ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 24 October 2016 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New GNSO Councilors Webinar on the Monday, 24 October 2016 at 20:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance may also be found at:
https://community.icann.org/x/Exu4Aw
The audio is avaiable at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-24oct16-en.mp3

Woman: Well, good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the New GTLD Subsequent Procedures working group call on the 24th of October, 2016 at 20:00 UTC.

               In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as there are quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via Adobe Connect. So if you're on the audio bridge, if you could please let yourself be known now. All right. Thank you.

Gg Levine: I'm sorry. This is Gg Levine. I'm on audio only.

Woman: Okay. Great. Thanks so much. I'll note that. Okay. And as a reminder to all, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

               With this, I'll turn the call back over to Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. This is Avri Doria speaking. So today is a different sort of (plenary) meeting for the group in that we're not going to be working on the substance of our PDP but we're going to be working on the planning of the upcoming meeting in Hyderabad though in doing that we may indeed touch some substance.

So what we'll basically, it's a simple agenda. We're going to go through this opening stuff. Then we'll do the SOIs. Then we'll talk about the meeting planning. And then if there's any other business, we'll cover that.

At this point I want to check. Does anybody have any other business that they want to make sure is added to the end of the agenda at this point? Okay, I see no hands so I will go ahead with this agenda hearing no objections to this agenda. And I didn't ask that. So any objections? Still hearing none. Okay.

So next is SOIs. This is just a reminder that everyone does need to update their SOI as necessary when they're job and other circumstances change as it relates to this group. And we'd ask you to please note that in this timeslot if you have not done so. So does anybody have any SOI changes they want to mention to the group?

Seeing no hands, hearing none, I'll move on to the ICANN 57 planning. What you'll see up in the frame in front of you is the first stab that we've taking among the leadership group in terms of putting together an agenda.

Basically it's a relatively straightforward one. We have what, about three hours. Is that correct? Steve or somebody? I'm forgetting (to check). Steve is typing. Closer to four hours. Okay, I know it's a four hour period but there's a break in the middle so I guess as long as we're disciplined about starting on time and coming back from break on time, we will actually have closer to four than to three.

But so one of the things that we haven't done yet is divide up time in this agenda. So we're going to walk through it and I'm also going to bring up one item that's not on this agenda that I think may need to be there but I'll put it out for questions.

So the first part we'll start with, the normal ICANN meeting, welcome and introductions. Now one thing about this meeting that we'll state at that point, that's not a participant only meeting. That's a meeting where participants, observers and anyone that happens to come to the meeting will be given the floor.

Don't plan to do any preference of participants first and then others. That would be really quite difficult to manage given the number of participants we have and observers we have. So basically it will be an open discussion meeting on a first come first serve type of basis for the most part.

Obviously if one of the leaders needs to answer a question, Somebody's mike is open. Then we'll obviously defer to a question and answer. But by and large it will run as that and they'll be no distinction about participants or not. We'll talk about the current status which will largely be a recap of where we are on the overarching issues, the CC1 discussions and Mr. (Jeffers) I'll come to you on this. I don't know if we plan to do any (deeper) discussion of it, then just a status report. And so I was away for two weeks.

I'm not certain of what we decided in this spot, whether we were actually going a bit deeper into some of the issues that we've uncovered and perhaps even some of the issues that have been - we think we're finding a first answer for. So I'll ask you first and then anyone else whether they've got a view on that. Please, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. This is Jeff Neuman for the transcript. So I think as part of the work track three there's a topic of round – I'm hearing a bad echo here. Let's try again. Okay, that's better.

Is, there's a topic on the round versus continuous first come first server process. As part of that we covered the overall topic of rounds. But I think everything else we pretty much had public discussion on in Helsinki. I think that was the last place we were.

So I don't think we go over the overall topics again unless anyone in the group thinks there's something particular we should cover this time.

Avri Doria: Thank you Jeff. Okay, fine. So we'll stick to basically a status update of where we're at on it and we can open it up to questions and see if there are any questions in the group but we won't do down any of the issue topics that we have.

Okay, then the next thing we have here is the work track based discussion. But I wanted to ask a question before that. While we're there we're going to be visiting the CCPs and perhaps some of the (unintelligible) protection mechanism groups, the RPMs.

We've got liaisons for all those groups and I'm wondering whether it would be worthwhile to ask our liaisons to those groups to just give us a brief update of where those groups are and what they're doing in Hyderabad so that the group knows especially on those things that connect to our discussion.

So I'm wondering if people have an opinion on adding a new number three which is a, particularly update from liaisons to CCPs and RPMs. Jeff, the leaders, anybody on this group, does that seem like it's worth doing? And liaisons too since some of you are on this group.

Is that something you're willing to do? I'd like to open it up, if anybody's got a viewpoint. I see Rubens says he supports the idea. (Karen Lentz) says it would be good. Jeff, yes but we should keep it short.

So yes, it would be no more than, you know, a five minute maximum for each and it probably wouldn't be that much but five minutes is relatively short for us – status and advertisement of meetings.

Anyone think it's a bad idea and we shouldn't do it? Okay. So then I'd like to ask that a new number three be added before the work track which is basically updates from CCP and RPM on liaison.

Okay, so then we'll go into the work track which is the majority part of the meeting and pretty much plan to take the time we've got beyond this. So I think that, you know, if we use, I don't even see us using a half hour on the first three.

But assuming that we use a half hour on the first three, then we would take the following three hours and try and subdivide it relatively evenly between each of the work tracks.

What we've asked each of the work track teams to do was to come up with two I think we called them teaser questions that relate to work that we're doing now that are on issues that we've discussed somewhat and felt that getting some early input from the wider group and the community would be a good thing.

So that being the basis, I'd like to ask each of the work teams to basically do a quick description of their issues and open it up for questions after they've gone through their teaser questions to see if there are any questions on this.

So from work team one, who do I have that can speak to it? Not seeing a hand. Not hearing a voice. Do we have one of the leaders from, I mean look down the list and see if we have one of the leaders from work track one. It's not on, (maybe) we could do it.

We've got Sarah and we've got (Christa). So both leaders are here. Can one of us, one of you please talk us through the work track one question? Thank you Sarah. I see your hand.

(Unintelligable): Thanks Avri. This is (unintelligible). Sorry, I was trying to get my audio to connect. Regarding the teaser questions for work track one, I note that one of them is out of date, being the second one.

But to the first one a question was, what went wrong with the application support program in the 2012 round and is there still a need for such a program? I see in the chat that (Kristina's) here but she just doesn't have a voice.

So that questions just sort of helps to spur our conversation regarding the applicant's support program. (Christiana), I have still been trying to get a meeting scheduled with the folks from that previous working group. And so we're just looking for input on that.

And then the second question needs to be updated to read from RSP accreditation to third party certifier, what is the most effective method to meet the needs of RSP registry and registrar? This change was made after we got (Donna's) proposal for a way forward for some sort of program.

So after getting some reviews to what she had submitted, we thought it might be a good starting point for us to have a conversation and sort of take that proposal and sort of flush it out and see what kind of progress we can make. Based off of the proposal.

And so those are our two teaser questions that we are trying to address at the moment. That is all that I have. Any questions? Comments?

Avri Doria: Yes, any hands? I see Kurt on question two. Do you mean end users or registrants or all users? Do you want to, okay Jeff, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, let's, Jeff Neuman for the record. I thought about that as well but the question is, I'm not sure what benefits the program has to end users or registrant? I'm not sure directly impacts them but Kurt, if you could think of ways that it could, I'm not opposed to amending the question

Avri Doria: Okay, anyone else? Kurt, do you have, I see multiple attendees typing. There's a silent space for people to speak. Jeff has put in the revised question in the chat box. Okay, Kurt, (unintelligible) internet, lower registration costs. (Unintelligible) into this will come out of the question. I see Donna is typing. Really, no one wants to speak?

Don't leave me talking to myself. Okay, Donna, I think it should also include applicants as this is one of the problems we're trying to solve. Okay, a different recommendation but that seems quite reasonable and considers applicant that have to deal with all this. Anyone else have a point? I see people typing. And Jeff is typing. No one wants to talk?

Kurt, I don't know if either of those will directly be related to registrants but yes to applicants. Krista, I definitely think applicants should be included. Okay, so at this point, recommending that we add applicants to the question and leave it open to discover whether there is any, you know, ones that does have a way in which registrants and users are also affected by a, by the question.

Certainly don't want to exclude them but also don't just want to include a whole list if there really isn't a specific concern that someone has in mind. And since no one's putting up their hand to say they have a specific issue as it relates to registrants and users, I'll leave that for now.

Any other questions or comments on the WT1 question? If not, I'll move onto work track two. Who do we have from work track two that would like to talk through? Phil, is that you? I see Michael Flemming with his hand up. Michael Flemming please go ahead.

Michael Flemming: Good morning Avri. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes, I hear you fine.

Michael Flemming: Hold on, I can't hear you. Just a second. Let me fix my audio here. Got it. Just give me two seconds. Can you hear me now?

Avri Doria: I could hear you before and I can still hear you.

Michael Flemming: Okay good. I can hear you better. Okay, so for working track two, we have three questions that we've thrown together and these basically reflect what we have at the current time, where we've gone through working track two at the current time.

The first question deals with the single agreement category base agreement issue. So I'm just going to go ahead and read it along. Is the single agreement still suitable for the needs of subsequent procedures noting that the 2012 round saw the introduction of TLDs with needs that differ from the standard ICANN model.

The idea of different agreements into a specific category has seen increased commitment. Do we need to allow for category based agreements? And what is the justification for such? If yes, what ways can we consider the category based agreement? Or, how should the single based agreement address the various needs of different categories?

So in this question we've kind of looked at, well, obviously trying to see whether or not we stick with one single based agreement or if we do have

category based agreements, what would the justification be for such? I mean we've already gone down this line a little bit but we're still looking for more additional feedback.

So the objective here is to see community feedback as well so they can kind of help us drive the discussion. My (alarm) keeps going off. Yes, then the next one is for reserved names. What is a reserved names and what are the reserved names per the RA?

Do any changes need to be made to the reserved names to reflect the changes in the recent procedures that allow for the release of such reserved names? So in this one we have to go back to policy. We need to look at what the policy has kind of laid out for reserved names overall?

Sorry. What we've already looked at so far, we've seen that what's written in the IANA guide book versus what was written in policy are very different. So this obviously has a lot of discussion that needs to be done.

And I know that what is reserved name is kind of a very broad question but allowing us to define that and allowing us to look at the principles or the, kind of the background for such, allows us to kind of get an idea of how reserved names were first thought of and then look at what has been established today to see, to kind of compare this and see well, is it justified? Do we need to make those changes in policy?

So hopefully that will give us more thought in that direction. And then the last one deals with continuing operations instrument, COI. In the 2012 round, a continuing operations instrument was required to be submitted in the form of a Letter of Credit to fund an emergency (unintelligible) and registry operator.

That requirement provided, I'm sorry, proved to be difficult for a number of registries to meet. What other options are there to fund the (EVRO) functions? Also, some questions such as registries such as brand TLDs

consider that a continuing operations instrument is not required due to the nature of their TLD.

This spans into the background of (EVRO) requirements as well but would the continuing operations instrument be required for these that would qualify for an exemption to the code of conduct before the RA? So obviously we are looking at, you know, the COI and what do we need in regards to kind of solicit the, not solicit, sorry, just woke up like five, maybe ten minutes ago.

So we're looking at the COI and kind of what do we need in order to support those funds that occur when an emergency (unintelligible) in transition happens? So in this case, we have kind of looked at the question, you know, is this best in the form of an LOC?

The, obviously the, what we've originally thought of in the application for each TLD is for the expected DOMs compared to what have actually come to be a result, you know, several years after those, the first few have actually signed the registry agreement has kind of show that the amount of money also, for example, prepared does not need to be, you know, is not what we originally thought.

At the same time is it sufficient to say that an (LOC) isn't required. I think nobody's looking to go that far but we're looking to drive the discussion in that area. And for some TLDs for example that are not for the overall, what's a good way to put this? The overall public benefit of public good?

It's not required basically that third parties that don't have a registration in a (TLD), is a COI even necessary for that. If we can drive the discussion in that area, we're, I believe we'll be able to get a better sight over all this policy. So are there any suggestions regarding the overall three questions that we've kind of laid out here?

((Crosstalk))

Michael Flemming: Okay, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, I'm just looking now at the question. So we had a question from Phil.
                    His question, do we need more reserve names, re: IANA transitions. Then
                    Ruben's, like PTI. Then there was question two, work track two from
                    (Anabeth Vincent). It is differences between, I'm having trouble reading. It
                    says …

Michael Flemming: RNWG.

Avri Doria   Right, RNWG. And what was the result in AGB especially for geographical
                    names. There is a need to see those two documents in connection. Phil says
                    exactly, Ruben, Ruben says only the ICANN community views of PTI as the
                    org managing IANA functions. I'm not sure what this has to do with it but I'm
                    just reading it into the record.

                    And then Jeff, (Anabeth), yes, that's one of the differences. Also have (IGOs),
                    Red Cross, IOC, et cetera? Susan, I see your hand up please.

Susan Payne: Hi, yes, Susan Payne for the record. Yes it requires a clarification really and a
                    comment. Just a (unintelligible) to the reserve name is the question. On our
                    last call we were talking somewhat about base levels so at the top level and
                    at the second level. And it was a, you know, a very preliminary discussion
                    that we were having.

                    But for the purposes of this question, I think we need to be, we ought to be
                    clear whether we're talking about reserved names at the top level or at the
                    second level. It's possible we could talk about both but it might be, I think it
                    would be helpful for us if we're going to do that to structure the question so
                    that we don't end up with a very confused conversation with people
                    misunderstanding what we're talking about.

Michael Flemming: That's a very good suggestion Susan. And I am so sorry. I will make sure to put in a clarification at the beginning of the registry.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I saw a hand from Alexander for a second but it went away. Any other comments? And I saw a comment from Karen saying I could barely be heard. I have raised the volume on the microphone so hopefully I can be heard a little better but please let me know in the chat if I can't be. Any other comments on the work track two questions?

Michael Flemming: Phil says that we would appreciate feedback from (unintelligible) experienced problems in relation to the COI, (LLC) question but that's just a wish, not exactly a commentary in the overall structuring of the question.

Avri Doria: And we also have Jeff who also wrote that we have two single character IDMs. There's (Anabeth) who completely agrees with Susan. Phil, re COIs says, we would appreciate feedback. We already got that. Sorry. And then (Anabeth) wanted discussion on two levels.

                     On first level, that was the only thing so far. Has agreed in the cross community working group on country and territory names. Okay. So any other comments on that? So it looks like we'll have a fairly full discussion in that area.

Michael Flemming: Yes, I think we can move on Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Okay, now moving onto work track three. I can hear myself echoing so I'd like to go to Karen on this one. I've seen that you're here Karen. So please, I've seen your hand. Please go ahead. Thank you.

Karen Day: Hi, this is Karen Day for the record. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: I can.

Karen Day: Okay. I decided to switch outside of the Adobe room and put myself on. For work track three, there are two issues that we wanted to get a broader community level on.

As alluded to earlier by Jeff, the concept of rounds versus continuous application period, in respect to how that is going to impact one of our work areas which is string contention and just have a discussion on, based on where we think we're going to go with that if we have a continuous first come first serve period as it were.

Obviously we wouldn't see some of the contention sets that we saw last time and have a discussion about which need to drive which. The impact that it would have on objections and contention sets need to have or play into what kind of structure we go into for subsequent procedures.

Or, do we want to make that decision and then let that decision flow down to the work track three area of string contentions? So that is what point number one is. I realize my questions are quite as not flushed out in writing as my colleagues re but we'll get those cleaned up.

And the second point, question for us to talk about at a community level is, the need for an independent objector in future application processes. Talk about what the original goals were. Were they met? Were they not met? Do we need an independent objector in this process? If so, what do we need that to look like going forward?

So those are the two areas for work track three that we'd like to get discussion on in Hyderabad. Anybody have any questions on this?

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'd like to open up the floor. Any comments? Questions? I see no hands. I see Susan is typing but I don't know if she's typing on this issue or another issue.

Because we did have one comment based on the previous questions which was a question to (Anabeth) on when we would get a CCWG on country and territory names report. And (Anabeth) says one was planned for Hyderabad.

I'm wondering if we'll have that before our meeting. Is that something that will come after our meeting? Or is that something that perhaps we can get a brief report on during this part of the discussion is the report is not out yet. So (Anabeth), sort of fed back a question to you.

And Susan wrote, would it be possible to get a copy of the proposed questions in advance of the meeting. Or, could you point me to where they are posted please? Some of use, we want to gather input from colleagues who may not be there. I think that shortly after this meeting we'll be able to get the agenda out including the questions and that should be a good basis.

And I'm assuming it will be posted. I don't know if anyone on staff what's to say where it will be posted but it will be posted and where it's posted can also be sent to the list. So I think the answer to that is yes. And, yes, so I assumed that that was a general comment. So thanks.

Okay, any other comments on work track three. I'd like to also mention in regard to work track three, as people know, we have lost one of our coleaders on that due to other work requirements. (Robin Gross) has been recruited into this lot and it is going through, it was just announced on the list and just making sure that the sub team, that the work track team is comfortable with it but we're seeing first signs that they are.

So I'm really happy that there's now a co-lead on work track three going into Hyderabad. So thank you. Thank you (Robin) and thank you Karen for carrying it alone while we were doing this search and recruitment. Thanks. Thanks to both. I see clapping hands.

Okay now, and seeing no questions on work track three and having plenty of time – oh wait a second. There's something in the, (Anabeth), on the question about CCWG on the names. We still have discussions on this and (Bart) is summing up the last discussions to be presented in Hyderabad.

As you know, we have two co-chairs from GNSO who can give you details. Who were the co-chairs from GNSO? (Heather) and (Carlos). I don't know who they are. Who?

Woman:	(Heather) and (Carlos).

Avri Doria:	Okay. Thank you very much. Sorry that I didn't know. So hopefully one of them will be there if (Anabeth) isn't there or something so that we can get an update on that. Thank you. And (Steve Chan) says s progress report of sorts is being prepared for ICANN 57 discussions.

So it sounds like we should have at least a bunch of information to go on for our conversations and I appreciate that. And (Anabeth) says, she will try and make the meeting in Hyderabad on Thursday arriving in the morning. So after a long flight, yes, it's understandable.

And we would appreciate it if you do but we'll understand if you can't. Okay, seeing no questions and no more writing, we'll move to work track four and is it Ruben or Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is going to …

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Ruben.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:	Okay. Thank you. Rueben, the floor is yours.

Rubens Kuhl:	Thank you Avri. Rueben here. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes, I can hear you fine. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you Avri. In work track four, we have been working on Hyderabad (unintelligible) the question that we will be sending. Some consultants that were involved in the application process including (unintelligible) (those questions that we're making as community) consultations to other stakeholder groups and other ICANN advisor bodies.

                     What we have on the screen, three of the topics that we have been looking into asking both consultants and the community and in effect ourselves. Most of the questions are actually the policy questions that we need to answer. So although we are thinking of this as an outreach effort, this is actually a (unintelligible) effort discussing the policy that we will be proposing in the end that have been working.

                     Have a question from Jeff. For number one, do we need to mean the evaluation processes as opposed to application process? Yes Jeff. It should be the evaluation process, the application process in the information, what's presented to evaluate it so it's not the application submission. It's one of the evaluation submission, the evaluation process

                     And that's all we had for us unless someone has a question with regard to – I see someone typing.

Avri Doria: And people are welcome to raise their hands to speak. Okay. No, I see that Kurt has stopped writing. So I guess we have no questions on this wither or no further questions. Actually no questions other than the one Jeff asked. So basically that brings us to the end, okay yes Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry. This is Jeff Neuman. Takes me a while to get off of, yes, sorry. Takes me a while. Yes, I just want to throw a general question out there. You know, in the very unlikely circumstance that we don't have a very talkative audience, we have time, can anyone think of some backup questions.

And not that you have to submit that now. But to the extent you have within the next 48 hours or so, you can think of something we can ask as a backup, we would appreciate it. I'm going to try to think of some for as well just to have kind of on the back burner. In case nobody talks, we shouldn't run out of questions. So I see Donna's got her hand raised. So I'll jump off.

Avri Doria: Yes, please Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Avri. Donna Austin. One of the things that struck me about the work track two questions is that they're talking about the registry agreements as categories.

I know we had some discussion around categories with the overall overarching issues and I wondered whether that's something that we're going to have as a backup if we have time in Hyderabad to have maybe a bit more discussion around categories. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. That's a good point. And that's similar I think to the point when I had brought up at the beginning whether we were going to get into details on any of the CC1s.

I think when it comes time to talk about categories in these questions, we can also sort of take a time out to look at the CC1 discussion and open that discussion up in that space.

Or do you think it should be opened up in a separate space sort of later at the end? But I was thinking it may make sense to talk about it there. I'm not sure. Jeff, you were the one who suggested that in terms of to have or not have grounds with something that we could allude to in the appropriate track.

Would you agree that that that's the reasonable way to handle categories also? I cannot – let's see. We've got a good point, Kurt, when he was talking about (Kurt's) point, not (Donna's) point.

So (Kurt's) point was, if you're going to ask – it jumped? If you're going to ask an open ended question such as number one, you should create some rules about participating in order to manage the discussion. And i.e., present your idea and why the change should be made.

We will compile all the suggestions for discussion by the group. Okay. Seems a good suggestion as several people said, though. Phil sad absolutely Donna. Jeff said yes. And (Ed) said Avri, yes. So I'm suspecting that we'll talk a little bit about categories in that space. Michael Flemming, the floor is yours.

Michael Flemming: Yes, I just wanted to kind of echo your point Avri, in saying that I don't' think we can really have this discussion overall without referring to the registry agreement in the first place. So I think moving this topic toward working track two might be a, perhaps a better option but that's just my two cents. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Let me get my (phone). Okay, thank you. So I think that that covers that. I see a bit white X on a red background next to your name Michael Flemming. What are you disagreeing with? Okay, your hand is up again. Yes, please Michael Flemming.

Michael Flemming: I'm sorry. I'm just trying to change the little man with the hand, so. I keep pushing the wrong button. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay great. Thank you. Just wanted to make sure I wasn't missing an agreement. So that's basically our agenda. I suggest also that we do, like every agenda, leave a little time for any other business until we get there. For

any questions that did develop during the discussion that didn't get into the flow.

So it's quite possible that we will have people that ask us questions during the session especially people that have not been involved in the working group or in any of the work tracks. So we may find, you know, that questions come up that we can explore under any other business. So I ask that that be added.

And that's of course the place we can handle any other questions that people come up with in the next couple days though in person with people talking, I really don't expect us to have a lot of silence.

But it does seem to be becoming a habit on Adobe Connect of late that a lot of people prefer to type and not talk. And it's something that I've certainly been guilty of in other groups so I have no comment on it. Yes, Steve says that staff can maintain a parking lot. And so that's a good thing to have.

Any other business? That way if we're going through a discussion and pints come up that are sort of tangents, we have a suggestion to just say, can we put that on the parking lot and discuss it toward the end?

And we'll leave a little bit of time open. And as we see the parking lot develop we can adjust timing. So anything else people would like to bring up about the Hyderabad meeting and the agenda at this point?

\

\   It is what we have on the agenda for today. So if there's nothing else we will end the meeting early but I do not want to cut discussion. Does anybody have any other comments on the agenda? Or any other business that they want to bring up at this meeting at this point?

I see nobody. Okay. This has been the third meeting of the day that I've chaired. I'm more than happy to have the meeting be done. So, only the first one in ICANN. The two others were in other groupings but still.

In which case I think I've talked on long enough. And no hands have come up and no writing. So I thank you all. To those who are travelling I wish you good travels though we do still have some sub-team meetings, work track meetings going on before we travel.

But I wish everybody good travelling and good remote participation for those who aren't travelling. And with that being no other requests for the floor, I thank you and the meeting has ended.

Woman: Thank you so much Avri. Again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, if you could please disconnect the recording lines. Have a great day everyone.

END