YEŞIM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 3rd of May 2023 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. To cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, Mouloud Khelif, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Judith Hellerstein, and from Alberto Soto. From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Chantelle Doerksen, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, and I will be doing call management for today's call. We have Spanish and French interpretation providers. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Lilian and Paula, and on the French channel we have Aurélie and Jacques.

Before we get started, one more reminder is for real-time transcription service we have. I'm sharing the link here on Zoom chat. Please do check the service. And my final reminder is to please state your name 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 you Hadia. Thank you very much.

HADIA EL MINIAWI:

Thank you. Thank you so much, Yeşim. Thank you all for joining the Consolidated Policy Working Group call today. First, let's take a look at the agenda. So we will start with a review of action items, then the

working group and small team updates. Then we have the policy comment updates. Then we will have the proposed renewal of the Registry Agreement for .NET presentation that's led by Michael Palage and Bill Jouris. We'll have a discussion as well. Then we have the SubPro team update. Cheryl, Justine, and Jonathan will go ahead with this. And then we have the ICANN77 update and Any Other Business.

I see no hands up. If no suggestions for any updates, then the agenda is adopted, and let's go to the action items. So it all looks good. All action items are done. Thank you so much. Let's go back to our agenda.

First, we will start with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process with Steinar and Daniel. We have five minutes allocated for this. I'm not sure who's going to start. Steinar, are you ready for this?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. Good evening, good morning. Yes, I'm ready for this. I actually think that we may need more than five minutes, because I have posted to the mailing list some sort of a work we have to do due to the outcome of the GNSO Small Team proposal for some sort of process between— there is a transfer dispute before it actually ends in to the kind of formal Transfer Dispute Policy, as we are now discussing for some weeks. In the e-mail I posted to the mailing list, there is this wording set by the small team. Our homework is actually to make some sort of assumption statement whether we want to have this being included as a policy in the inter-registrar Transfer Policy or it should be some sort of informal guidelines that is not required to be followed by the registrars.

So starting a little bit here is that the Transfer Dispute Policy is kind of a very formal process where either the losing or the gaining registrar is entering a case into a panel. And then this starts getting both costly and more and very detailed process-like. Taking the fact that most of the transfer dispute are being handled directly between the losing and gaining registrar without any formal process, that there might be some sort of a step that one of the registrars think that "Well, I kind of disagree in just reverting this or any way." That kind of process has not been codified before the small team took this action.

So the way I see it is that the small team proposal to be seen as some sort of Transfer Dispute Policy light version, that there is an option to actually solve this dispute within certain process element, and also reduce the cost, meaning that they will not establish a panel, etc., that's the costly element. And finally, also, maybe this is the best opening for the registrant to initiate, kind of settle transfer dispute—that's a better wording, settle a transfer dispute—before it ends up in the cost and court or whatever. So my proposal to this is that we recommend it to be a policy requirement, meaning that it will be added to the inter Transfer Policy in a formal way, and some sort of a pre step before whatever comes as the Transfer Dispute Policy. So that's the recommendation.

Due to the deadline we have here, all the stakeholders should report back to the working group by the end on Monday, May 8. We have a very, very short time. So my proposal is that anyone can read the wording as it is and make the statement into the Google Doc which I have copied that is kind of separate from the GNSO Google Doc. This is kind of an At-Large version. So that's something that I hope to get feedback on. If I don't get another feedback, I will actually kind of signal

that we may take this as a policy requirement. But I'll open for some discussion here. So anyone that likes to take it floor, please go on.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Steinar, I don't see any hands up. So maybe I could ask you. So who's supporting actually having it as informal guidelines? What's former guidelines versus informal guidelines?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Taking the last one first, the former policy, then the text will be kind of make more clear that there will be must and have to add more direct orders. But we will also most likely remove some sort of technical steps that we don't see to be needed in a policy. That's some sort of a work out between the registrars. But the formal thing that if there is a dispute, this step, this kind of policies, this kind of TDP are light, will have to be concluded before you actually go into the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, the formal, the very hard way with a panel, etc.

Based on the discussion in yesterday's working group, there was no consensus among the registrars. Some were in favor of making this policy and some said, "No, we have a way to deal with it today. Don't make another policy that is strictly had to be followed." And that's why the chair kind of asked the stakeholders to get back to the working group with some sort of a temperature of the room about how these different stakeholders are seeing this either informal or formal in a policy way. I hope that kind of answer your question, Hadia.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: It does. Thank you so much. It's very clear. So, policy be it. I see Alan's hand is up. Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a very brief quote. Just from hearing what Steinar says without having seen the document yet, it sounds like what he's proposing is not only reasonable but a good thing to go forward with. So pending looking at the document, we tend to support what he's saying. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you, Alan. I will repost the document with clear instructions to actually get everybody to have their view by the end of business Sunday or something like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Those of us who don't always pay attention, thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. Any more comments anyone thinks?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Steinar, I don't see any more hands up. So maybe we could just post the link in the chat. Thank you so much. The support is for the policy, as you mentioned.

So let's move now to our next presentation as the EPDP for Internationalized Domain Names. Today we have Justine and Satish. They're both going to present on this. I'm not sure who is going to start so I give you both the floor. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Hadia. Justine and I will jointly cover the allocated time of 30 minutes. We are very grateful that we got 30 minutes. We have for the next four or five CPWGs we have work lined up to kind of share with the CPWG and get input.

So here is the agenda. I'm going to cover the first eight slides and Justine is going to cover the rest of the—I'm not sure how many slides. It should be about 15 to 18 or so. So we're going to look at the overview and the timetable for the public comment process.

This PDP agreement is focused on variant management policies. So we will take a quick look at what is this variant. Just revisiting. I'm sure most people don't know what these are. We look at the structure of the Initial Report, which is the sections, categories, and also the annexes, and so on. We will look at the poll for this meeting, this session here, for the underlying principle. We're also going to look at Section 4.1 to 4.3. There are 24 preliminary recommendations and implementation guidance.

So what we're trying to do the EPDP IDN team, which is four of us— Justine, me, Hadia, and Abdulkarim—we are aware of the short time that we have, we're trying to present all the Preliminary Recommendations and Implementation Guidelines. But we might have

to gloss over some of them, given the time limits, and be able to focus on those with clear, direct or indirect end user impact. We have regrouped the charter questions in order to show the connections and consequences. There are some necessary points on processes. Some of it is quite heavyweight and difficult to wrap your head around.

We have four team members and we have CPWG happening in two different time slots week to week. Justine and I will be covering the 13:00 UTC, the meeting at CPWG, and Hadia and Abdulkarim will be covering the 19:00 UTC CPWG. The end result after the next four CPWG meeting, the fifth CPGW meeting on 31 May, what we would like is an ALAC statement that contains input from these consultations. Next slide, please.

The public comment is from 25 April to 5 June unless there is an extension, which we are not sure at this point. So by 5 June, we have to complete our statement. The Initial Report is available for public access, we can take a look. Phase 1 covers policy questions at the top level, which basically means those that impact the next step towards the new round of gTLDs. We will see later that the total charter questions have been divided into two phases, the first phase that has an impact on the next round. So we didn't want to delay the next round. So we have taken that out as the Phase 1. We'll cover these A to E later. So I'm going to skip over it. There are a total of 68 PRs and IGs. We are going to make presentations on all the CPWGs from 3 May, that's today, all the way to 31 May. 31 May we're trying to have the draft statement and ALAC vote and submission. This is the anticipated timetable, again, assuming no extension to the closing date. Next slide, please.

Variant labels are labels that may look different but are the same for the script community. The whole debate is about script. It is not per se about language. It's about script. Script communities based on different conventions. For example, for Chinese it is the two parallel scripts, traditional script and simplified script. That actually causes these variants. So you can write HSBC the bank in the traditional Chinese script or in simplified Chinese script. And obviously, both HSBC and its customers would want both of them to be equivalent. We don't want one to be pointing to some other place. That would create a whole lot of end user confusion. So the idea is that these labels are considered the same, which is a positive thing in most cases, but in some cases, it can be negative if there is a homograph kind of a security issue. As you can see, on the right hand side, between the Cyrillic and Latin script, both the labels look identical, but they are actually not the same label. We have to prevent this sort of security issue from happening. So we identify them as variants and block one of them so that only the other one is available.

In the other case, in the left-hand side, Chinese and Arabic, we may actually delegate both because that is you might want, for instance, both the different versions of its name. So this is a basic purpose. So we are trying to put together policies for managing these multiple variants so that the security, stability, resiliency of the root zone is not impacted. Next.

Some top-level or high-level points, as mentioned earlier, the EPDP team divided the charter questions into two phases, and pick up the first phase that would have an impact on the next step first and finish it off first, and hand it over to ICANN Org up to the public comments and

all that, so that it won't kind of hold up anything else. So all the charter questions that have any impact on the new round was bundled into Phase 1. The Initial Report is now available for public comment.

The EPDP team in the meantime is continuing to work with the remaining charter questions, which are mostly about the second level. Again, IDN variants, variant labels but at the second level. Now, one of the observations that we have is most of the recommendations that are more relevant for the applicant and in the application process, and also to registries and registrars who's the policies, even agreement, the legal document, the contract, will also have to be changed to kind of accommodate the variant labels. So most of the impact is actually for the ICANN Org, Board, Registries, Registrars, and applicant.

For end users, there are a few and we will be trying to highlight with those that are relevant especially for the end users. The actual structure of the report is that the Phase 1 report starts with an Executive Summary, followed by the EPDP team approach and the Glossary because there are many technical terms involved. So we thought it's prudent to have a Glossary that we can do. The Glossary has been specifically designed to be new user-friendly or novice-friendly, and we have not been very technical about the Glossary.

The report after the Glossary goes over to the Preliminary Recommendations and the Implementation Guidance under 10 categories. You will see these categories next. Then the report, it highlights the different—there's a parallel process happening in ccNSO. This is called the ccPDP4. There are also these variants that are taken up. Now, there are some differences in the way both the groups are

approaching. And the reason for that is the core difference between GNSO and ccNSO. The ccNSO has additional constraints. For example, that each label must be meaningful representation of a geographic territory in a particular language input. That constraint does not apply for GNSO. So the EPDP itself is not directly concerned with those things. But the Board has instructed both the groups to ensure that there is inter communication. And therefore, we are kind of trying to highlight the differences and whether those differences have any meaningful impact as we move forward. Next.

So these are the grouping of the recommendations that I did. Root Zone LGR is a sole source. We will cover some of them in the next slide. Same entity principle and the application submission, administrative check, initial evaluation, string similarity review, the objection processes, string contention, contractual requirement, delegation and removal, variant label state. There are a few questions which have no recommendations at this stage. Those questions have either become moot, meaning they don't have to be answered at this point. So those are actually recorded separately. Next.

These are the Annexes. The first Annex is the hybrid model. This is something that EPDP kind of evolved through a small group process. In order to balance the need for a conservative approach against the huge workload that can happen due to a large number of variants in some cases. The second is the charter itself, Annex B. Annex C is the responses of the EPDP team, not the recommendations per se, but the responses. Annex D is some background. Annex E is the EPDP team membership and attendance. Annex F is about how the EPDP has sought community input. Annex G is a monument to Ariel's skills in

drafting a diagram. It's one of the most complex diagrams I've seen. It's the entire application process flow diagram indicating which points are impacted by the EPDP's work. Next.

This is my last slide, I'll be handing over to Justine after this. So the four underlying principles. These were not actually stated in the EPDP when we started the whole work. These were evolved as we've started working, although the first one was actually flagged. So earlier, there was no clear source of how to enumerate variants. So this EPDP has made it very clear that the Root Zone LGR, which is the kind of work built upon from the Generation Panel to the Integration Panel. It starts out at the language communities Generation Panel and Integration Panel. And finally, we have a tool that can kind of pick out the variants if you enter a particular limit.

So to understand the meaning of this, you have to understand what is meant by a variant set. The variant set starts out with a primary label or the applied-for label. And the tool can then generate based on that applied-for label, what are its variants, and what are their disposition. Are they blocked? Are they allocatable, etc.? So the point to be noted is that if you change the primary … Suppose we generate a variant set from a primary. So you have a bunch of string labels that are equivalent for the community. But if you change the primary label from the original primary label to one of the variants, then the variants have changes. That means you don't have the flexibility once you apply for a particular primary label to downstream to change the primary label into something else. That's one of the things that we'll see as the integrity of the set. But Root Zone LGR is the single source for enumerating variants. That has been established by the EPDP. Second is that of the same

entity. Now, given the fact that you have a variant set and they are equal into the language community or the script community, we cannot have a situation where one of those labels is allocated to one registrant/registry and another one to another because [inaudible] because they are equivalent. So the same entity basically means that the top level of the DNS, the same registry operators must manage the approved label from a variant set of a primary gTLD from all standpoints, application, legal, and operational standpoint.

The third is the integrity of the set. The relationship between the primary label and its allocatable and blocked variants shall not be infringed upon during this whole process—application, legal, operational. Even by deoperationalizing a particular variant. If the primary is deallocated or removed from the root, then all the variants have to be removed as well. So the fact that they move lockstep into every step of the process is because of the integrity of the set.

And finally, conservatism. We were cautioned by different groups saying that we have to be cautious. We have to approach the conservative approach while looking at variants. So the idea is that we adopt a cautious approach in the gTLD policy development as a way to limit any potential security, stability risks associated with the delegation of variant labels. So I'll stop here and pass it on with Justine. Justine, over to you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Satish. It's important to kind of grasp the four underlying principles because they sort of permeate through our deliberations in

the EPDP team, and they will feature themselves in some of the PRs and IGs. And I think you will see the logic behind the usage of these underlying principles. Okay. So just bear these four principles in mind. I may actually skip the next slide. Just go back a little bit.

Most of you have seen this diagrammatic illustration of the RZ-LGR, the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. Satish said it is basically a tool that is used to generate a variant set. The tool is actually produced through community input by language communities who form Script Generation Panels. So we're talking about certain things like where multiple language could partake in one Generation Panel. So if you imagine there's only one Latin Generation Panel but Latin is used for various numbers of languages in the written form. The same with Arabic, the Arabic script is actually used by not only the Arabic language community, but also other communities like the Urdu language community and so forth. So we have combinations of same script used by multiple language communities. We also have things like similarities between two different scripts that are used by different language communities. Satish alluded to one earlier where you have English and Cyrillic, some of the characters, some of the labels are very similar looking but they're actually different labels. So we have to account for all those. I won't go into the stats. This you can see it for yourself. Moving on to the next slide.

Okay. I think this is a diagram that we have used many times before. So I don't think it would be unfamiliar to most of you. This is an example of what comes out of the RZ-LGR. If you put in what's labeled as original in yellow, which we call primary, so primary and original means the same thing. So I'm going to use primary. If you put in a primary label into the

RZ-LGR too, then it spits out the variant set. So the variant set could look something like this. The disposition value is also presented in the results. So you will see that this particular primary label, where you see the new label, well, it has actually more than 24 variant labels. So this is just a screenshot, right? So in some cases, the Arabic script can come up to thousands and thousands of variant labels. So this is just a snapshot. But here itself, you can already see the disposition value of the variant label set. Some of them are allocatable and some of them are blocked. Generally speaking, allocatable means that they are available for delegation. But the entity that holds the primary as the TLD will have to apply for it's not an automatic process. Blocked just means that it's not available for application or delegation. So just very simple. We tried to keep things simple.

As Satish has said, this is about using the RZ-LGR as the sole source, because earlier on, we didn't have a tool or ICANN didn't have an agreed upon tool in order to manage variant set. That's why we don't have variants at the top level and we are developing policy for allowing variants at the top level. Hopefully within the next round, we can finish our work.

Okay. This seems to be the only viable way and it's been the RZ-LGR has been an effort of language communities and even technical community for a good number of years, in fact, maybe over 10 years, I think, or maybe closer to 20 years. So this seems to be the only tool that is available to us for determining variant sets. So therefore, PR 1.1 says that we're going to adopt this tool as the sole source to determine variant sets.

And because we already mentioned that the variant set is dependent on the primary, if you put in the primary, you get one set. You put in another primary or if you use a variant label within the primary as the primary, you could possibly get a different set or different disposition values in the variant label set. So, it is very important to identify what the primary is because that determines the set. Therefore, logically, you can't apply for allocatable variant label before you get the primary. So that is PR 3.1. So quite simple. No controversy there. Moving on. Next slide, please.

So, this is where we have some identification of where the principles come into play. So for PR 2.1, it's a combination of the three principles that you see in the screen. So, basically, as we said, the tool RZ-LGR is used to determine the set of variant labels. And once that set has been determined, then they must stay together. So, that is the integrity of the set principle. If an existing RO already holds the primary label, then they should be able to apply for allocatable variants for that particular primary label. So, that points at the same entity principle.

In application of these principles, therefore, we have in the context of the existing gTLD operators there are ones which are managing Chinese and Arabic IDN gTLDs from the 2012 round as top level. So, especially the Chinese ones, they are particularly keen in getting their variants and they've been waiting for a while. So, in the context of them in the existing gTLD operators, the IDN gTLD operators from the 2012 round, whatever variant label sets that are determined from their particular top level IDN gTLD has to be held for them and they can apply for the allocatable ones in the next round or whenever they choose to.

Satish, I'm going to ask you to just monitor the chat, please. And if there's any questions, hopefully you can try and answer them, unless somebody wants to verbalize the question. Okay. Thanks.

So moving on. So 2.1 is quite clear, no issues there. Moving on. We're going to try and cover a good one-third of the 68 PRs today. So one-third of it. Hopefully, moving swiftly along. So the next seven slides, we grouped them together because they deal mostly with application process and fee-related PRs and IGs. Some of these, they don't necessarily have end user impact per se, but it is useful to understand the recommendations themselves. There may be certain angles that the four of us may not have seen. So if you think there's something that we need to do something about, then by all means, please draw that to our attention. And if the explanations are not sufficient in what we're trying to do in this limited time, then we're also happy to answer questions through the mail list.

Okay. So in essence, Satish mentioned that we have the process flow, the application and evaluation process flow in one of the Annexes. I think it's the last Annex. What we did as the EPDP team is we actually looked at the process flow with the help of staff, obviously. We basically tried to see whether we could cover up any of those processes in order to establish whether we could have separate rounds for just variants. Well, originally, it was whether we could have a separate round for the existing IDN gTLD registry operators to get their variants. And then technically speaking, if you have a separate round, then that particular process could also apply in the future for other future registry operators to get their variant labels separately from the round.

But after looking at the full process flow, application and evaluation process flow, we've come to the conclusion that it's actually not feasible to have a separate round because operationally and cost-wise, it didn't make sense. There are a lot of processes that you can't just take out and say that they only apply to non-variants. In fact, most of the processes do apply to variants and primary as well. So you can't split the two up. So that conclusion led us to basically say that we can't have separate rounds or we can't have a separate process for just variant labels. And to many existing processes which have been retained by SubPro recommendations, so we can't disregard them for this variant label alone.

The uptake of this is that PR 3.2 and PR 3.3, if you look together, so that just simply means that everybody, all the registry operators, whether you are existing or you are a future potential one, can only apply for allocatable variant labels during an application round. But we have made an exception through PR 3.15, and it's a one-time exception only, and I go back to the fact that I mentioned that there are Arabic and Chinese existing IDN gTLD registry operators that have been waiting for quite a while to get their variants. So this is the exception that applies to them per se, which is that in the immediate next round, they would have priority in terms of processing if they were to apply for the allocatable variant labels. Jonathan, I see your hand up. Do you have a question?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, I do. Thanks, Justine. I know you're trying to get through a lot of information. Pardon me if this is something you've answered before.

But what is the basis for determining whether something is allocatable or blocked? And it looks as though in the chat, Bill has said that what you choose is the primary actually changes that list. Why wouldn't somebody be able to allocate something that was on the blocked list if these are all just ways to forward to the same site?

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, we don't know what the applicants or the registry operators are going to use the TLDs or the variants for that's coming up in one of the later PRs. As I said, the RZ-LGR is a tool that is a combination of all the language communities putting in their own language requirements. I'm not a linguistic person so I'm not a linguistic expert. And maybe Bill can allude to some ways of trying to explain better he was part of the Latin panel. But our understanding is that the language community has a set of rules by which they determine the linguistic uniqueness requirements and that sort of thing. So they formulate those rules and that becomes LGR or Label Generation Rule. And then each language, each script community has an LGR. And then each LGR gets assessed by an IP, Integration Panel. Yes, that's right. Then they all merge into the RZ-LGR, which is the main tool. So the tool works in such a way that it has to account for all different script LGR, which is the basis of all the language community requirements. So it gets a bit convoluted. In fact, that is actually outside the remit of the EPDP team. We are just looking—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Okay. I don't mean to take you outside of your remit. And probably this is something I should have absorbed sooner. The idea of

things being blocked so you don't have to allocate them makes sense to me, but being blocked so that you can't allocate them seems strange. That's all.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. In some simple sense, blocked can mean a lot of things. Blocked can mean that—because the disposition value is actually determined by how you line up the different—what's the word I'm thinking of? So in a particular label, you could have a few characters, right? So the variant label basically could be a rearranging of those characters. So one explanation for being blocked is when you rearrange those characters, they don't come to a usable or meaningful word or label, the language doesn't provide for that kind of label, which is why you can't allocate it or it's not allocatable but it's blocked. So that's one particular explanation of block.

Bill, I see your hand up. Maybe you want to help us out a little bit here.

BILL JOURIS: The determination of what would be allocatable or blocked within a particular script was made by the Script Generation Panel. The identification of cross script variants was more a matter of good luck, which is to say somebody doing one script happened to notice that there was something in another script that was very similar.

To clarify for Jonathan, the allocatable versus blocked may be an example. In German, the word for street is strasse. In Germany, spoken in Germany, that double S is replaced by what's called a sharp S. It looks

like a letter B. Spoken in Switzerland or Austria, the sharp S isn't used. And so if you've already registered something with the sharp S, then the double S is allocatable. But if you have registered something with the double S, the Latin Panel decided that the sharp S was blocked. So it's, in some sense, arbitrary, but those were decisions made by the individual language panels. Does that help with your question?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, yeah. In some sense, arbitrary is the part that I guess I'm caught up on because I feel like it's just in plain old Roman character land that people have been registering like typo versions of their names and things like that that aren't legitimate words or anything like that. I don't understand why there needs to be anything that's blocked.

BILL JOURIS: It's blocked because if you have something that's a variant and it's not blocked and some other person can come along and register it, if somebody comes along and wants to register icann.org, replacing the initial I with acute, if that's a variant, then they can't do that. If it's not a variant, they're free to register that even if they have no relationship to ICANN. Those are the kinds of—

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes perfect sense but why am I blocked from it if I did register the primary?

BILL JOURIS: Then you'd have to take up with the IDN project as a whole.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I don't know if I'll do that, but thank you. That got me to take too much time.

JUSTINE CHEW: Jonathan, I think you're also thinking in terms of just the Latin script. So I don't know that your logic applies to other languages and other scripts.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think you may be right. The fact that Bill said that the order in which you choose them can impact which ones are available start to feel arbitrary as well in any language. Yeah. Obviously, I only know Cyrillic and Roman script. I don't know the others. But again, I don't want to take any more of your time. I know you're trying to get through a lot. So, thank you. I appreciate it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Alan, a quick one?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I just wanted to respond to Jonathan. I mean, the primary answer may well be, well, not everything makes sense. But in this case, you're right. You can register typos separately. This is not a typo as such. This is the same character depending on where you live. The panels are paid

the big bucks, so to speak, to make decisions on what makes the most sense and makes the fewest restrictions while protecting people. Maybe they made a mistake, but so be it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. All right. I see a couple of questions in chat. Satish, if you can.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Justine, just to note.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Just to note, we don't have much time. You're on slide 12 and we have 20 slides to cover. Maybe we could take the questions in the chat. Satish and I can take them. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, please. So how much time do I have left? Or have I used all the time already?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: You have less than eight minutes, I think.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. We'll try to get through as much as possible.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yeah. We can take some extra time maybe, but not much.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Just tell me when to stop. Okay? Don't feel shy to stop me. So I've covered slide 12. So can we move to slide 13, please? Okay. So this is where the conservatism principle applies. The conservatism principle, if I can say very simplistically, is championed by SSAC. The basis by which I would describe the way they advocated is that in terms of the root server, the root server doesn't know, doesn't care what is a variant, what is the primary. Because from a technical point of view, anything you introduce, whether it's a primary or a variant, is a TLD in itself. So the root servers think everything is a TLD. It is because of this linguistic thing and the way us humans understand certain languages that we apply these constraints on to this thing about introducing variants and labels into the Root Zone Generation Rule. So we're essentially trying to find a way to tell the root zone how to make sure that this TLD is connected to this TLD. And we can't really do it in the DNS itself, but we can do it by how the registry uses those TLDs. So in that respect, basically, if you just accept the argument that with the primary and the variant, they are meant to be the same word in the eyes of humans or in the minds of humans. So the more variants you introduce—and if you think of a primary plus variant in the set, so the set could be up to 2024, like we saw in the example. So the argument is the more variants you introduce into the root, which are meant to be the same thing, the

more complication you will introduce as well from how you get the root server to do it for you. That means that from a conservative point of view, we should try to not introduce too many limits. There should be a limit as to how many variants for each primary that we should allow to be introduced to the root. That is the basis of the conservatism principle. It's basically to limit any potential security, stability risks in the way that I tried to describe in a very simplistic manner.

So from this point of view, we then look at measures to ensure the safety and security for end users. Because remember that if you have a lot of variants, because they tend to mean the same thing to some people, there is a risk of confusion if you're trying to introduce too many at the time. So from that point of view, there are two aspects of safety and security from the perspective that the EPDP team. One of it is more like the business oriented side. The other part of it is the technical and operational side of things. So PR 3.5 tries to pin down the business side, which is to ask the applicants why they want the variant labels. We want to understand why they want it. Basically, what are they going to use it for? We have not come up with the criteria for evaluating this, the answers to these questions. That is something that we provide for in IG 3.6, and that goes to implementation.

The EPDP team themselves aren't linguistic experts. So there's only so much we can foresee and we need more help on that. So from this point of view, if folks here can think of what sort of ways or what sort of elements that we can try and evaluate the reasons for the applicants wanting to get the variant labels, then I would welcome input from that, because then we can provide more substantive feedback to the EPDP team on PR 3.5 and IG 3.6. At the moment, it's what it is. This is

something that if we want to champion, we need to have the basis, we need to have the understanding because it's not something that I think the registries or the group will easily accept beyond what is stated here.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: I just want to note that we are already way over the time allocated for us. So I don't know if you can quickly goes through the other items or would you prefer to postpone?

JUSTINE CHEW: Can we move on to the next agenda item? If there's spare time at the end, I can come back. I can stay on the call. If not, then we'll see how we can rearrange for the next session.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Thank you so much. I think this is a good way forward. Please stay on the call, you and Satish. But let's take any questions that anyone might have for you now before we move to the closed generics. I don't see any hands up so let's move on.

Okay. Thank you so much. So now we have five minutes for the closed generics. Yeah, closed generics and the Applicant Support. We have five minutes here. Greg, are you ready?

GREG SHATAN: Yes. Can you hear me?

HADIA EL MINIAWI:	Please go ahead. Thank you. Yeah, we can.

GREG SHATAN:	Thanks. As you know, Alan is the alternate, so I'll give him time for his views as well. We have another meeting this afternoon of the group. Meanwhile, there's been some asynchronous work going on and documents. We've reached an interesting point as we're trying to come to some form of a conclusion by ICANN77, where it seems like we sort of have somewhat of a majority opinion and a minority opinion, but not a lot of persuasion has taken place yet. Maybe that's what today's meeting was going to be. It was more identifying the points of difference in the last, and it seems that there has been some crystallization of subgroups with kindred views, but no crystallization of a single view. On many things, I would say that the overall issue is how lax or strict the public interest concept will be for closed generic, and how it will be tested, how it'll be evaluated, what information will be in the application. That's kind of the stream that's running through everything, and certain GNSO parties participating would seem to like more of a superhighway with few rules and broad guardrails, and the ALAC and GAC participants seem more interested in a two lane road with narrow guardrails and traffic lights and lots of police. So we'll have to see how that resolves itself. Hopefully, there'll be some discussion we've been long on developing points lately in short on persuasion. Obviously, there'll be more to report after today's meeting. Alan, over to you for your thoughts. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I don't have an awful lot to add other than, as you said, there are clearly multiple positions we don't have unanimity. Our At-Large position tends to be aligned with that of the GAC, and there are others who agree, but that's the important part for what I'm saying. It is not understood at this point or not clear how we proceed if we don't have unanimity, and is there a threshold which essentially wins. And that's the position that will be presented to the GNSO and the Board, and thus to the policy process that will be charged with actually implementing this.

Ultimately, if what comes out of it is counter to what the GAC believes, then we're going to have more GAC advice and the whole process will start again, which seems to be a somewhat fruitless way to go. So it's all going to hinge on how do we resolve the differences or how do we come up with a single position to be implemented in policy if there are multiple positions presumably with some weighting of one side or the other. So we don't know how that's going to be done. I think everything hinges on how that is done as to whether what we have is an outcome which will really address the problem or just create a new process going forward and delay it by another N years or another round. So we're going through the motions and optimistic that it will result in something that will be usable.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. I see two hands. First, Justine, please go ahead, and then Michael Palage.

JUSTINE CHEW:	Thank you. Probably a strange question to Greg and Alan. I was informed that we could expect some kind of draft framework by the end of April. It's already early May. But what I'm hearing from you two is it doesn't seem that that draft framework is anywhere near ready to be looked at by the community. Is that right?

ALAN GREENBERG:	Greg, if I may try. The answer is we have a schedule that we're trying to meet. We're running as fast as we can. That's it.

HADIA EL MINIAWI:	Thank you, Alan. Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE:	Thank you. So Greg and Alan, I want to be respectful of the Robert's Rules that are governing this particular process here. Are you able to provide any specificity regarding what the details? So obviously, superhighway as opposed to a two lane with traffic lights. Are you in a position to provide specificity on what that current majority/minority opinions are? That's part one.
	And then part two, I think one of the reasons that this group was to work in Robert's Rules was they wanted to see if they could work, if you will, in a different structure to get stuff done more quickly. It does not seem that that is happening. So as the group discussed internally, at what point in time they may say, "We tried this but now we're going to go back to the normal, open, transparent way of trying to resolve policy"? Particularly to Alan's point, should this result in something that

results in the GAC coming back and just issuing new advice? It would seem to be—I don't want to say a waste of time—but not the most optimal use of time. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: I'll take it first. I'll take a crack at that. Answering the second question first, we did discuss it last week's meeting and decided that we would go to a system of greater openness. Our meeting at ICANN77 will be open. It's still figuring out how to cut over to a more open system. But that's imminent. And it's actually Chatham House Rules rather than Robert's Rules that were operating under, our modified Chatham House Rules. But even under Chatham House Rules, you can report the results of discussion, just not who backed which result.

So I don't have all the details right in front of me. And I think it would probably be more better to do that next week after today's meeting. But we can certainly take a little bit more than the five minutes we allocated this week and go over some of the details in terms of tests or criteria that we do have, evaluation criteria for what constitutes a public interest and also what constitutes an anti-public interest. So, for instance, avoiding anti-competitive behavior or anti-competitive uses of string is one thing we've spent quite a bit of time discussing. But I think next week, we can allocate a little more time and go over kind of a more of the 10-foot level and get away from analogy and actually talk about some of the particular to give you a sense of what kind of pressure points and issues are being debated and the concerns also that are being debated as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may add. The decision to be more open at ICANN77 did presume that we actually had a framework presented by that time. That remains to be seen. As Greg said, we spent the last two weeks or last two meetings trying to identify what the hot issues are. This week, I think we're supposed to start trying to resolve them, and we'll see how it plays out. The whole issue of what happens if we don't succeed, that's a really good question. And there is no game plan. Assumption is this will succeed. And if it doesn't, then we're in new territory and we'll have to reinvent something new. That's how I'm reading it. But we're going through the motions and hoping that it will result in something. I mean, right now, if we apply the rule, 51% wins. No argument. That's it. Then we probably have resolution. But I'm not sure that's the rule that will be applied.

GREG SHATAN: I think that even if we got a more of the GNSO rule, that strong support of significant opposition is enough to get a win. Then maybe we have that as opposed to divergence. But there's a question about whether that's, A, where we are, and B, that's the strategy for getting to an answer here. It may well be that our facilitator, Melissa Peters Allgood may, in essence, threaten that in order to get some more movement towards something common.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: No, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, what we come out with is going to go into a policy process. The concern that some of us have is that we've put enough guardrails and enough restrictions on it so the policy process cannot diverge and end up with something which isn't what we meant.

GREG SHATAN: And that'll be a GNSO policy process.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right. We don't know what the process is. We don't know how the group will be structured to do that. There's a lot of unknowns.

GREG SHATAN: And that's up to the GNSO Council, not the Board, what the policy process will look like.

ALAN GREENBERG: And how that process is staffed with the volunteers. We've seen issues before of how outcomes are partially controlled based on how you compose the group. There's lots of issues.

HADIA EL MINIAWI:	Thank you, Alan and Greg. I note Jonathan is saying in the chat, "We'll need a debrief on your reflections on this process." Unless no one else has further questions, we move to the policy comment updates recently ratified by the ALAC, none.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Hadia, apologies. We have Applicant Support for five minutes. Thank you.
HADIA EL MINIAWI:	Sorry. I'm sorry for that. Sarah, are you going to take us through this?
SARAH KIDEN:	Yes, please.
HADIA EL MINIAWI:	Okay, great. Thank you so much.
SARAH KIDEN:	Hi, everyone. I'll give a brief update as well. This week, we have mostly been refining the text in our report in preparation for the ICANN77 meeting. So there are three things I'd like to update you on today. The first one is on that slide, slide number two. There was a proposal from the GAC that we should use the UN definition for underdeveloped, and then use the GAC and SubPro Final Report definition for underserved. In this case, for example, underserved would be regions or countries that don't have a well-developed DNS industrial economy or countries where

governments are not aware or they have little information about ICANN for functions and policy processes. This was a suggestion that we supported and I think everyone else seemed to be happy with the suggestion.

Then the next thing is on slide number seven. We were informed by the Global Domain Division team that an ICANN Learn Module will be developed that is dedicated to the Applicant Support Program. The goal of this ICANN Learn course will be to help potential applicants to get a strong understanding with application requirements and the evaluation process. At the end of the ICANN Learn course, it's anticipated that potential applicants could take a survey and read the course and share if they found that it helped them to get a good understanding of the requirements. Of course, the ICANN Learn course will support all the other resources that we've been talking about. For example, the outreach materials, the portal, the proponent services, and so on and so forth.

Finally, on slide number nine. We've just started discussing this particular life cycle element but I'd like to highlight Recommendation 6. After the application process, the recommendation basically is for ICANN Org to investigate the extent to which supported applicants that are awarded gTLDs are still in business as a registry operator after two years. And if they're not in business, what were the challenges, why are they not in business, and so on and so forth. So just started having discussions, but I've seen people commenting in the working group about how data like this will be collected. This particular one is under discussion. But the text looks cleaner now. So kindly take a look and

send Maureen and I feedback before our next meeting on Monday. Thank you, everyone.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much, Sarah. I see a hand from Justine. Justine, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Hadia. Thanks, Sarah. This is good. I like what I hear. Just to clarify, are we saying now that the applicant must be from an underserved—what's the other term—underdeveloped space or region? If that's the case, then would Applicant Support be denied to an applicant who may be based in a developed country but is trying to support a community in an underserved region? How would that work?

SARAH KIDEN: We've actually extensively discussed this issue. This week, actually, people are raising concerns and saying that if you open it up too much, then you create a situation where someone who actually does not deserve the Applicant Support will come and apply. And that example you've used, that's really something that Mike talked about. The target right now is underdeveloped, underserved, and underrepresented.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Sarah. So there's a question in the chat and then I will give the floor to Abdulkarim because he also has his hand up. The question in the chat says, "Will the Applicant Support Module be a requirement for all applicants to complete or will it be optional?"

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you. It will be optional because it's going to be used alongside other information. The recommendation from our working group is that outreach should be in various forms. For example, social media, which has traditionally not been used to advertise something like the Applicant Support Program. Other resources, for example, creating something on the ICANN website where people can come and access. This is just another avenue for people to come and get resources. So it's not the only thing and they don't have to take the course because they can still access information in other forms.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. I hope this answer your question, Bukola. Abdulkarim, please go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Hadia. Thank you, Sarah. I just wanted to clarify, you mentioned the UN definition of underdeveloped. Is the UN definition of underdeveloped has been used or the ICANN definition?

Because the UN definition, they are usually based on GDP per capita. And there are some countries that are classified as underdeveloped with the UN. They are not classified as underdeveloped. We're generally classified as underdeveloped. I'm thinking of rather UN definition, it's better to look and think critically. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. Staff, if you could go back to slide number two. For underdeveloped, we're using the UN definition. And then for underserved, we are using the definition provided by GAC and the SubPro Final Report. The UN definition is totally different. It's about GDP and the economy of the country. But this particular underserved is around having DNS ecosystem in their countries and their governments being aware about ICANN, the role of ICANN, the functions and policy processes. So there are two different things and we are using both definitions.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay. Thank you, Sarah. Because I know that, for example, Nigeria is usually—because of the per capital income, the GDP the way it's used by the UN, it's sometimes not classified as underdeveloped when you look at some definition. So that's why I'm saying we need to look at the classification as actually been used.

SARAH KIDEN: Noted. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. Thank you, Abdulkarim. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I'm following up on Justine's question. I'm trying to understand how or whether Applicant Support would be available to indigenous population in what would be considered developed countries. For instance, the U.S. and Canada have significant indigenous populations, as do Australia and New Zealand. That's only by way of example. The way this is written, it seems like all of those groups will be excluded from Applicants Support. Is that correct?

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Greg. This is something we've actually discussed in the working group. I think an indigenous community can apply for applicant support. But kindly allow me to check back with the team and get back. But I know we've discussed it. We even went as far as talking about communities that are in developed countries but the community itself is underdeveloped. It's something we've discussed extensively. But I'll come back to you next week with a better response.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I appreciate it. That was the other part of my question, was about underdeveloped or underserved communities. For instance, those that have various indicators, poverty, education, mortality, but are not indigenous. For instance, parts of the South Bronx or Mississippi or communities in those areas that don't have the resources at their

fingertips that you might expect in a developed country. I'll be interested in both. Thanks.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you. I'll probably come back with a response next week.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. Thank you, Sarah. I move to Justine. Justine, go ahead, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Just a quick one. Sarah, you might want to have a look at the chat. I think John McCormac makes a good point. You talked about ICANN Org doing a study after two years of operations of a particular applicant support qualifier. This is just in three years instead of two years, and he makes a pretty good argument for it. So thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Justine. Thank you, John. That's actually a good suggestion because this is something we're going to discuss on Monday. Good feedback for us to get to the group.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much, Sarah. Abdulkarim, is this a new hand or is it an old one?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Sorry. Old hand.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Thank you so much. I don't see any more hands. Sarah, are there any final comments that you would like to share?

SARAH KIDEN: Just that kindly take a look at the document. We are finalizing it. So if you have any other comments. I'll send it on the mailing list but it's also in the wiki. Please send us feedback so that we can take it to the group and finalize before the next ICANN meeting which is very soon. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much, Sarah.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Hadia, I think you're muted.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: I'm sorry. For the policy comments, we don't have any updates this week. We move quickly to Michael Palage and Bill Jouris for the proposed renewal of the Registry Agreement for .NET. I believe on our last call, we agreed that it is within ALAC's remit. Michael and Bill, I give you the floor. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. We will try to keep this real quick so that Justine and Satish could hopefully finish up. In a summary, feedback from last week's presentation both online and offline was positive. Alvaro from Panama, another attorney, has asked to join and help Bill and I in the drafting. ICANN Org has created an online doc. We have not yet started to build out the framework or the response. Bill and I are just waiting until we connect with Alvaro before we begin with that undertaking. And hopefully next week, we will have a more detailed response. I yield back the remaining 19 minutes of the original allotted time. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Michael and Bill. We will be waiting for your update on our next call. Now we have Cheryl, Justine, and Jonathan for the SubPro subteam update.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Hadia, if I may, Jonathan's hand is up.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Jonathan, please go ahead. I'm sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Again, it's just me disrupting your schedule, again, Hadia. Just a quick question for Mike and Bill. The presentation from last week was quite substantial and I think there was a lot of variance in the reaction to individual items. I was wondering whether or not you had a high level

sense of the topics you were going to recommend that we focus on in our response.

MICHAEL PALAGE: That is something that I wanted to discuss with Bill and Alvaro about how to do that. I will note, Jonathan, that on the CPWG list, there was a lot of talk about the RAA. In fact, ICANN actually updated the public forum comment to specifically respond to that. Because I believe—by my last count, I think over 35 of the 40 submissions were on that specific issue. We did not identify that as one of the top issues. That is something that we're looking into to see how we potentially incorporate that into a response so that At-Large can decide whether they want to include that. We have some current best thinking but we really want to use this next call with Alvaro to get another attorney's eyes on our current best thinking and how we're going forward. Hopefully, that answers your question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Thanks, Mike.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. Thank you. I see Naveed has his hand up. Naveed, please go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just a quick follow up. As I remember in the last meeting, we had a presentation on this, the differences were presented. But I don't

remember that we had an agreement of which area we're going to target in our comments. Do we expect that over next week or something to get consent on—we agreed that this comes into our remit but we did not agree on whether we are going to comment or which area we are going to comment at. So just want clarification on this.

BILL JOURIS: That is what we're hoping to have by next week. Our presentation raised, as you say, a large number of points and we hope to narrow that down to maybe three or four that we want to focus on. We haven't got there yet but that is what we're hoping to do for next time. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Bill. I see a suggestion from Jonathan saying next week we could also have a presentation instead of a draft. I don't see any more hands up. We wait for both of you for your presentation. I give the floor now to Jonathan for the SubPro subteam update. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Cheryl has been leading an effort to go through the panoply of outstanding At-Large or ALAC recommendations that are currently before the Board. And with the help of staff, we're trying to determine which of those recommendations potentially have an impact on the timeline for the new round of gTLDs. Of those that have a timeline implication, which of those are ones that we feel strongly need to get done even if they have an impact on the timeline. Hopefully, that

makes sense. We have a lot of recommendations out there that are just decisions that need to be made.

For example, we have a recommendation that perhaps $2 million isn't enough for the Applicant Support Program, and that's a decision to change that. But there's another recommendation out that originated with the SSAC for a study on why DNS abuse found its way into the new gTLDs so quickly. As John was mentioned in the chat in previous CPWG calls, it could be price. Interestingly enough, ICANN has announced a study on that very topic. The idea that that study might want to be finished and perhaps used for some of the safeguards that get created for the next round suggests that that's something that might exist as a prerequisite for the round and therefore have an impact on the timeline. Where we want to hold the line is the discussion that's taking place. Of the ones that have a timeline impact, the small group, roughly 25% of them or something like that are surfacing as we should hold the line on this. That will result in a presentation to this group with what those initial thoughts are and then get a broader feedback on those questions of where to hold the line.

So the subteam is really just trying to create a framework for assessing what recommendations we're going to really fight the hardest for being prerequisites versus ones that will be ongoing. Hopefully, that makes sense. I'm happy to take questions. But that's the idea behind the subteam as it currently exists.

As Cheryl mentioned in the chat, we're going to workshop some of this in a session that Cheryl's leading at ICANN77 as well, again, to get more voices and more understanding of this process that we're going through

to be as effective participants in the next, what looks like, two and a half years prior to a new round in terms of what needs to get done. Thanks for the reminder, Cheryl.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. I don't see any hands up. Big thank you to Cheryl for all this work, and of course, the entire SubPro team. Now, I guess it's you again, Jonathan, the ICANN77. We have three policy sessions. I will briefly speak about the first one. The title now I think would be "A User Perspective, The Next gTLD Application." The session will be mainly focusing on end user's perspective. It will be composed of two parts. The first part will aim to gather input from all five RALOs on the new gTLD program focusing on topics such as Applicant Support, IDNs, DNS abuse, and community applications.

Then the second part of the session will aim to gather input from all stakeholder groups, the next application round for new gTLDs from an end user perspective. The objective of this session is to gather regional and community-wide input on the new gTLD program from an end user perspective, and the expected outcome is to identify advantages and concerns related to the next application window of the news gTLD program from an end user perspective and also from a regional perspective.

Again, those are initial thoughts. This is an initial description for the session. It's on a Google Doc. We will all start contributing to the description and the agenda objectives and outcomes. As Jonathan mentioned and also Cheryl, we will be having an internal policy session

about the new gTLD program. Jonathan, I will give you the floor to talk about the unfinished business and the cross-community session on auctions. Please, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. We've had a little bit of a series going called Unfinished Business, which are discussions that didn't get fully fleshed out by the Subsequent Procedures workgroup before they had to finalize their report. We've had productive sessions on both. One was on Applicant Support. That was a great session that I think has helped inform our position and perhaps even the community's position on Applicant Support. And we did another one on unfinished closed generics. One of the remaining items that is still under discussion by the Board and elsewhere in the community is this question of auctions and how contentions are resolved in the next round. There's a strong feeling among the ALAC but also the GAC and elsewhere that that system of private auctions led to a lot of potential promises of gaming in this round. So trying to come up with contention resolution processes that minimize gaming and that are also rational for applicants to participate in is, I think, the question of this panel and just get that conversation going. What kind of auctions makes the most sense? Because we're not fans of the private auctions. But also, what we need to do to allow smaller entities to participate in contention resolution. One example has been to apply a multiplier to their bid so that it can better compete with a larger entity, and that's the idea behind this. We'll have somebody from the Board, some people from the community and then perhaps an auctions expert beyond this panel to help further this

conversation that still needs to finish in the area of auctions and contention resolution. Thanks, Hadia.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. Jonathan, it seems a really interesting session. I see Michael Palage. Please go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Jonathan, perhaps we could get ICANN's Economist to weigh in on that as well. I know we extended an invitation before but I believe he's tied up. So that may be another opportunity for us to get that interaction. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Michael. Maybe. I think the Economist is acting as a roving consultant on a lot of the studies that are taking place. So we'll have to figure out what the best way is to interact with that new role and this might be an area that makes sense. Thanks, Michael.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. There's some interesting comments in the chat. Maybe you would like to take a look at them. And if we don't have any more comments or hands up, we could, I think, move to Any Other Business. So any other business? Again, I don't see any hands up. So we go to our next meeting. When is it? It's Wednesday, 19:00 UTC. Staff?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thanks, Hadia. Our next meeting will be, as you said, next Wednesday, 10th of May at 19:00 UTC.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much all of you for attending this call and for the active participation. Thank you to our interpreters. Thank you all. I hand it back to staff to adjourn. Thank you.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thanks so much, Hadia. And thank you all for joining today's meeting. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]