
ELISA BUSETTO:

Hello, and welcome to the 10th meeting of the SubPro IRT on 5th September 2023 at 1300 UTC. My name is Elisa Busetto and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor.

Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Please mute your mic when you're done speaking. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, and you may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Lars. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thank you, Elisa. Would you mind putting up the agenda? Thanks so much. Welcome everyone. Good morning, afternoon, good evening. The agenda for today, which is actually, I'd like to add a kind of topic 1.1 or 1a to talk about the conflict of interest that we talked about last week. I hope that is okay. And then I'll pass it on to my colleague, Sarmad, who's going to talk us through the topic 11, Universal Acceptance or maybe 2b, 2a maybe, after the information status.

First of all, before I continue rambling, question as always, have there been any updates to anyone's SOI? Sure. I can't see anyone raising his hand. It does not seem to be the case. With that, Elisa, I don't mean to

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.

put you on the spot, but maybe I know you're busy with the sharing the screen as well. I don't know if there's a lot of people who have not yet submitted the SOI, and I've been chasing them, we'll follow-up on the next call as well. There we are. Then, Elisa, if I can go to the overview slide for the IRT. I think that's the usual graphs.

There we are, meetings held, members attendance, and then the next slide, which I think the progress slide here, counter to the next AGB session, completion rate and we still owe you. I apologize for that. The holidays and a bit of work here on some of the topics prevents us from updating this, the issue of percentage versus time to kind of see whether we're on track, considering we had 730 days to complete the AGB, making sure that with our completion target here, the percentage lines up with the time passed. We'll do that over the coming meetings.

I also like to note that there is a new landing page being planned or developed by ICANN around the new program. And so, links to our Wiki page and also some information around the IRT will also feature on that side, which is going to come on ICANN.org. I don't have the timeline of that yet. I know it's work in progress. I'll keep you updated if I hear anything. I was going to say pinky promise, but I think you can believe me even without that.

With that, I have one other thing I wanted to discuss. We discussed last week the issue of conflict of interest. It was presented by my colleague, Antonetta. And there was some feedback. I think Susan—So, I'm just checking if Susan's on the call. She isn't at the moment. Anne is on—and I think others as well, noted some feedback around the differentiation between panelists and the independent objector. And

so, we took that feedback. That's okay. Thank you. Who noted that? Elisa. Thank you. Susan is excuse today. I didn't realize that.

There was some feedback on the COI that with some misalignment or misunderstanding about the roles and responsibilities of the panelists versus the independent objective. And so, we went back and discussed this internally, and we made some updates to the document. However, maybe it we didn't maybe quite land where the feedback took us initially. While, obviously, the independent objector and the panelists perform very different tasks, the conflict of interest that they shouldn't have that would prevent them from performing whatever tasks they performance in their positions, in our view, should be the same.

In other words, if anybody who's employed as a vendor or a contractor or anything else to work on the program, who has access to information on the applications, especially sensitive material that is not public, should be subject to the same conflict of interest policies. And so, instead of passing it out into conflict of interest policy for the IO and for the panelists and for the dispute resolution and the evaluation panelists. We, in fact, made it clear that this, we take in the words out to avoid confusion and defined anybody who's in contact with better language use in the document and application define that as a vendor, if you want. And so, this conflict of interest policy or guidelines should then apply to all those vendors, whatever task they may perform.

And so, with that, if there's any quick feedback on that, obviously, very keen to hear that. But I'll connect with Antonietta later today, and we'll post an updated version of that document, into the external drive. And then we'll invite comments on the document from the group over the

coming week or so, if that works for everybody. I just want to see if there's any hands or initial reaction to that. Absolutely. And yeah. 100%. Susan's and everyone else's for that matter, obviously. That would be good.

Good. I see there's no initial reactions to that. I'm going to take that as okay to proceed for now. So, we'll do that. We'll post something onto the list and ask for comments on the document. So that will be underway either later today or tomorrow. And with that, I think all that remains is to pass the microphone or the floor, or the screen, I guess, onto my colleague, Sarmad, who's the lead on this topic 11 here, Universal Acceptance. Sarmad, can I pass on to you?

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Sure. Thank you, Lars, and hello, everyone. This is Sarmad. So, I'll take you through the draft language which is being proposed for AGB for Universal Acceptance. But before that, I thought it may be useful to very quickly look at the Sup Pro affirmations and recommendations and an implementation guidance very quickly, which you can see on your screen. Just to note a few things.

So first of all, there's an affirmation 11.1, which welcomes and encourages the work of Universal Acceptance initiative and the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, which is a community-led working group. The second information basically confirms the guidance provided in section 1.2.4 of the applicant guidebook, which is a notice concerning technical acceptance issues with the new gTLDs. We'll talk about that a little more. As well as a clause 1.2 of the registry

agreement, which is eventually going to be part of the registry agreement itself. So, there are two things here. One is section 1.2.4 from the guidebook, and the second is the language which should go in the RA.

In addition to that, there is a recommendation 11.3, which says that applicants should be made aware of UA challenges in ASCII and IDN TLDs. Applicants must be given access to all the applicable information around UA currently maintained by ICANN's UA initiative as well as USG. And finally, 11.4 implementation guidance suggests that ICANN should include more detailed information regarding UA issues directly in the AGB or by reference in the AGB, including the work which is being done by USG.

So that's sort of a background which is leading the language for AGB. So, Elisa, if you can switch to the suggested language. This has been shared. So, this section when we were drafting it, there were two ways of doing it. First of all, one way was, of course, to include, of course, the section 1.2.4, which has been affirmed by SubPro. But in addition to that, also include a lot of detail or at least some level of detail of information around Universal Acceptance, its challenges, as well as the work which is being done and the current status inside this section. In fact, that is where we started from.

However, when we were reviewing this section, one of the things which was, feedback which was suggested was that AGB is more, I guess, text which is guiding application for our strings by the applicants and is not supposed to be including more general information, but information which is more targeted to the application process itself. And therefore,

for this reason what we did was we actually excluded the more general information and decided to go with the recommendations part where it says that we include the more general information by reference rather than directly in this section.

Of course, that's one question for all of you to consider as well, as we review the section on whether the reference to or pointers to the more general information from the section is sufficient or you think we should include more detailed information in this section directly. Again, as I said, we've taken the position that as AGB is more directly related to application process, the more general information is included by reference and or directly here at this time.

So, with that, in context, let's look at the language itself. If you can scroll back up. So, it's a very brief, section. We start with a very basic definition of what Universal Acceptance is in section 1.1. If you can zoom in a little bit, Elisa, I think that will be useful. Thank you. Then section 1.2 actually is an exact copy of section 1.2.4 from 2012 applicant guidebook, except the last paragraph here, which updates the links to point to now the UA page at ICANN or website, rather than a previous link which was pointing to a page which actually doesn't exist anymore. Otherwise, the language, the first two paragraphs are the same. The title 1.2 is changed from technical considerations to Universal Acceptance of domain names and email addresses to refer more directly to UA rather than an indirect reference.

And next section, please. So, if you scroll down. 1.3 then includes, as I said, more pointers and references to where additional information is available. All the information is actually accessible through the ICANN

org/UA page where it lists different details of UA, UA training, UA status, also points to the USG pages, UA Steering Group pages which are actually posted at usg.tech, but we are also including that link directly in the text here as well. So, the text here references both ICANN's work on UA, and also the communities work on UA by sharing links to both those, I guess, sets of web pages. That's which it is covering.

One of the reasons is also good to include this information by reference is because there's still very active work going on on UA. So, in case we include that information directly in the AGB, if we finalize that text now, unless we write it at a very high level, it will most likely get outdated by the time AGB is actually used by the applicants. Including this information by reference to websites means that when the AGB is out and is actually getting used by the applicants, they will have access to the most recent information which is available to us because we constantly update these websites on a regular basis.

With that, then in addition to that, if you look at the last section, that's just a placeholder in this box here. That's a language which was included in the RA, existing RAs, and we'll include the same language I think as it is applicable still in the new RAs has been affirmed by SubPro as well. With that, let me stop here and see if you have any feedback. We'd love to get your input on board and update the section based on your input. Thank you. So back to you, Lars, and everyone else. Thank you.

LAR HOFFMAN: Thank you, Sarmad. Yeah. I think we shared the document on Friday as well. I'm not sure we've any comments in the text. Obviously kept it relatively compact for the applicant guidebook. And yeah, seeing whether there's any comments or feedback for Sarmad. Amr, please.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Lars, and thanks Sarmad. This is Amr. And well, this is my first meeting with the IRT, so please forgive me if I'm not up to date on everything. I was just wondering, there is a section in the rationale for the outputs from topic 11, Universal Acceptance, in the final report that addresses a belief by the working group that ICANN should I quote, "more clearly and thoroughly illustrate the potential applicants of possible problems that registrants of IDNs in particular may face in the usage of those domains, as well as work underway in this regard".

I'll put the text in the chat, but I was just wondering if any thought has been given to addressing this. It's not in the implementation guidance language per se, which was shared on the screen earlier, but it is included in the rationale. And just wondering, what thoughts anyone has on this. Because I looked at the UA web pages and the UASG's website as well, and it didn't seem that there was anything necessarily directly addressing this. So, in the spirit of particularly pointing this out, it's not really pointed out in a very prominent way, let me say. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you so much. Justine, I was just checking if you are on the same topic or if you want Sarmad to react to this first.

JUSTINE CHEW: I think Sarmad should provide an answer to Amr First. Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you Justine and Lars. So let me very quickly point to that. So, the place to go, if you scroll slightly up, section 1.3, Elisa. If you look at this last sentence in 1.3, it basically points to the annual UA-readiness report for basically those applicants who want to really see what the status is. This UA-readiness support is actually posted at the landing page for usg.tech. The link which is provided in this text.

If you go into the UA-readiness report, it actually goes into and provides some very detailed data on, for example, IDN versus ASCII long and short TLD usage, numbers. There's actually a diagram. We normally test a short ASCII, long ASCII, and then IDNs in, well, based on emails and see what is the level of acceptance. And we actually have clear numbers, about 95% for short ASCII new TLDs, around 85% for longer ASCII TLDs, and about 11%, 12% for emails which are developed or using the internationalized, I guess, domain names. In addition, there are much more detailed studies on how IDNs are, and longer TLDs in ASCII, for example, fair as far as the usage in, for example, social network applications are concerned, and on other applications are concerned.

So, if you look at the UA-readiness report, if you read through that, you will see a very detailed analysis of how, actually, IDNs fair versus ASCII new and ASCII longer TLDs. But, of course, that information is, in some ways, sort of reasonably more internally presented through the UA-

readiness report. So, anybody who wants to get that information will really need to go through that report in reasonable detail.

We tried to point that out here, but if you think it needs to be more explicitly done. Again, as I said, we didn't want to go into the actual discussion of the numbers of UA-readiness, for different categories, for example, because those numbers will change over time. And we keep reporting them on these websites. But if you include them in AGB, then the issue, of course, is that those numbers become outdated at some point. So again, I think, we do capture some of those details in the UA-readiness report. I would, I guess, invite you to take a look at that as well. But if you think we need to add more here, we will certainly take on your suggestion and add more details but let me pass it back to you, Amr, and see if that addresses your question and concern or would you want us to, well, maybe add more here. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you, Sarmad. Just checking the chat. Justine, over to you, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Lars. This is Justine. So, I don't know if Amr had a response because I think Sarmad pose a question to him.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thanks, Justine. I'm putting it in the chat. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Right. Cool. So, I actually put my hand up for something else, but the point that Amr raises is actually quite a good one. And I think my preference would be to elaborate a little bit more on what you can find in that UA-readiness report. Sarmad gave a pretty detailed response in terms of what sort of information is in that report. Perhaps a summary of the types of information that can be found in that report would be useful to just bring more attention to what's in there. That would be my input on that.

As I said, the reason why I put my hand up is to just ask regarding the hyperlinks. Now, in principle, I think the use of hyperlinks is a good insofar as if information gets updated and you don't want the information to be outdated by the time the handbook, the AGB goes out. I can understand the principle behind that. But my question is, how often would the content behind these hyperlinks get updated? Possibly it wouldn't make that much of a difference with new UA, I guess. But in so far as something else, would we have an idea of whether the text would be stable during the application period? Because you don't want really information to be changing while applications are being considered and submitted. Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Lars, you want to take that?

LARS HOFFMAN:

Yeah. I'm going to take a quick stab at that, if I may, Justine. So, Justine, I think your comment is a broader one, right? I think that the links here are probably triggered your question here on the validity and

the updatedness of links. So, for the time being, we use the hyperlinks because, as Sarmad has said, in this case, and more generally, it points to the related information, rather than having that statically in here somewhere that is potentially outdated whether it's for this topic or other topics.

I think what our best practice is that before the applicant guidebook is eventually finalized, and that's probably even the final public comment, first of all, we'll make sure that the hyperlinks work and are obviously in working order and point to the right information and the information is as updated as it can be. So that that is one best practice. I think that will be helpful at the time. And I just took a note as well, Justine. I think maybe what we can do is as we move different things for public comment from the various topics, maybe there's time for the working group or for the implementation review team, I should say, to also look at some of the links and the information that is provided to determine whether that is appropriately updated or not. We will do that internally, obviously, of course.

But in general, our assumption is the information that's on the website and that we link to is the most updated information that we have. Normally, these things get updated on a regular basis, and we'll make sure that we'll update the links if need, but we've been already talking to our colleagues from IT to make sure that wherever possible we get stable links so that if an update occurs, the link goes to the updated website, and we don't have to replace hyperlinks. I think for obvious reasons, that is I think the preferred way forward. As I said, I've taken a note here, Justine. I think maybe something we can revisit later

because it applies to other topics as well. And I see your comment there. Thank you, Justine, very much.

Sarmad, I saw that Amr has posted into the chat. Oh, before I pass it on to you, Sarmad, for any comment on that, just see Phil's question there as well. There will be a glossary in the AGB. That's work in progress. It's something that's going to be happening on an ongoing basis. That we built up the glossary, and so that most certainly will be included. Sarmad, and then I see Catherine's hand up.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Right. So, I guess, just to try to close the discussion. So far, what I'm hearing is that we should include in section 1.3, perhaps a short summary of is covered in the UA-readiness report and maybe on these websites, to just give the applicant a very high-level overview of the information, and then they can go to the different links to follow through. And we'll get at that. Beyond that, I think Amr said he'll probably get back to us in case he has more details or more feedback. So, let me stop here and see if that's generally agreeable. And if it is, then we can move on to Catherine. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thanks, Sarmad. I think we have a thumbs up there from Amr in the chat. Catherine, please.

CATHERINE LIU:

Thanks. This is Catherine from Berlin. And apologies if I am asking a question which has been raised before because I wasn't able to attend

previous calls. So, I was wondering whether the new gTLD agreement language is kind of carved in stone or if it's negotiable. Because I stumbled upon one word, which I would suggest to amend it a little bit, but I don't know if this is possible at all or not.

LARS HOFFMAN: Catherine, you're talking about, the document here or the future guidebook?

CATHERINE LIU: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. This one.

LARS HOFFMAN: No. Absolutely. We're just sharing this document for feedback at this moment. So, any input that you have, it's very much welcome.

CATHERINE LIU: Okay. So then, in the second line there, the language says "certain top-level domain strengths". And that sounds, at least to me, to a non-native English-speaking person, as if it's a certain category of top-level domains. And I would suggest to amend that to "some new" because it's more about new and old ones, right? So, we're talking about the lists the portal operators implemented in their scripts. So, all the old ones, let's say, like .com, .net, .org, they are implemented. And the newer ones, which started back in 2014 and so on, some of them are not working. We use not used to work. So, certain would rather mean to me, let's say it's a long word or it's a category, which doesn't work.

And this might give a wrong impression to people who read this. And so, I would suggest that be amended. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thanks, Catherine. I'm going to suggest we'll take that away. You provided some edits on the spot, but I had them solved about that already and others may too, if that's okay. That's really good input. We'll work towards that. Sarmad has his hand up as well.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Right. Thank you, Catherine. And I've noted your input, but I think one of the things we would need to consider when we are reviewing the language is that some may actually indicate that there may be few or fewer. And I think we need to assess whether that's accurate or if it is more than a few, then maybe some other language may need to come in. But we will take this back internally, as I said, I've noted your comment here and make sure that we try to address it and we'll actually have to look at what is the extent of the impact and based on that final is the language. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thank you, Sarmad. Just seeing if there's any other—Catherine confirms in the chat—if there's any other questions or comments on the text. The text is in the external drive. Sarmad put a comment in here, so that's certainly open for comments for the group over the coming week or so, and it'll be there until it goes for public comment and beyond. But if we can encourage you to provide feedback over the

coming week, that would be great. Unless anybody puts their hand up, I suggest we move on to upcoming meetings and specifically-- Thank you, Elisa. I'm just going to organize my screen. It's not super organized. There we are.

If you can go one back, Elisa. Yeah. I'd like to talk about this first. So, you recall from last week, we have added some calls to our rotor, starting next week. So, we have two weeks on the agenda every week, until ICANN78. Whether we're going to keep all of those, double date as it were, remains to be determined. We certainly have topics lined up, and we're going to talk to that in a moment. But, yeah, it was important for us to get that on the agenda.

I want to give you a quick preview of the likely topics that we're going to talk with you about over the coming weeks. So, I note, first of all, we're going to bring back predictability in the conflict of interest as well. You recall, for both of these, there was some editing work for org to be done for ICANN on the COI that is done, and we will share this document, as I said, at the top of the call. For predictability, we're still doing some work. You remember them, there was some request to put some more drafting language around the diagrams. So, we're working on that as well.

With that, next week, we have two sessions on Tuesday and on Thursday. On Tuesday, we'll talk again about the conflict of interest topic that we talked about last week, reviewing input and obviously, Susan and others hopefully will be able to join to discuss. And actually, Anne maybe you can do that as well, if you don't mind me asking you, otherwise, I'll also reach out to her to make sure she can be on that call.

Then on Thursday next week, Sarmad is going to be back to talk about string similarity evaluations, which as Jeff pointed out during the call last week, there's obviously still some open recommendations from the Board. There's also some dependencies from the IDN, EPDP.

Sarmad is our expert and certainly we have both of those and so the language that we're going to share there best that in mind. So, we can discuss in more detail next week, but that is forthcoming. And we will try to share that document with you either Tuesday or Wednesday. So, the document, I think, will be longer than the UA's overview today. I encourage you to take the time to at least skim through the document. If not, read through it carefully before the call. I think that will be helpful.

So, those are the two topics for next week. The week after, we have a second-string similarity session planned, and most likely we'll then talk about a predictability in that week as well. And then, the last two weeks before the ICANN meeting, we have three topics that we are planning to bring. That is role of applicant comment, reserve names, and related to that, geographic names. We didn't put that here onto the slides. In terms of the topics, some of these are still kind of moving in review and couple are still in discussion. I just want to share that with you, so you have an understanding or an idea of what is coming up. And then, as soon as we have certainty that the documents are ready, we'll share them with you as soon as feasible. But I think we're on good course to have that all covered.

And then this brings me, and I'm sorry, I can't see a chat. There's no hands up. And then I think what we will do during ICANN78—and again,

this is a suggestion, I'm looking forward to feedback, not just today, but over the coming weeks—is to kind of take the topics that we already discussed and revisit any open questions during meeting to make that a working session rather than starting "something new". Whether that makes sense, I think it's best to determine a closer to the date but for the time being, that is the planning.

The meeting slide, Anne, is part of the deck. I'm just seeing your comment there. Is part of the deck, which should be on the Wiki page as well. I don't know if somebody has maybe a link to the Wiki page that would be helpful. We usually post the deck—there you are. Thank you so much, Elisa—on the Wiki page here for each meeting. Jim, you hand us up, please.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Yeah. Hey, Lars. Thanks a lot. So, is there going to be a SubPro IRT update session as part of the prep week? I'm just thinking for people outside of the group who are involved in the "day to day". Are they going to come to our meeting or meetings? Hopefully more than one. And that's, I guess, the second part of my question. Any luck in securing any more face-to-face time for us during 78?

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thanks, Jim. So, I'm going to take that in the order you ask. We have not requested a prep week session, and this is really to do with the fact that the group is open to everybody. There's going to be an update, a written update, the Board requested that, as part of the briefing that PRSP—that's the department that's led by Karen Lentz that we all work

for—puts out before every meeting. And so, there will be written update about the progress in this group. And so, I'm going to be honest with you, Jim, as you note already, spending time on a prep week session takes time away from working on this. And so, we made the decision for this meeting not to have one. If there's a desire to have it future meetings, we can talk about that.

JIM PRENDERGAST: No. I don't disagree with your rationale there. So, let's just keep trucking along, and a written update can suffice to those who aren't involved in the day to day.

LARS HOFFMAN: Okay. And then to your second question, much easier to answer for me. If I can see the next slide. Thank you, Elisa. We've been in touch with the policy support team who have been working very hard to "free up" a couple of spots on the agenda. So, this is what we've come up with. We have now three sessions. Jim, thank you for asking for that. And thank you, I'm not sure who's on from policy. I think Steve, I've seen him earlier, and team, for making this possible. So, we have these three slots, as I said, just a moment ago. We suggest that we determine the topics and the "questions or issues" that we're discussing those sessions closer to the time. And when we know what makes most sense, it was next week, I certainly would say, we discuss a predictability in COI, but with a bit of luck, we move beyond that by ICANN78.

Those are, yeah, the updates. And I think what we want to hear here and if there's nobody looking for maybe non-objections or no concerns,

three sessions is a lot. Jim, I think you're absolutely right that there's a lot of work to do. So, I think from an agenda perspective, not a lot of concerns to have that filled. Want to make sure that there's no concerns in this group for having these many meetings, four hours, and also whether there's any concerns, and as the liaison, about attendance. Personally, I do not, but I wanted to go through. And they have not. We we're not going to send out invitations until the agenda is finalized.

These are dates that are still being moved around by our GNSO colleagues, so this is the best guess at this moment. We didn't want to faff around or send out invitations and then we have to faff around with adjusting those. I believe those used to be slots that the small team had reserved, and I believe I'm no longer required-- On thin ice there with that segment, but I think that's about right. Jim.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Yeah. Thanks, Lars. This is, I think, a fantastic news. And I think obviously, we've got another six weeks or so before we're all together. Maybe just treat this as meeting 12, meeting 12a, and meeting 12b. If we get to the end of the meeting on Wednesday and we realize, hey, you know what? We've exhausted everything we could possibly talk about, then we just cancel the third meeting, but have any opportunity to do it and if something comes up, we have the time and the space. I like this option. We don't need to meet for meetings sake, but if we need to do the work, let's take advantage of the time together.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thanks, Jim. Appreciate that. Justine, so you note about being conflicted. We tried to, I think we did, in fact, also contact support staff from other SO/ACs, including the ALAC, and so I think there was awareness around this. I think there was already some conflict with the ALAC in Washington, Cheryl pointed that out. So, I hope that, yeah, not both of you will be prevented from attending. If there's anything we can do, we'll contact or work with the ALAC and the GNSO support, but we're the kind of the people in the middle. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Thanks, Lars. I'm conflicted out because of the IDN CPDP.

LARS HOFFMAN: Oh, yeah. Yeah. I understand. Yeah. We have that internal issue as well, but the slots are very far and few between. I said this before, I'm going to say this again, and if anybody of you is in the planning session, if you can advocate for conflict free time for this group or other groups. Certainly, from our end, there's a full support for that. Good. I realize we are ending potentially early again today. I don't think I have any other business. I'm just thinking as being slowly to make sure that it's true and somebody can ping in the background if I'm forgetting something, but I think this brings us to the end of this meeting.

I'm just going to do a quick recap. We'll share the COI document on list later this week. We'll return to that next week as well. String similarity, we'll share the document early next week, with you as well. We're going to discuss that on Thursday. And then we'll send out invites for those slots in ICANN78 as soon as the agenda is finalized, including, Jim,

I like the suggestion of meeting a and b, and then it's easier to cancel if we needed to, if we have everything exhausted, as unlikely as that may be. With that, thanks, everyone. And I'm wishing you a lovely rest of your day/evening. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]