YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 31 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 Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Adrian Schmidt, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Alberto Soto, Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet, and Judith Hellerstein is expected to join us slightly late. Joining from staff side, we have Chantelle Doerksen, Marika Konings, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present and I will be doing call management for today's call. We are also expecting Heidi Ullrich to join us shortly as well.

For today's call, just a reminder that we do have real-time transcription service as usual. Let me actually put the link here on the Zoom chat so you can check the service provided. We do not have any interpretation for today's call due to the ICANN77 Prep Week. However, I still would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the transcription purposes, please. And with that, I would like to leave the floor back over to Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Let's go through the agenda. And we'll start with the workgroup and small team updates with an

---

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.

update on the Expedited PDP on Internationalized Domain Names and an update also on the facilitated dialogue on closed generics. After that, we'll have a very quick trip through the policy comment updates. Then the main star of today is Justine Chew with the Subsequent Procedures and DNS Abuse updates. Justine is our GNSO Council liaison. There is a particularly important and interesting ALAC GNSO Council call that will take place on the 6th of June. Justine is going to take us through some of the points that are going to be discussed, the penultimate call before the ICANN meeting, ICANN77, which Hadia and Jonathan Zuck will take us through in agenda item six.

That's today's call so far. Are there any amendments, changes to the agenda, additions, deletions, etc.? Now is the time to speak. I am not seeing any hands up. So that means we can go straight to our action items from last week, which I invite you to have a look at on the Action Items page. They are all completed. That includes one important one which is CPWG members to review Steinar Grøtterød's update on the Transfer Policy submitted via the CPWG mailing list on the 24th of May. Last week's update was done online. This week is going to be done online as well. Are there any hands up first before we move on? No hands up for the action items so we can move on.

Going straight into agenda items three. That's our small team updates. Now, the first one is the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. The update is on the CPWG mailing list. But if you scroll to the bottom of the agenda, you will also have minutes from the GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP meeting on the 30th of May 2023, which was yesterday, very short minutes about what's going on there. I invite you to read this in your own time. I know that Steinar is on the call in case

you have any questions or comments. I'm not seeing anybody with their hands up.

I note in the chat that the .ZIP conversation that this might be a possible topic for this and later Zoom meeting. I thought that there was going to be actually a discussion on this. Let's add this to the Any Other Business part if we have some time at the end of this call, have a quick discussion on .ZIP. If I did note that Jonathan had asked for a discussion on this, and I am surprised actually it wasn't added to the agenda. Thank you for this reminder.

Okay. Now we can go to the Expedited Policy Development Process on IDNs, Internationalized Domain Names. And for this we have an update. The update doesn't have a slide deck but it has to focus on specific parts of the work that is taking place. My screen has gone blank. Over to Satish who's taking this today.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. I will start off and then Hadia will follow up sometime. So what I will talk about today is about the glossary part of the report which we hadn't presented to file. Now there are a couple of things about the glossary that is interesting. Now, we're aware that the EPDP on IDNs is somewhat technical in nature. Now, normal glossary uses the official terminology for defining this term. But after a discussion wherein the ALAC team also made its kind of point that there are many non-technical community members. So the decision that the team took was to not define these things officially, but they talk about meaning rather than the word definition. So it's kind of simplified. But wherever

there is more details available, it is linked so that people who want more details can look there.

One other thing is that if you look at these alphabetical sorted entries, we will go through quickly to some of them, not all. You will see that there are some texts in italics. For example, the second one allocatable, the Root Zone LGR is in italic. And on the next column disposition value is in italic. This just says that these terms are described as an entry in the glossary from within. Just like kind of cross reference.

So I will in the next eight minutes quickly go through the first few of these, and then Hadia will take over for me. So 2012 round, we are aware of this so I will not spend any time.

Allocatable is basically a disposition value. When you run a label through the Root Zone LGR, it comes out and says, "Okay, these are the labels that are allocatable. These are the ones which are blocked." So for us in the EPDP on IDNs, we have these two values, blocked and allocatable.

The ccPDP4, they are using one more term called delegatable. That's because they have an additional constraint that each of their labels have to be meaningful names of territories in Sanskrit. That's constraint we don't have in GNSO. So we only use two.

Allocated administrative assignment to a particular applicant. Next, please. You can scroll down.

AGB is a very important part of our chapter. At least quite a bit of the policies that we create in the EPDP influences the AGB and that is

basically for documenting the policies. So the Applicant Guidebook is very important.

The next is blocked which is I just mentioned about. It is, generally speaking, the output approach on LGR, where a label is classified as allocatable blocked. But there is something else called the label state, which we'll see in another entry. Blocked is also a label state. That basically happens after the application is approved. And then it begins not the application part of the process but delegation part of the process.

I'm not going to get into the details of this. Next, please. Scroll down.

So ccPDP4 is the ccNSO's policy on IDN ccTLD. Now, although these are two distinct processes, the ICANN Board has informed us that you have to communicate with each other. So we have this periodic meeting with each other with the group. We also have a section in the report that talks about the places where we have treated some of the questions slightly differently. None of them are really consequential, but it has been documented so that everybody is aware of the differences between the cc approach and the GNSO approach.

Now, conservatism that we see here is actually one of the principles. The document, the glossary, has several principles, and these are the foundational kind of elements of the EPDP work. So, these are actually very important. Conservatism basically is about not having too many variants that might destabilize the root zone. The SSAC actually has also talked to the EPDP and said that this is a very important factor. And the EPDP has considered this conservatism as one of the kind of pillars.

However, we'll see later that there are some places where we have chosen to take a slightly more liberal approach. Next page, please.

We are aware of what is delegated. So, this is a label state. We'll see the label states later. Now, apart from principle, we also have failure mode, at least two are mentioned explicitly. The first failure mode is denial of service or no connection. So you can go through it, I'm not going to get into it. The failure modes basically are a caution for us. We don't want this failure to occur. So the EPDP has to work around it or take precautions that it doesn't happen. And for that reason, we have done some extra work to avoid these failure modes.

Disposition value we already have covered. It is the output of the Root Zone LGR and it can be for us in GNSO primary. It can be allocatable or blocked. Next page, please.

EPDP we don't have to get into.

GP—technically speaking, Generation Panel is for a particular language or a group of languages, which are kind of related because they use the same script. This is technically outside ICANN. This is a group of volunteers who work together to create the Label Generation Rules. All the Label Generation Rules, LGR of different languages are integrated by the Integration Panel into the Root Zone LGR. This is a language specific or script-specific component of this Root Zone LGR.

Hybrid model is actually an innovation by a small group which had our members, Hadia as well, for a more efficient approach to String Similarity Review, balances the number of comparisons with the risk of the failure mode. So, this computationally it simplifies matters, it is not

the originally proposed 123 model, but it is between 2 and 3, so it's called the hybrid model.

IRT is Implementation Review Team. Now, originally, when the EPDP started off, the idea was that we will coordinate with the SubPro IRT, but for various reasons that has not happened. So, it has been mentioned, documented in this glossary also. Next page, please.

So, I will stop with this page and hand it over to Hadia. Now, here we had talked about there is a principle called the integrity of the set or the variant set. This is basically the idea that if you started the primary label and you regenerate from Root Zone LGR tool all the variants with their disposition values. Variant set is kind of the result of the process. Those that are not blocked and allocatable plus the primary, the primary and all the allocatable labels, together they are called the variant set. And the principle that we've been following in the EPDP is that throughout the process from the application process onwards onto the delegation and even post delegation, the set has a kind of sanctity of its own, integrity of the set so that means the set cannot be atomic, you cannot separate the elements of the set, we cannot break it apart, they have to be treated as one union, one composite. Although at the technical level, at the DNS level, every level distinct. There are no connections between these variant set entries. But for us, the management level, we have to treat these as a set and we cannot break them apart into their constituents. I'll stop here. Hadia, over to you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much. So now we have the definition of Internationalized Domain Name. It's a top-level domain label that has characters other than ASCII characters, ASCII letters, digits, or hyphens. Technically speaking, an IDN gTLD, it consists of an A label. So it's XN-- and then you have a Punycode. That's how it's put in the DNS. But anyway, a label is a domain that does not include ASCII letters, digits, or hyphens.

How do we define a label? If we can scroll down a little bit. So a label, when we say, for example, icann.org, ICANN is a label and org is a label. So that's the definition of label. Another term for a label is string. So again, if we say, for example, www.icann.org, then ICANN is a label or string, org is a label or string. If we can scroll down a little bit. Yeah, okay.

Label states. Those are the states that the domain can take or the variant labels can take. Those are derived from the primary label. So we need first to define primary label. What's a primary label? So the primary label is the label that the applicant chooses as its primary and based on which the rest, the variants are going to be calculated. So the applicant, which is the primary label, the applicant puts the label in a calculation tool, and then the calculation tool makes its calculations and determines the variants associated with that primary label.

Those variants take states. Those states could be either blocked or allocatable. Allocatable variants, the applicant can apply for those and have them later on delegated if approved. Blocked variants are variants that cannot actually be applied for. So they can never be a top-level domain.

Misconnection. So misconnection is if, for example, I typed www.icann.org, and then instead of ending up on ICANN site, I ended up somewhere else. That's a misconnection. So misconnections can happen, for example, due to confusion. So I can mistype a domain name. Unfortunately, that domain name exists so I end up somewhere else. So that's the misconnection.

PDP, of course, we know that. That's a Policy Development Process.

Primary label, we already defined what the primary label is. It's the label based on which the other variants are determined or calculated. I must say that it does matter which label the applicant uses as its primary. Although the entire set will remained unchanged if I decide that I pick one of the variant sets and make it my primary and put it in the tool, the tool will make the calculations. You will end up with the same set but you will not end up with the same disposition. Same disposition, I mean whether the labels are blocked or allocatable. Allocatable could be changed to be blocked and blocked could be changed to be allocatable. So choosing the primary label does matter.

Rejected—that is a label state that is allocatable. It's applied for by the applicant and it does not go through the process so it's not approved, so it becomes rejected.

Reserved names. A reserved name is a string that is reserved to maintain the exclusive rights to the names of ICANN, its bodies, or essential related functions of ICANN and IANA. There is actually a list of reserved names that you could refer to if you wish.

A string, we already defined that.

Root Zone Label Generation Rules. Those rules include a list of permissible code points, the code points that are actually allowed. And the latest version is version 5. It includes 26 scripts. Also, the Root Zone Label Generation Rules are developed by the language community.

Same entity, it's a principle that the EPDP team adopted, which requires the same entity to own and manage the primary label and all the variant labels as well. If we can call scroll down a little bit.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) staff paper. It's a shorthand reference for the IDN TLD variant management paper that was developed by ICANN Org. If we can scroll down. Yeah, that's still discussed paper. Yeah, we already covered that.

A string, it's the same as the label, it's the same definition. Again, icann.org, ICANN is a label and org is a label.

String ineligible for delegation. It's a label that cannot be delegated, whether at the top-level domain or the second level domain. Those include acronyms of intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations. So there is a list that you also could refer to.

Subsequent Procedures. It's an abbreviation for the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure policy. If we can scroll down.

A valid label, it's actually a label that could be delegated. It's eligible for delegation. It's valid. Again, whether the label is valid or not valid, this is based on the calculations of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules.

Variant label, it's an Internationalized Domain Name, IDN label that can be registered in different ways due to variations in the spelling of words in a given language. Again, variants cannot be self-identified. Those again are determined by the calculations of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules.

The variant label set. Those are the set of labels which are calculated by the Root Zone Label Generation Rules using the primary label. The variant set includes allocatable variants and blocked variants in addition to the primary label.

Withheld. This is a label state of a top-level domain that is an allocatable variant label but has not been applied for as a top-level domain. So it has not been allocated nor delegated. It's withheld to the same entity, because as we said before, we have the same entity principle. So no other entity could actually have this label.

I think that's it. If you think I went too fast or you did not get some of the abbreviations, I'm open to any questions. And Satish is here, of course, as well. He could answer any of your questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, I'm letting you run the queue. You've got two people in the queue at the moment. It's Gopal Tadepalli and then Justine Chew.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yeah, sure. Thank you. Please go ahead, Gopal.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. Thank you very much. It's a nice piece of glossary. One suggestion is that very necessary, there must be a link, the definitions given. The definition makes sense. For example, DDoS. Case in point, what Satish was talking about, distributed denial of service. Mitigation is a very expensive proposition at the time of assigning the domain name, difficult to run through the strings. So we can give a link to DDoS and its basic concerns. It'll be useful. We understand it ourselves. The reader can understand oneself. Good property of DDoS is if it occurs, it stays unless somebody really desperately wants that service located. So we can simply give a link and then hope for the best. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much, Gopal. But, of course, you know that this glossary is part of the report. And it's at the top so it's Section 3, just before the Recommendations section. Again, those are not technical definitions. As Satish mentioned, we just wanted people to understand what we're talking about.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: You could do a discussion.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Hadia. So the reason why we're presenting this is because there is a specific ask out of the Public Comment Proceeding for comments to

the glossary, in addition to all the recommendations, recommendations and the Implementation Guidance, of course, and the point is, as already mentioned by both Satish and Hadia is we are using certain terms to describe certain things in the report. Therefore, it is meant to be and, as already described, meaning rather than technical definition. And it's supposed to aid the normal person, not a technical person, non-technical person, to help them understand what we are talking about. So insofar as if you all read this glossary and you read the meaning of the term and if you can understand it, then we would have achieved our purpose. If you don't understand it, then it's something that you might want to highlight to us probably on the list or something, and then we can have a look at it. But these meanings that we have come up with are based on the team's work. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much, Justine. Indeed, it is important that you read what's written in the report, and if you can actually understand it—I didn't use the words that are in the report. I tried to explain it my own way. But you need actually to read what's there, just as Justine mentioned, and if it does make sense to you, then it's fine. If it doesn't, then please make suggestions. Thank you. I don't see anyone else. So, Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. Thanks for this update on the EPDP on IDNs and taking us through the reports and the tables one step at a time. Now, the other fields in the small team updates, whether it's the RDA Scoping Team, Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team, the

	Registration Data Request Service and the Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process, somewhat are on hiatus at the moment. The only update we have is on closed generics, and for this we have Greg Shatan and Alan Greenberg. Over to you, gentlemen.
GREG SHATAN:	Thank you. I hope you can hear me. It's been a very busy couple of weeks in the group as we're attempting to bring a deliverable or work product essentially to completion in time for ICANN77. Our work product has pivoted somewhat in the interest of time to essentially a Framework document describing and trying to reach consensus or agreement within the group on a number of key points relating to how closed generics will work. It's been very much a whirlwind, the last two sessions or so, and we have another session this afternoon, having had one on Monday. The last session we had, it was somewhat problematic, in my view, as there were very few GAC participants on that call and it seemed like we were coming to quite a number of potentially heavy compromises on certain things. As I pointed out to the group, if this is just going to result in the GAC giving the same advice about closed generic, that they would have had this group not met more or less, then we won't have succeeded even if we have a work product at the end. That's probably a little overly pessimistic. Because there have been some, I think, appropriate realistic compromises or discoveries where we've been able to come up with things that hopefully we'll be able to pass muster with the GAC. As you all know, the GAC can't send half a dozen people to a meeting and call them GAC representatives with authority to bind the GAC. They're really participating in their individual

GAC capacities. It's more a question of force of an intellect and persuasion down the road.

With apologies to Jonathan Zuck, I don't have a laundry list of the decisions that we've made. Still unclear exactly how much we can drop the kimono during our discussions, although we have had discussions about greater openness. The fast pace of work has kept the preparation of documentation from really taking place. We only have a limited amount of staff. Therefore, we haven't had that much of a chance.

There is a Framework document. I can certainly take you through it, given the new openness concept, if you will. But it is a number of pages and we'd be here for the entire rest of the meeting really going through it. Generally speaking, we went through overall concepts that won't be shocking to anybody about how the application process would proceed, that there will need to be additional information provided by the applicant to enable a thorough evaluation of the application. And we want concrete and factual statements rather than abstract or generalized statements being put in place. There's a specific requirement to specify the public interest goal that the closed generic TLD will serve. And that should be, if they want to be successful, go beyond the commercial or individual interest of the applicants. Because after all, it's the public interest, not the applicant's interest. It can be both a broad or a narrow public interest but they need to discuss what it is.

We recognize that the ICANN Bylaws and the ICANN global public interest framework can be useful tools. But we're not applying or limited to either of those constructions of what the public interest is.

We've more or less avoided trying to define the public interest since that's a classic ICANN rabbit hole. Plus, we are preparing a document that will then be taken into account, hopefully, followed by a PDP process to be initiated by the GNSO, probably EPDP, although that hasn't been decided by the GNSO yet. We need a clear description of the intended public interest party. We also need to be clear that this isn't intended solely to exclude other competitors from using the gTLD as well. We'll need now the second level of delegation rules and management rules so that we'll understand how that will work out since again it's a closed universe so everything will be administered by the registry.

We also asked for a discussion of how the application will help the broader public interest even if it's beyond whatever specified public interest is being put in place. I'm, again, not going to go through every aspect of this. We want to understand the nexus or connection between the applicant and the term and the public interest goals and essentially the public that will be involved or the sector of the public. We will want to know whether it is either a representative group such as an NGO or perhaps a trade association or a cooperative or whatever it might be that represents a broad number of participants in a sector. Or if it's a single applicant, they will need to demonstrate that they won't be involved in anticompetitive behavior.

That's high level on the application. There's also requirement to identify threats and risks that might be posed and how they'll be mitigated. For instance, if you were not a closed generic, if you were applying for .ZIP, how would you mitigate against the use of it for phishing and malware and other ways of pretending that you're sending a zip file as opposed

to a link to a .ZIP domain? One know that up front. We'll be looking for specific commitments in terms of how it will monitor the TLD as well. I think it's a more robust application process in a number of ways, which will be very useful.

We also specify a number of aspects of the evaluation process and what the evaluation panel should consist of, at least, generically, so to speak, in terms of individuals with professional qualification. Not too detailed on that. The evaluation process, in some ways, is a mirror of the application process given that the application is intended to provide information for the evaluation. We expect that there'll be an additional specification. We don't absolutely dictate that but we expect that there'll be an additional spec covering closed generic, and we also will be looking in there. Obviously, we have a list of the criteria that we want to see in the specification in terms of publishing policies, in terms of operating in line with its application and commitments that are made in the application.

We debated whether there should be an absolute use it or lose it deadline, not only to delegate the TLD but to go live with it. We ended up with a strong encouragement there, a compromise. We've dictated that there should be post delegation reviews, early stages that there should be post delegation reviews, and that the contract will be enforceable by ICANN since that seems to be including any public interest, commitment, and the like. That is a kind of high level view. We have a whole bunch of questions that we didn't get to or didn't fully develop, didn't come to any resolution on, which we will leave to the PDP to decide whether any of those really needs to be worked on. Some

of them are, frankly, quite important. So it's not just a graveyard of dead ideas.

That overall is what we're at. We have a meeting this afternoon where we have a number of issues still open to discuss. One of the issues and one that I've been active on, along with Alan and Kathy Kleiman from NCSG, and some of the GAC members, is whether there should be a second comment period. The initial comment period for new gTLDs starts immediately when they're revealed. So then there's a scramble to see what's out there, see what groups are interested in commenting on them, getting the comments in. We have proposed that there should be a second comment period coming after early warnings that would come from the GAC, which would allow more organization and contemplation of the list prior to early warnings coming up. And also coordination or at least consideration of the GAC position when making comments or putting together comments where you might be able to amplify the GAC messages, ones that make sense to amplify. At least, it provides greater amount of information and context.

There has been a considerable amount of resistance from some participants who I think are prioritizing getting new TLDs sold and delegated and also trying to ease the application process. Concern being too that adding an additional comment period could slow down the process for all new gTLD applications, not just closed generic, given the kind of the pipeline or workflow that's intended for the new gTLDs that spelled out—largely what took place in the previous round and is also spelled out in the output of the SubPro Working Group.

So that is a 10 cent tour, hopefully more substance than usual, given that we are getting close. But we have, as I said, much to do to both see where we landed and to try to deal with some of the key outstanding questions this afternoon. I'm on my phone so I don't see the—I see two hands up. I see Jonathan and Justine. I'm in my list, Jonathan is first. I'll call on Jonathan.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. You may want to let me give a couple of comments first.

GREG SHATAN: Of course, Alan. Alan, why don't you amplify, clarify, direct, amend, comment, and generally provide your input, and then we will go to the queue? Sorry, Alan, I've gotten too used to treating you like a potted plant the way the rest of the—

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm invisible by definition.

GREG SHATAN: Not among here. You're among friends, you can take off your cloak of invisibility. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Thank you. A couple of comments. I'll try to be brief, although there is a lot to say. Last week, there were two meetings. There's only one meeting this week, I guess, because the Monday was a U.S. holiday.

Although we're working to a tight timeline, and what I consider actually a completely unreasonable timeline and we apparently are determined to have a work product out regardless of whether to what extent we've covered all the issues, I find that more than a little problematic, but that is the direction we're going in, that implies there are a number of issues as Greg already said that I believe should have been addressed but have not been addressed fully.

An example is should we restrict applications to nonprofits, for example, or some other way to subset it? That was brought up and it was discussed to the extent that it was clear, we were very divided on that. Therefore, the issue was put aside. Now, in my mind, if it's an important issue to some people, then we cannot ignore it completely, and we have. There are a number of other issues like that. As a result, I would not be surprised if we've come to the end of this process and Greg and I feel that we must submit a minority statement to the report, pointing out that we are not necessarily comfortable with the report as it's written because there are unresolved issues which were not fully discussed, we believe, largely due to timing, perhaps. It's not clear.

In terms of openness, although we're still bound by the confidentiality rules that were set up, the meetings at ICANN77 are going to be completely open. Regardless of what we have released in the interim, those meetings will be completely open. So that should be interesting. One of the issues that we are looking at right now, which some of us feel is a hill to die on, that it is mandatory, there's no discussion, it is a comment period following the early warnings, that will significantly delay things and it may even delay things for non closed generics. For instance, if there is a contention set which includes a closed generic and

a regular one, that regular one would also be delayed because of this comment period. That being said, these things are different. They're different to the extent that they didn't exist in the first round because of the concerns and I don't think we can let timing restrict the overall ability of the community to comment on these. We'll see where that goes. If we have to submit a minority report, it is completely unclear what the timing will be. That may be something that's going to have to be done in relatively short order and we'll do our best to respond. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Alan. Very helpful. Jonathan, why don't you go ahead?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, guys. Thanks for the substantive presentation. I appreciate it. I have two questions, I guess. One is how much did you ... Maybe dismiss this, address the definitional issue behind this. In other words, if I wanted to start a new gTLD .lightbulb for bright ideas or something like that and I'm not in the light bulb manufacturing business, would I'd be able to do that? And then my other question is I guess a little bit more, I don't know, existential, which is what was the essence of this debate would you say? And are these recommendations very far off from what you would have done if you and Greg and Alan had sat down and just created a proposal for how closed generics might be allowed? Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: I'll take a first crack. First, I would say that if you're not applying for .lightbulb as a generic term, it would not be a closed generic. However, the issue of having a closed non-brand, non-generic is an issue of its own. It's outside our scope.

One thing we probably didn't account for in this group is essentially challenges to non-closed generic applications to say that they should have been treated as closed generic applications. But that's neither here nor there. I guess in your bright ideas, if it's not a closed application, of course, then nobody cares.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I meant that it was closed. I totally get to decide who gets over something.

GREG SHATAN: Right. Again, if it has nothing to do with light bulbs as such, and especially, it's so far away from light bulbs as to be bright ideas, then it won't be a closed generic because we're not saying any application for a term. But again, it goes back to the question of, "Then what is that application? Where do we allow closed TLDs generally?" The answer, I think, is we don't. I mean, there is some potential opportunity, I think, under Spec 9. I don't remember exactly. There's one that was attempted to be used by some trademark owners who couldn't apply for their actual trademark but still wanted to have a .brand but it didn't fit in .brand.

I would say that the overarching philosophical dilemma or dichotomy related to how easy and how broad the highway to get to a successful closed generic application would be, how much you would have to prove that it's in the public interest? How much would have to be operated by those acting in the public interest and the like? It seems that those who are perhaps most closely allied with advising new gTLD applicants or themselves being new gTLD applicants or representing potential applicants as an ICANN structure were the most interested in having an easy process that would maximize the flow of closed generic. That ALAC and GAC in particular, but also some sectors of GNSO participants were much more interested in narrowing higher guard rails, looking at these as unique spaces in both scarce real estate and spaces that need to be uniquely managed. I think left to our own devices would have been significantly more rigorous than it ended up being. It is still significantly rigorous but there are some very flabby parts. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think the last part of the answer of whether this is what we would have invented ourselves, no way. I'll give you an example and it's a farfetched example. But nevertheless, you should get the idea. If IKEA, worldwide furniture company, were to apply for .furniture as a closed generic saying they are not going to be selling products there, all they're going to be doing is giving pros and cons of various types of furniture and the benefits and the drawbacks and trying to give a very balanced tutorial on the different kinds of furniture and what people should consider when furnishing their homes. They're not going to sell their own furniture. They may well, of course, use their own furniture as

examples but they're not going to be talking about their furniture. They're talking about how do you furnish your home. They would probably get it because they are not doing this for commercial interest, they're doing it for the public interest of making sure people know how to spend their money wisely and furnish homes and everyone has to furnish a home. So there's a good chance they would get that.

To go back to your first question, part of it would hinge on whether light bulb is one word or two. If lightbulb is a single word, then it would be a closed generic and you would have to demonstrate why you believe you personally owning this closed generic and you allocating all of the subdomains would be in the public interest. Whether you can succeed or not, I don't know. You might be able to. If light bulb has two words, then it's a phrase and I don't think it falls under our auspices. That may not make a lot of sense but that does look like where we're heading, at least, as I understand it. And I may be wrong.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So it's any word even if it's unrelated to the business that I'm in.

ALAN GREENBERG: Whether it's related to your business may make it more difficult for you to convince the panel that you're not doing it for business purposes. But closed generic, there's no necessary reference to the fact that it's your business.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That was the essence of my question. Thanks. That's an important clarification. I didn't mean to introduce another variable with the possibility of it being two words. Sorry. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I'm a little concerned of the time. Do you have any anything else to add if there are no further hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Good luck to us.

GREG SHATAN: We'll need it. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is effectively is our last meeting, I think. I see no way that I can understand how we're going to come to closure and then craft a report which we are proud of because the timing is just too tight. Even for the normal editing that takes place, I don't know how we're going to do it. Never mind the content. So be it.

GREG SHATAN: I guess we'll discuss that this afternoon as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably. Back to you, Oli.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg and Alan. Good luck on this afternoon's call and know that you'll be able to tell us more during the ICANN77 meeting that's coming up. And obviously, hopefully there'll be something coming out of this process. We have to move on. We have to go now swiftly if we don't want to waste too much time to the policy comments process system, which is effectively the policy pipeline with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia El Miniawi.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. Recently ratified by the ALAC, we have the proposed renewal of the Registry Agreement for .NET and Bylaws amendments and documents to implement the NomCom 2 Review. Open for public comment is the DNS abuse contract amendments. This opened last Monday, the 29th of June and it will remain open until the 13th of July. It's a 45-day comment period. The amendments built on existing obligations, they provide two separate contracts. Changes are at the registry level and at the registrar level. One set of change is for the registries and the other set is for the registrars. The amendments include a definition of DNS abuse.

For the purposes of the Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement, DNS abuse is defined as malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam. Amendments to both contracts include, in addition to the definition, where to report abuse, requirements to provide confirmation of recipients of a report and requirements to take mitigation actions. I think this would be interesting for us to take a look

and comment on it. Yesterday there was a session about it during Prep Week. If you want to know more, you could always go to the recordings. During ICANN77, there will be I think also a session about the amendments.

Then we have two statements with a decision of no statements with the OFB Working Group. With us, we have the Phase 1 Initial Report on the Internationalized Domain Names EPDP. Today we presented the glossary, and on previous calls we presented the recommendations. I think all in all, we are in agreement with the report and we are yet to draft a statement. Meanwhile, take a look at the recommendations or the glossary and provide any thoughts that you could have. I think I will stop here and hand it over to Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Hadia. Nothing for me. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. Thanking Michael Palage and Bill Jouris for having taken us through the bottom-up procedure of drafting that proposed renewal of the Registry Agreement for .NET. Great collaboration with the CPWG. Again, with the Phase 1 Initial Report on the Internationalized Domain Name, same sort of process. Really good to notice process at work.

Now we're going to agenda item five with Justine Chew. That's all about the Subsequent Procedures and the DNS abuse update. Justine is our GNSO liaison. She's going to speak to us about the ALAC GNSO Council call that's coming on the 6th of June and the process where we are today. Over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. Just to preempt, since Mike and Bill did such a good job with the registry renewal agreement that's going to vote, I think they should take a first crack at the next one that's coming up for renewal in public comment.

Okay. Today I'm going to talk to you guys about the two items that's currently put up on the agenda for the ALAC and GNSO Council bilateral call that's happening on the 6th of June. This is currently what it says as the agenda, but after today we may end up cutting down some or not, depending on what you all think. I'm going to be posing questions as I go along so it would be great if you could give input so that we can try and shape this up and finalize it and hand it over to GNSO.

So two main topics would be the new round, the next round. Under the next round, we know about the Board resolution of 16 March that happened in Cancún. From that resolution, there are a couple of work products being pushed along to be generated in time for ICANN77. One of the work products has got to do with the 38 SubPro recommendations that have been marked as pending. Another work product would be the closed generics dialogue framework that Greg and Alan just talked you through. Under the second topic would be DNS

abuse mitigation. This is based squarely on the work of the GNSO Council Small Team. So we know that within the community of ICANN, there's lots of things happening about DNS abuse. So I'm not going to go into everything because I'm not the subject matter shepherd on DNS abuse per se, I'm just going to be talking about what the Council Small Team on DNS Abuse are doing and have done and are possibly moving forward on. And that's by virtue of my role as liaison on the GNSO Council.

So under the DNS abuse topic of the small team, there are two things that are still kind of pending. One is the targeted contractual amendments that Hadia sort of mentioned. I'm going to take you through what we know for now. And then the other one is 2B which is the role of bulk registrations in DNS abuse. There's something that ALAC brought up as one of the inputs into the outreach done by the small team. So there's some developments on bulk registrations, and I need to know what you want to do about pushing it forward. Okay. So moving on. Next slide, please.

I'm going to jump around and start with closed generics because it's a way to what Greg and Alan talked about. So the first the slide, you see slide number four, is basically a regurgitation of the Board resolution. I'm not going to go into details. I think you can read this on your own. It just basically highlights the two work products, a couple of work products that are meant to come off this resolution. Many of the work products are the responsibility of GNSO, if not all of them. Okay. So basically, like the 38 outputs that's pending, the closed generics, and so forth. So can we go to slide number nine first, please?

So this is on closed generics, the 1B that I mentioned in the proposed agenda. This is information I have drawn from the Council meeting on the 25th of May. So I think what Alan and Greg have alluded to earlier today is actually more information than I have because obviously they're coming from the horse's mouth and the two gentlemen are participating in the dialogue itself. But from the Council's perspective, we were informed that the framework that's meant to be the work product of the dialogue was meant to have been released today, by 31st of May. So obviously, that's not happened and that's not happening. But apart from that, we were told also that the framework is meant to draw some boundaries on how to introduce closed generics in the next round. This framework is not policy, it has to go through an onward policy process in order to produce the consensus policy, and that was set to be expected to take 18 months. The mention of EPDP as the mechanism to take that forward as a policy process was mentioned at the Council. It's a proposition by the leadership of Council and it's not been decided yet because there were some pushback from other councilors. So that remains to be seen.

My take on it is we basically are unable to shape any real substantive interaction with GNSO Council until we actually see the framework. We can't see the framework until it's been released. I do understand from Council that the framework will include things like application questions, evaluation, posted delegation, and specifics on Registry Agreement. I think all these were mentioned by Greg earlier, so I'm not going to go into specifics.

At this juncture, I would assume that until such time the framework is released for proper consideration by ALAC and At-Large, then I think the

position that we have held so far would remain, which is to defer the introduction until the consensus policy is in place.

The other possible thing that we might want to bring up with GNSO Council on closed generics is the suggestion that was actually brought up in Council meeting itself on the 25th is that to ask GNSO Council to then ask the Board to take closed generics off the table as a pending item for the next round. Which means that if that were to be accepted, then the next round can proceed, just don't have closed generics, just don't allow closed generics to be applied for, as was the case in 2012. That will give more time if we needed it to actually develop a policy on closed generics.

So any problems with how that has been framed so far in terms of what is our take on this vis-à-vis GNSO Council? Okay. I'm rephrasing. Does anyone have any concerns about how we are going to put this towards GNSO Council? Alan? Alan, go ahead. I'm not hearing you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you repeat the last thing you said in regards to not allowing closed generics in this round? Just to make sure I understood exactly what you were saying.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I'm going to repeat myself. One of the suggestions that we as ALAC in the call with the GNSO in the bilateral can make to GNSO Council is to ask GNSO Council to then ask the Board to take closed generics off the table as a dependency for the next round, because

currently it is. If we end up of the opinion that we need more time to actually shape up the consensus policy for closed generics then so be it, just take it off as a dependency.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. This is something we could suggest not something that's currently has been discussed.

JUSTINE CHEW: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Got it.

JUSTINE CHEW: It was something that was raised in the Council by myself and one other, but there was no discussion, and therefore there was no contemplation of whether Council might be amenable to it or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So does anyone have any issues with what I've just relayed? Because if not, then I'd like to move on to other more substantive things. Okay. So no hands, no comments. I assume that it's a go.

Okay. So let's move back to the 38 pending SubPro recommendations, slide number five. Okay. Now, this is the first time I've actually presented this to CPWG and I need to preface this or qualify this to say that things are still ongoing, the discussion between basically Council Small Team on SubPro and the Board Caucus and the Board itself is ongoing. So we've had a series of meetings between all these parties. We've been trying to triage these 38 pending SubPro recommendations to see how we could actually resolve it by first understanding what the Board's concerns about them are exactly and looking at ways to possibly see a path forward to resolve them.

This is a snapshot. So that's why it's important to note that this is as of 25th of May because there are certain things still moving around and the way that small team and Council has adopted the small team's approach, in any case. So the way that the Council Small Team has approached it is to put them in groups. I'm not going to use the word buckets. Somebody said it's inelegant so I'm going to use groups. So they have come up with a number of groups, and then so far, we are going to use four of those groups, getting a total of eight or six or something like that. I can't remember exactly, but that's not important. But the grouping is probably important. They have been in the last meeting itself between the small team and the SubPro Board Caucus some moving around between the groups. That's why I said it's important to note that this is as of a particular point in time, things are still moving, and that's a good thing. Because if things are moving, then potentially there could be a resolution, which means that in a way we don't have to necessarily get hung up on things.

EN

So the first group that the small team came up with is something called provision of clarifying information to the Board. This is on the basis that the small team thought that there are things within the SubPro Final Report, things under the rationale, things that were in the deliberation part that may not have been recorded in the Final Report but possibly recorded in the Initial Report. Or even in the meeting notes that took place in the PDP Working Group itself. So there were a lot of things that we could possibly draw on to explain what we mean or explain the recommendations to help the Board understand certain things that maybe they misunderstood or maybe they're not clear about it. So that's the purpose of this group of thing called provision of clarifying information to the Board.

So there's quite a few things here. But I'm just going to concentrate on the ones that ALAC has had an issue with. Some of it, we'll see I've indicated those right here on this table. So very quickly, and I have to say that this is a very, very dumbed down, simplified presentation on what has transpired. So obviously, you know that SubPro took five years. There have been at least eight meetings between the SubPro Caucus of the Board and the small team. So it's literally impossible to condense all that information into just one slide or a few slides. So this is all you're going to get. I don't have time to go into specifics because it's already 19 past the hour.

Okay. If you don't have issues with what I'm saying, then great. If you have questions regarding it, you might want to just put in chat, and maybe I can take them offline to help explain, the understanding. Okay.

EN

So with the applications assessed in rounds, topic three, the issue is that the Board found the recommendations too specific that there was inflexibility to move to something called steady state, which is basically very, very small stoppages between rounds. So nothing to the effect of what happened between 2012 and what's going to happen whenever, which is a gap of 10 years or more. So they're trying to avoid that situation where you have such large gaps of time between rounds. The GNSO's perspective is that we didn't say that the recommendations, in fact, just allow for something called the steady state, which is what I think the Board was trying to get to. But there was also a point made by one of the Board members to say that they also kind of looking at the possibility of first come, first served, which is what a FCFS means on the table. I think GNSO here is correct to say that we can't have first come, first served because that is not the recommendation that was made, that's not the consensus recommendation that was made. We did discuss the possibility of first come, first served. There was no agreement on that. The policy that is there now just says this possibility of steady state. But if anybody wants to change it to first come, first served, it must go through another policy process. So in any event, if there's a push for first come, first served again, then I think we need to put our foot down and say no, that's not what the policy says. If people want to move it to first come, first served, it has to go through another party process.

Application queuing, it's just a question of taking the formula that was introduced in the recommendation, not the batching size of it. So I don't think there's an issue, we should be able to take it up and resolve it in the IRT. That's what GNSO believes as well.

Moving on. Name collisions. Name collisions, I think there is no disagreement between GNSO, the Board, and us, which is to say that let's just all wait for the NCAP Study Tools report which is due out at this point in time in September. So we have time for that process to finish for the NCAP DG, the Discussion Group of the NCAP, to finish its work to come up with a Study 2 report and for that to go to the Board. It has to go through all the public comment process and so forth. But for that to go to the Board, the Board can approve it, and then there's still time to implement it before the next round happens.

Committee applications. This is more about the possibility of publishing confidential information for public comments. We basically said that that's not the case. We can sort that out in IRT, the Implementation Review Team, and I'm in agreement with that. GNSO has said that. The Board is kind of coming towards that notion anyway. So I don't think that's going to be an issue anymore.

Okay, auctions. Now, auctions here is about the fact that two of the recommendations that were approved by GNSO Council that's now at the Board have mentioned private auctions in those two recommendations, which is 35.3 and 35.5. The problem here lies in with the fact that there were other recommendations within the topic of auctions that were not approved by the GNSO Council and therefore did not go to the Board for approval, obviously, because Council has to approve it in order for the Board to approve it, for the Board to look at it. The ones that did not get approved by Council were the ones that actually say that we can have private auction. I'm paraphrasing, okay. So because there was no full consensus and we were one of those parties that put our foot down and said, "No, we do not want private auctions.

EN

We don't want private auctions." So we contributed to the fact that there was no full consensus or there was no consensus even. I think it was marked as strong consensus but with significant opposition. So we were part of the significant opposition, which is why Council decided not to approve the recommendation. The problem with that is now there is no policy that allows for or disallows private auctions. But you have two of these recommendations that still mentioned private auctions in them. So it's disconnected in that way. So what we're told by the Board is that—if you can just read 35.3 and 35.5 without the mention of private auctions, then it can still sense. These two, 35.3 and 35.5, do not go towards making it a policy, whether they should be or should not be private auctions. The larger question of private auctions is supposed to be still taken up by the Board, as you see on the slide. There are plans to engage external expertise to deal with the questions surrounding auctions. I'm suggesting that we push for all issues to be really related to auctions to be dealt with through that process that the Board is going to start. Okay. Any issues so far? Okay, nope. Moving on. All right.

Next one, next group would be that these issues can be resolved during implementation. The only one that I want to point out here is regarding 17, Applicant Support. I think this is something that we can possibly deal with with the IRT. And obviously, this has to be dealt with in the IRT because we want this to happen for that. Okay, moving on. Noticing the time.

The third group, this one is quite interesting, which I think we need to consider. This one is called "Explore the starting of a Bylaw change process." Now, this basically has got two with PICs and RVCs, the

enforceability of them. Although you'll see that this table has also string similarities, GAC advice objections in it, the overarching issue around this group of topics and issues is to do with enforceability of PICs and RVCs. What the Board is concerned about is that in the event an RVC, for example, mentions something that deals with content or something that squarely falls outside of the ICANN Bylaws, then would there be a problem for ICANN Org to enforce it because it's outside the mandate of ICANN?

I think I've mentioned this before. There are two schools of thought. One is that it would, because there is mentioned in the Bylaws also in some other section that insofar as a PIC is a contractual obligation, then ICANN can enforce it. But the Board is playing devil's advocate and they want to be absolutely sure that they won't get taken to court and somebody screams, do [inaudible] and says, "This is outside of ICANN's mission so how can you be doing this?" So the proposition that's been put on the table now, so for a while. People are talking about it but it's not official, I don't know how that works. But anyway, that the Board is mooting a Bylaw change, unlimited Bylaw amendment that deals with once and for all the issue of enforceability of RVCs and PICs. So it's not RVCs or the PICs. I don't know what form that Bylaw change is going to take because nobody's actually talked about it. Even the Board says that they need to go and talk about how they're going to figure this out, what they need to do exactly. The question is, do we as ALAC and At-Large support in principle the idea of unlimited Bylaw amendment to solve this issue?

Okay. I see Avri Doria point in chat to say that it is only one possibility that Board is looking into. It's something the Board is still talking about

it and they're trying to figure out what to do, what is the best way to resolve this. This is one possibility that's been raised so far and people are talking about it. I think the GNSO Council intends to socialize this possibility. So I guess the question will probably eventually come back to us as ALAC and At-Large as to whether we would possibly have a problem with this in principle. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that we strongly support such a concept. By the way, as part of the Empowered Community, we definitely would have a say and would have to speak up on it. But I would strongly advocate that we do support this.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you. Well, we need to socialize this amongst our own community to see if there's any objections to it. Of course, again, it's still in principle because we don't know what form it's going to take. I can't tell you. It's not up to me anyway. So we don't know what the words are going to look like, that's something that the Board has to take a lead on if they choose to take this option. But we can help by saying that either we support it or we think we don't support it or whatever. Because if the Board chooses to take it this way, they also don't want to see it fail. So they want to be able to establish that none of the component parts of the community will have a problem with passing this amendment.

Christopher, can we make it short, please? It's already half past 10 and I haven't finished anything.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Just to say that I support Justine and Alan's approach to this. There was a time and I can remember it 20 years ago when the Board was able and did amend the Bylaws unilaterally. At the time, I recall complaining about that for the lack of consultation, but today we've gone to the opposite extreme and in serious issues where the community and particularly GNSO can't reach agreement, the Board has to retain ultimate responsibility and powers to take action. And if that's amending the Bylaws, so be it. Thank you. Thank you for your time.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thanks, Christopher. Thanks, Alan. Olivier or Chantelle, can I have an indication of whether we can go over time?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: We have to wrap up. I'm so sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's a hard to stop, unfortunately, just after this call. So unfortunately, we have to close this one very quickly.

JUSTINE CHEW: This is really hard on me because I don't know what we're going to do with the Council. Okay. So I'll just make that point. Perhaps we have to talk to ALAC directly then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So you got another two minutes because you did start about five minutes late. So there you go.

JUSTINE CHEW: If I can just finish the last group, which is slide number eight, the one that says other dialogue between the Council and Board. Now, this one was originally shorter and some things got moved on to this group. So again, this being part of the things moving about. But under here, I think only one really consensus which is to do with obviously some PICs, and this has got to do with Recommendation 9.2, a waiver on the DNS abuse obligations for a single registrant TLD.

Here the difficulty is—and I say difficult because this is going to be a balancing. GNSO's perspective is that a single registrant TLD is a .brand. And the .brand won't be selling domain names in the typical manner of what we know the business model to be. So therefore, there won't be other registrants under the TLD which is a .brand, which is why it's called a single registrant TLD because there's only one registrant which is the registry itself. If GNSO's perspective is if you read the obligations under Spec 11 (3)(a) and (3)(b), which has to do with DNS abuse obligations, if you read them together with Spec 13 then there is no registrant to protect because it's only the single registrant which is the registry itself. And the fact that if it's a .brand then the registry operator who's also the single registrant would be in the best position and it would be in the self-interest to do everything possible to not have DNS abuse. The Board's perspective, which is quite interesting, is that they don't accept the fact that that business model is the only one that's possible. So they don't know whether there's going to be other business

models in the future, and they don't want to cut off that possibility. So that's what it means by not all single registrants ROs are equal. So they don't want to just leave it to one business model. We're looking at things from one business model. There could be potentially innovative about a single registrant that does something that would affect other possible registrant under the TLD, although it's not officially a domain name holder registrant. So they prefer to look at it from a case by case waiver, as opposed to a blanket waiver approach, which is what Recommendation 9.2 talks about.

I think this one, I personally would support the Board on this, really. So insofar as the Board does not want to accept 9.2 the way it stands, then I think it's good for us, really. I need to make a note that we are not in the habit of relitigating any consensus policies that we've agreed to. With the exception of maybe if there's new information brought to light and I think this is the case where the Board has actually brought something to our attention. And therefore, we should be able to exercise some expression to say that we may not want to support the consensus policy as it is. Okay. So my two minutes is up. I give up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Justine. I do realize you've got a lot more questions in your time, well, in the PowerPoint presentation. We'll try and see if we can do something next week. But in the meantime, perhaps I should ask that staff also shares this on the CPWG mailing list. And if you any specific questions that you haven't had answered on today's call, which I realize there's so much here, it's probably a

complete CPWG call, but we'll have to try and find a solution on the mailing list.

Now, we've kind of run out of time because we have a hard stop on today's call. So the suggestion is to skip ICANN77 update, which is just a quick update from last week. We could have one last update next week briefly on a very brief call next week. So let's go over to Any Other Business. I'm not seeing any hands up. Hadia, was there anything that you wanted to bring up?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Nothing. Thank you so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. My apologies for the quick, abrupt end. Now, you can see the next meeting. When are we going to meet?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. I'm assuming we are meeting next week which is the 7th of June and the rotation time would be 19:00 UTC. Just a heads up, just like this week, we will not going to have interpretation next week, on next week's call either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thank you. Now, at the moment, it says 20th of June. That's four weeks away. So a quick discussion behind the scenes today. We'll have a short call next week, not a full call, and it will just be

focusing on items that need to be dealt with before the ICANN meeting. So we'll be building this agenda during the week in the lead to this call.

Thanks to everyone who has participated on today's call and have provided updates. Apologies again for having to cut shorter the call. There's just so much that we have to discuss. Follow up on the mailing list, please, and thanks to the real-time text transcriber today. Next week, no interpretation either. We are in between the ICANN Prep Week and the actual ICANN Week. This week is the ICANN Prep Week. So please do take part in the calls that are taking place during the ICANN Prep Week. Very interesting topics, and then you'll be prepared for the ICANN meeting itself. With this, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are. Thank you.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]