeşim. Now regarding the next meeting, I think the next meeting we can do it on 4 May. Can you jot down that?

YESIM SAGLAM:

Noted, Shreedeeep. So as usual, it will be the first Thursday of the month at 6:00 UTC. So as you said, it will be 4 May at 6:00 UTC.

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI:

If anybody has any comments or any suggestions or anything, please, the floor is open. You can unmute yourself and speak.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: On a separate note, I just wanted to remind the people in the forum that we have the APRALO monthly call next week, and we would like to have you there. We will have a small recap of ICANN76 which [inaudible] is working on with some of the [inaudible] members. So hope to see you in that call too. Over to you, Shreedeeep.

SHREDEEPP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Amrita, for that information. Now are there any more comments or suggestions or information that people want to share? If not, then I would officially like to end this call. Thank you for attending this call today. I'll hand it over to Yeşim.

YESIM SAGLAM: Thank you very much, Shreedeeep, and thank you all for joining today's meeting. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
