
AUTOMATED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, great. Sorry for the background noise - I'm at the airport. This is Jordyn Buchanan, and welcome, everyone, to the Competition and Consumer Trust sub-team of the CCT RT. Just before we start, I'll do a quick question of whether anyone has an update to their statements of interest since we met face-to-face last week?

Alright, I'm assuming that means no. In terms of agenda, we're just going to run through the review of the sections of the draft report and public comments, as well as the action items that we identified during the face-to-face in Abu Dhabi.

I think that's the main objectives, [UNKNOWN]. Alright, so, why don't we go ahead and jump in. Let's see - Jean-Baptiste, just to understand what's being projected right now...

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, Jordyn, right now [UNKNOWN] you have the [UNKNOWN] during the face-to-face, and if needed, I also have the four points of all the different [UNKNOWN] recommendations that can be placed in [UNKNOWN] if you wish.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, we can do it in the reverse order, that's fine. Why don't we start, then, with the action items from Abu Dhabi. The first one is really just

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.

the thing we're going to talk about with the follow-up on the draft report, so, let's skip that. Recommendation 5 - Jonathan to provide an updated version of [UNKNOWN] paper - that's done. Actually, let's just skip through the ones that are done.

Okay - consolidate 13, 15, and 33 in [UNKNOWN] survey. It looks like (Maureen)... Oh, wait, it looks like I'm supposed to consolidate the recommendations, so, I haven't done that yet. Let's tag that as an ongoing action item for me.

Recommendation 14 - have we seen anything from David on that, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And then these following recommendations 16, 25 through 30, 32, 35 - those are all in the other sub-teams, is that right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, that's correct, and if you look at the bottom, there is recognition for the where you [UNKNOWN] to get to a discussion on the registrar survey with INTA.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, so I think that's basically the same as the previous- [INTERUPTED] Yeah, exactly.

Okay, then looking to the final report - the executive summary, that's- Jonathan will look at that again [UNKNOWN] the sub-team. The numbering of recommendations, presumably, [UNKNOWN] is going to handle that. Is that right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah? Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, sorry to interrupt - I didn't know the right place to bring this up - but I guess we're really focused on recommendations here, and I guess I'm wondering, I do have a sense we should be updating the prose of the report to incorporate thoughts, or address things from public comments. We're making additions to recommendations, we're making changes in the prose itself - and the two examples I'm thinking of, one is kind of straight forward, and that is that you came up with a thought at the face-to-face that I then made use of during the constituent update, which was the notion of the program perpetuating a mono-culture as a

way to talk about it that was more universally interesting, whether it was NCUC, or ALAC, or the business constituency, and getting away from trying to support a specific business model. We were thinking that, maybe, that should be part of the choice section - and I can make it part of the executive summary, but I didn't know if it should be part of the choice section as well, so that I'm summarising it from somewhere. Do I just wing it in the executive summary?

So, that was one thing, then the other thing, I guess, had to do with the USG stuff on competition and rivalry - we want to give some thought to addressing some of those comments, either explicitly or implicitly, in our competition analysis.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, thanks, Jonathan.

So, to answer your initial enquiry of whether we should be looking at the prose as opposed to just the individual recommendation text - I think the answer to that is yes, actually. In our review of public comments, we initially did a pass through the recommendations, but then asked folks to look through the relevant sections to see if there were updates that make sense with regards to the surrounding prose as well.

For example, I think Waudó's already completed that for recommendation number 9, and I think Dejan's going to take a look at that as well, for the recommendations that he is looking at. But-
[INTERUPTED]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I don't mean, just like [OVERLAP] on the recommendation, I mean, like, the analysis part of the paper. Or are we talking about- [INTERUPTED]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, sure, I think we are talking about the same thing, in that, just the way the the staff report summarised the public comments, they were all tied to the recommendations, so it was asking the review team members to go back and review the public comments with an eye to the overall section, as opposed the just the recommendations.

But, since the comments were categorised into recommendations, that seemed like the way to divide up the work. If that makes sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, it does, I just didn't know if - and I leave room for the possibility that this just went past me, but - I didn't know the request that we put out to look at changes to the prose included the analysis section, or just had to do with the, like, rational and things like that, and the recommendations themselves, because it was recommendation centric, the analysis and the comments.

I mean, I look at the USG comments on competition, and they're not tied to any recommendations, right? They're just pissing on our competition, and I- [INTERUPTED]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: - and that feels like what we need to do is go back and address some of that stuff in the competition analysis, separate from any recommendations at all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right. So I was going to follow-up and say that your two specific points - I think you're right, they aren't currently reflected in the discussion. In the US Government recommendation, the public comments in particular, apprise, primarily to findings as opposed to the recommendations.

So, we should take a closer look at that, but, I'll just ask Waudo, and Dejan to confirm when they looked through the comments, that they were look at with an eye to the findings as well, or just at the recommendations - let me know. Waudo or Dejan - to you want to follow-up on what you guys have done already?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, so, when I was looking at the public comments that... Hello? Hello, can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I was looking at both the recommendations themselves, and the other write-up that we had in the report. It was the detail? I think we called it detail, so I changed the [UNKNOWN]. That is for the recommendations that I- I'm talking about recommendation 9.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, Waudo, did you- [OVERLAP]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: - Yeah, so-

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [LAUGHTER] It's your call, I didn't mean to high-jack it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, it's totally fine. I was going to say - I was just going to ask a question to [UNKNOWN], so why don't you go ahead and address Waudo first, and then I'll ask my other question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. So, Waudo - it sounds like what you did is look at the recommendation and the justification text for the recommendations, so the question I have, and the answer may be no - did you find anything in the comments that addressed your work, that suggested that you should make any changes to the findings, or just to the recommendations? Does that make sense? Were there comments and assumptions that you made, or findings that you made, in the main body of the paper that you thought needed to be adjusted to address public comments?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, sorry, I think that actually you should look at the main body that was in the big report. I looked at the place where we [UNKNOWN] the summary, and the recommendation, and the detail - I don't know whether I can go back and have a look, where are we... I can see [OVERLAP]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, in the comments-

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah I can see-

JONATHAN ZUCK: In the comments-

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, it was kind of a [UNKNOWN]. I just changed the recommendation, and then the place we're calling details.

So, I didn't go back to the main write-up, but I [UNKNOWN] the main write-up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And do you have a sense whether or not the public comments you were reading suggest-

WAUDO SIGANGA: We are changing the main write-up-

JONATHAN ZUCK: [UNKNOWN] that we should go back to the main write-up?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes. Yes, I think so. In fact, there was a time I mentioned I think with this public comments we need to go back to the main text and see are there anything we need to change there, and I think in addition this would be an exercise that we would do a little bit later.

So, yes, I agree with you - I think we have to go back to the main text, step-by-step, and [UNKNOWN] by the different public comments. Apart from the organisation and the details.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks for that clarification, Waudo. Yeah, I was just going to say, it sounds like we do need to make that pass then, and have everyone take a close look at the findings in addition. I was going to ask [UNKNOWN] if there are any public comments, or summary of the public comments, that isn't tied to specific recommendations? Or, is there any way for us to easily make sure that we can attach public comments to findings that aren't attached to a specific recommendation, just to make sure that we don't miss any of that.

Because, the US Government's comments in particular - I don't think it actually addresses any of the recommendations? So, maybe it did slip through the cracks as a result of a recommendation based analysis.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jordyn, I would need to have a quick look now at the summary of public comments received that we produced, and see whether, for example, USG appears under recommendations in detail, or not. Let me have a look.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, and just - I think the question is, as well - even if 80% of what they wrote about was findings, and then they mentioned one of the recommendations, would we keep- would the summary somehow capture the 80% under that one finding, under that one recommendation, or, you know - how do we make sure that we're accurately associating the specific comments with findings, just so that we can divide and conquer the work and no-one has to read all of the public comments in order to address specific sections.

Okay, while Jean-Baptiste is looking at that, let me take a quick look at the other items from our agenda - from the follow-up.

One I would suggest is - in the chat - is whether we have an exercise where we go through all the comments one-by-one. Waudo, are you suggesting that everyone goes through all the comments? Or that we somehow divide up all the comments by sub-team member?

Waudo, I don't know if you're trying to speak, but we don't hear you, so.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. Can you hear me now?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, now we can, sorry. Yeah, go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello? Yeah- [COMMUNICATION DISRUPTION] What a lot of noise. So I thought any of the two [UNKNOWN] advantages. We can take all of them. We can divide the comments amongst ourselves, or even, we could have one long [UNKNOWN], up to two hours, we could go through all the comments. There are not many, there are just 33.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, that makes sense. So, Jonathan - maybe, I think, this particular question is something we should take-up on the leadership call, to figure out how we want to address this findings related work, and to make sure we're not missing comments that relate to findings [UNKNOWN]

recommendations. That might want to be co-ordinated across the sub-teams.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that makes sense. It might make sense - if I'm understanding what Waudu is suggesting - that we just arbitrarily divide up the comments. The review team should get someone to- [INTERUPTED]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: - do we each read one- [OVERLAP]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I agree that may be a reasonable...

JONATHAN ZUCK: [OVERLAP]- findings. Is that the way we would do it? Something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, agreed, and then I think if that were an approach, it would make-
Yeah, sorry, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So yeah, we can pick up on the leadership call how to approach it. Meanwhile, transactionally, if you want me to try and take a whack at mono-culture, something like that, like an added- One of the interesting challenges that I think we will discover on the leadership call from Jean-Baptiste, is that he would probably prefer that we do block-editing, as opposed to finesse-editing, just because it would allow for incremental translation. So, that's just something to think about. So then I'm translating a whole document over from scratch.

So, we can have that conversation with Jean-Baptiste on the leadership call as well, but if you'd like me to I could take a whack at a mono-culture paragraph, or something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

So, I think you're right that it makes sense to incorporate that into the consumer choice section. I think that mono-culture, doesn't necessarily widely reflects our discussion in the review team, which some genesis or catalyst out of the public comments around the recommendations do sort-of reflect, and the way we talked about encouraging other - or maybe specific business models, in the case of the draft reports - so. Once you tie it up back to the- I guess in the report itself we don't really need to tie back to the [UNKNOWN], I'm just thinking about how to frame that. That would be useful.

Are you thinking of making a stab just at the executive summary, or in the choice section as well?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was thinking about making it in the choice section first, so that then I'm referencing it in the executive summary. I don't know how much I should pull from the text and be repetitive, but it probably belongs in both places, when all is said and done.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, no, that makes perfect sense, so, yeah - if you want to go ahead and do that, I think that makes sense. Why don't we go ahead and slide that, then, since we don't have- I think [UNKNOWN] had the initial competition section, which would be the logical place to look at the USG's comments - but why don't we hold off and wait for that leadership call before we [INTERRUPTED] Yeah, I think that part should probably be done in joint with handling the review of the US Government's comments, because I would have thought that- [INTERRUPTED]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, for sure. [UNKNOWN]. You want me to make a presentation on that comment, I can do that, is what I was saying.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, I mean, that's probably fine. I would say - why don't we wait for the leadership call to figure out how we're going to divide up the comment review.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Makes sense. Yep.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so I'll circle back to Jean-Baptiste - did you get a chance to look and answer that question about the other comment analysis, or should we wait for you to do that off-line, and include that in an email follow-up?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, Jordyn, can you specify exactly what you would need?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, just, we're trying to figure out whether or not the [UNKNOWN] report would include - how it would include - comments that aren't related to specific recommendations, that are related to findings in particular, because my recollection of the [UNKNOWN] report is that the chart sort-of summarises the public comments by recommendation, not by findings.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, where there are public comments about findings, how would we make sure we're not missing those? And it could be that we'll just make someone read all of them to do that, but I was just wondering if the - [UNKNOWN] report attempts to answer that question.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: As I said in the chat, under the [UNKNOWN] tab - which is not about recommendations, but more general comments, summaries, findings, but - I'm not 100% sure that there wouldn't be references to findings that are missing there. Maybe- [INTERUPTED]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [UNKNOWN] public comments received, and comparing that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so I'm just going to defer this [UNKNOWN] till the leadership call, to just figure out how to make sure that we're looking at the public comments with an eye to addressing any changes to findings as well. Because I think that will need to be co-ordinated across the various sub-teams. But, referring back to the chat, it seems like you've noted that the US Government's comments are on the general comments section, so it could be that all the types of comments that we're talking about are just summarised in that general comments area, which would make our lives easy.

Okay, great, so. Jumping back to the previous discussion - now I can't see the file report action items - are they being [UNKNOWN] still, or am I just - Okay, there we go. I don't think any of the final report recommendations really relate specifically to this. Really, the only action item we have coming out of Abu Dhabi for the sub-team is for me to do

the consolidation of that registrar survey recommendation. Unless anyone else sees something here that we need to address?

Okay, great. So then can we turn back to - I think previously we had a summary of the recommendations and where we were with regards to our analysis of the public comments? Okay, great, hold on, give me one second, let me take a look at this. Okay, did we even start a recommendation [UNKNOWN]? I'm confused. Sorry, Jean-Baptiste. Oh, we're [INTERUPTED]-

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, yeah, because, just before Waudo was talking [UNKNOWN] recommendation which is why [UNKNOWN].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, okay, great. Sorry, I think I'm on the infamous Adobe mobile connection-

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: There's a delay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, it's not very fast - it updated.

Okay, recommendation 1 - this is actually part of the sub-team. Jonathan, have you finished, have you made adjustments to recommendation 1?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's approved already, right? That's complete?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's approved and ready [UNKNOWN].

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so we're done with that. Recommendation number 2, on pricing, has been updated, but this is one where I haven't yet gone back and updated, taken a look at the rationale and surrounding prose, but I think that's what's to be done here. So, we leave that as an action item, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Mhmm.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great. So, then, recommendation 3, I think, is in the same state, actually. That's right - so we have an update on the recommendation, but as of recommendation 2, I need to look at the related prose and analysis. So, I think that's [UNKNOWN] number 2.

Alright, recommendation 4.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Same.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think that's the same. Recommendation number 5-
[INTERUPTED]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Recommendation-

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, so this one was updated [UNKNOWN] the new section that will be published for public comment.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This has already been sent out, so. So this is [UNKNOWN]. Recommendation number 6, I think, we need to have [UNKNOWN] do that same analysis, of - I think she said that doesn't need to be updated, but we need the analysis with the rational and the related prose, for [UNKNOWN]. So if you'd flag that as an action item, Jean-Baptise, feel free to follow-up with her.

Alright, recommendation number 7.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Recommendation number 7 - I think there was a consolidation proposal from the- [OVERLAP]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Between 7 and 8.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [UNKNOWN] on screen, a consolidation between recommendations 7 and 8.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right, and Dejan - I think you may have already looked at the analysis, and the prose, and the public comments, not just the recommendations. Is that right?

Nothing still... Dejan, if you're talking, we can't hear you.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [SEVERE COMMUNICATION DISRUPTION]

Can you hear me now?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, yes we can. There was quite a bit of noise, but we can hear you.

DEJAN DJUKIC: You can hear me now?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

DEJAN DJUKIC: You can hear me? Okay. After my last [UNKNOWN] some suggestions, and I think I completely agree with it, and I said to Jean-Baptiste and you, but previously [UNKNOWN], they edited the last version, [UNKNOWN] in the recommendation [UNKNOWN]-

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So that is the- [OVERLAP]

DEJAN DJUKIC: Also, I [UNKNOWN] the prose-

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [OVERLAP/UNKNOWN].

DEJAN DJUKIC: Can you repeat, I didn't hear you well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, I was just going to ask - the changes that (Jamie) suggested, is that reflected in the current text that's being projected here, or are we still waiting for that to get- [OVERLAP]

DEJAN DJUKIC: Well, I checked also if there is any changes in the report, and there is no need for any changes in regards to (Jamie's) or my [UNKNOWN], so.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Okay, so we think that the text that's being projected right now - the consolidated recommendations - this should be [UNKNOWN]. Is that right? Does everyone agree with that?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yeah, that's okay. Unless you need to compare the last version, but it is [UNKNOWN] version that [UNKNOWN] we can include and approve that version, if you're agreed with that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think unless anyone has any comments, I think from a sub-team perspective this is fine, and we should [UNKNOWN] this up to the plenary. Okay? [UNKNOWN] Then, let's move onto recommendation number 9, which I think Waudu has been looking at?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I have updated this [UNKNOWN], Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Pardon?

WAUDO SIGANGA: I updated it, as you can see- [INTERUPTED]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right.

WAUDO SIGANGA: - there was a bit of an issue [UNKNOWN] public comments, which [UNKNOWN] but I don't think I need to go through that, because it's quite lengthy, but I went through each public comment, and it just indicated [UNKNOWN] they think that this was, this particular recommendation. So, the final wording is what is on the screen now, and I think all that was left was for us to agree whether this consensus.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. So, is everyone on the sub-team, at least, comfortable with this recommendation as it stands? Waudo has actually done quite a fair analysis of the [UNKNOWN] indicates. Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, we should- [OVERLAP]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Then let's go-

JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: - then you would submit [UNKNOWN]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right, it'll be the same as 7 and 8. So, 10 - I think David and I have talked about 10, and do not intend to consolidate this, so this will remain as is unless anyone on the sub-team has a contrary recommendation. Okay, so we can just leave 10 as it is.

We'll say we've got some work to be done on details and [UNKNOWN], which I think we'll follow-up on, or even sign that as an action item, Jean-Baptiste?

Then, recommendation 11 - alright, we have no updates suggested here. A lot of the same [UNKNOWN] of the overall text, and the related prose. And then also, I guess, the [UNKNOWN], and so on.

I apologise - I am about to start getting on my flight, so I hope I'm not going to get cut-off here. We'll find out in just a second.

Okay, let's look at recommendation 12. Yeah?

DEJAN DJUKIC: [UNKNOWN] that there should be no consolidation recommendation 24.
[UNKNOWN] recommendation 24.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, what was that again?

DEJAN DJUKIC: [UNKNOWN] not related to recommendation 24.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, so you've already taken a look at that, and decided not to consolidate it. I think we can flag that as not going to be consolidated. Dejan, can you try to take a look at the- Oh, go ahead, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, no - I think you were about to invite Dejan to detail the success measures?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's exactly it.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay. [UNKNOWN]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [UNKNOWN]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Exactly [UNKNOWN]

DEJAN DJUKIC: [UNKNOWN]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, perfect. Thanks, Dejan. Is that the last of our recommendations?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so, then I believe we've covered all recommendations for this sub-team, and have all the relevant action items at this point. Sounds like all the follow-up items here are quite minor, actually. [OVERLAP] follow-up-

JONATHAN ZUCK: [UNKNOWN] recommendation 40-

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, what was that, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, I could just be clueless here in the morning, but was recommendation 40 something that was the end of the thing [UNKNOWN]. It felt like it was relevant, but I forgot what it was.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, David and I are independently having some conversations about work being [OVERLAP]-

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so it's got your name on it. Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right, it's in the [UNKNOWN] section.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cool.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I have a question about recommendation 12.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, go ahead, Waudu.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello? Can I ask a question about recommendation 12?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you, Waudu, go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, it's the recommendation is [UNKNOWN] initiate, etc., etc., so why is the target organisation down the ICANN Organisation instead of the GNSO?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's a good point, we should probably update that. Dejan, you should take a look at the other points - do you want to do that?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Hmm, I agree we can change it to the [UNKNOWN] ICANN Organisation, but, because it is more specific, it is more precise if it is GNSO, but if you agree to change it to ICANN Organisation, we can do that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [UNKNOWN] the opposite, it should be to the GNSO, not- [INTERUPTED]

WAUDO SIGANGA: [UNKNOWN]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

WAUDO SIGANGA: [UNKNOWN] ICANN organisation, but I think should be GNSO.

DEJAN DJUKIC: So, what do we want to do - are we going to leave that as it is?
[UNKNOWN] GNSO, and need to change it to ICANN Organisation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, no, see- [INTERUPTED]

WAUDO SIGANGA: [UNKNOWN]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, Waudo, I would suggest maybe just stop [UNKNOWN] with the
proposed change, and we can incorporate that into the text. Hopefully
that works.

Okay, if anything shows up in the chat, I can't see it any more. Just
wanted to let you know, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jordyn, no, it's only Jonathan saying [UNKNOWN] should be GNSO.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, yeah, let's get that updated- [SEVERE COMMUNICATION
DISRUPTION]

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I think that's it for the conversation. [LAUGHTER]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, maybe that's it. So, why don't we - I don't know what that noise was, but apparently it's telling us something. In terms of the action items on this call, I think they're all quite minor, so let's attempt to have them done by the next plenary - a week from today. That work for everyone? It [UNKNOWN] for me, so, there's a few others.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, I'll write that in, and they should be done next week.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. Alright, does anyone have any other business for this call?

Alright, folks, I think we've got a good road map for finalising the Competition and Consumer Trust section over the next, hopefully, few weeks, and moving on to the publication of our final report. We'll be following-up with folks on action items next week, and hopefully that will be the final [UNKNOWN] review that we'll talk about on [UNKNOWN] call. Should have an update next week as well.

Alright, thanks, everyone, for participating today - sorry about the background noise on my end, and I'll look forwards to chatting at the end of the week.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Safe Journey. Safe travels.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]