ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

YESIM SAGLAM

Hello and welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group session. My name is Yesim Saglam and I'm the Remote Participation Manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation are in French and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. And when called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Avri Doria and Olivier Crepin-Leblond, CPWG co-chairs. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And normally Olivier would be the first one to speak after that, but because I'm on site, I'm speaking first. And I will welcome you all, and I will also take the quick tour of the agenda

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.

that we've got before us on this meeting. So, thank you, Olivier, for letting me do that particular task.

After this welcome, we're going to do an overview of the CPWG and the Policy Working Group activities. And that will be Olivier and myself running that for 30 minutes. Then we will go into, and basically that will be very similar to the way we run a meeting with Olivier starting to go through the working groups and work that's going on. After that, we'll look at the Implementation Review Team Activities, if there are any, and see what involvement, what we need to do, what affects the users.

Then what is out of the ordinary somewhat is we'll be going into an extended session on DNS abuse mitigation. And while it says that I will be leading that, that will actually be done by Olivier with the team members, Steinar, Kathleen, Claire, Eunice, observers, all those who are participating in that.

Then finally, we'll look at Next Steps, and that will be Olivier talking. So, that's the agenda. Like in any CPWG meeting, is there anything that needs to be added or changed in this agenda? Is there any other business that we should take up if there's time? No. No.

FREDERIC TAES Frederic speaking. Just I have pralines here for working people.

AVRI DORIA Ah, some ppprizes. There are sweets for working people.

FREDERIC TAES Sweets for working, yeah.

AVRI DORIA Way cool. It's always good that there are sweets for working people. There's also a possibility that I'm putting somebody on the spot, specifically Steinar, but that there may be an any other business issue with discussions about what it means to be a community name, a community domain name and such and talking about some of the issues around .radio. Don't know if we'll get there, but I wanted to make sure that that was on the table. It now is on the table.

If we have time, I will put Steinar on the spot to sort of give us an introduction to the issue and what there might be that concerns the CPWG. At this point, if no one else has anything to add and everybody has managed to grab sweet, I don't know what we're going to do about the online folks, which seems terribly unfair. But anyhow, with that, I pass the floor to Olivier. Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and I'll remain professional, even though I'm very annoyed not having sweet, but there you go. Never mind. Welcome, everyone, to this week's, because it is this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group meeting. And so, we're going to go through our agenda, as

we usually do, with first the Policy Work Group and Small Team Updates.

Now, there are three active groups in this subheading. There's the Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group, and our ALAC-appointed representative is Edmon Chung. There is the RDRS, Registration Data Request Service, formerly the SSAD ODA, so System for Standardized Access and Disclosure Operational Design Assessment, was it? Or, yeah, something like that. Yeah, assessment, correct. And Alan Greenberg is our lead on this one.

And then we've got the Latin Diacritics Policy Development Process, which is potentially the one that's really active. And that one has Satish Babu as our representative, and we've also got Bill Jouris as an alternate. And I believe some of these people are in the room.

The four inactive groups at the moment, because the work has either completed or is on a hiatus, I believe, though, for most of them, the work has completed, where the IANA Naming Function Review, IFR2, the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Internationalized Domain Names, EPDP on IDMs, The Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, TPR PDP, and the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team, RDA Scoping Team. These are currently inactive. They're still listed in our agendas usually in case something happens, but also for archival purposes and reference purposes.

So, let's just open the floor first on any of the Universal Acceptance Working Group, Registration Data Request Service, and the Latin Diacritics PDP. Who has an update? I'm very surprised there's nobody standing up in the room. Maybe I'm not seeing them. No, we haven't even.

HEIDI ULLRICH Hi, Olivier. I'm sorry. This is Heidi. I have not raised my hand. I've just been informed that there is a conflicting session for the IDN's group right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND So yeah, that's what I thought.

HEIDI ULLRICJ Latin Diacritics.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Yeah, for the Latina Diacritics, that's correct. I did see, though, was it Bill Jouris who had written the note that things were okay his end? Or maybe he's just following remotely on the -- Did I see Bill? No, I did not. Okay, I am hallucinating at this time. Okay, great. So, unfortunately, no update on this at this point in time, because we have, as Heidi mentioned, a conflicting time. We probably will have an update during our wrap-up then.

AVRI DORIA Can I jump in a second?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Yes, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA This is Avri jumping in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Go ahead, Avri. Yeah.

AVRI DORIA For anybody that we're introducing the CPWG to, this has been a standard. Somehow or other, this is what happens when two groups are permanently assigned against each other in the same spot. So, what you're experiencing is not something that's exceptional for this meeting, but it generally happens.

And so, part is of the introduction, I just wanted to annotate that often we wait for the members of this group to come back to us with a report at the end of the meeting or somewhere else. So, this was not an unusual, this was kind of like a standard occurrence. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Yes, thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Yes, that's obviously one of those problems that we are faced with. However, we also do have a very active member in the group, and

that's our GNSO liaison that, I guess, has to be aware of everything happening in the generic name supporting organization, which is where most of the policy that we discuss takes place. And thus, I think we can turn over to Justine for a quick update on any of these groups, actually. So, Justine Chew, if you may, please.

JUSTINE CHEW

Sure. Thank you, Olivier. This is Justine. So, just on the Latin Diacritics PDP, yeah, they're having a concurrent session at the moment. In fact, they have two back-to-back sessions. And what I understand they're doing is they're reviewing the inputs from the public comment proceeding that closed recently, and they're hoping to use the two sessions to make any adjustments to the initial report based on the public comment proceeding feedback.

And hopefully they will be able to produce the final report for their recommendations sooner, ahead of schedule I believe, and then that would go to GNSO Council for approval. And then once that happens, it will go to the Board for approval and then we have to figure out the implementation.

So, I know that part of the community, including the GAC as well, are very, very interested in seeing the recommendations implemented ASAP. So, hopefully, this part of the meeting, where they're reviewing the public comments, would lead to that rapidly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much, Justine. Olivier Clépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. And just one quick question. You mentioned implementing these as quickly as possible. Do you think it's actually possible for this to be added to this round of new gTLD process, bearing in mind the process kicks off, I guess, immediately after this meeting?

JUSTINE CHEW This is Justine again. So, we know for a fact that it's not going to go into the applicant guidebook because the applicant guidebook has already been approved and published. The next best thing that I can think of, and this is predicated on the recommendations being approved by the Board, so we're not there yet. So, that's going to still take time.

As I said, the final report for the recommendations need to come from the PDP, goes to the GNSO Council for approval. If that approval happens, then it goes to the board for approval. And once the Board approves it, then the Board will send it to ICANN Org for implementation.

So, I don't really have a finger on the time that it's going to take to get through all this process, but it certainly won't be before April when the round launches. What we can consider doing is, depending on when this approval by the Board takes place, we have the avenue of SPIRT to try and make adjustments to the

program. So, we need to see what happens at a point in time. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you, Justine. What is this SPIRT, you mean?

JUSTINE CHEW Yeah, sorry for using acronyms. So, SPIRT stands for the Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team. And that is the group that looks at any issues, non-policy related issues, more like implementation issues, that crop up during the application process once the window opens. And it is kind of taking on the role of making sure that if there are any issues being brought up by applicants or the community or whoever, they are addressed properly so long as it is not a policy issue, because the time for policy has passed.

But since the reason why I mentioned SPIRT to this group is because once the Board approves the policy recommendations, then it is policy. So, then we have something to refer to ICANN Org to ask them, look, when are you going to implement this? Can we do it now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you, Justine. Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I put up my hand to… Avri speaking… to come up with a question. Previously, when I was talking about the diacritic's work, I talked about it not being related, and in fact I found a comment from Bill Jouris saying, quite specifically, the diacritic's work currently is about Latin script, and that's been made very obvious, not about any particular script using that script.

And that almost touches on the topic I've made, is once we've put in rules, policy, about how to treat diacritics, does it become a hammer, screwdriver, or wrench that we can use anywhere? In other words, once there is a policy on something, normally, if the policy is semi-applicable, then people will start saying, I'm free to use it.

There is no rule that says a policy can only be used on what it's created for. A policy can be used wherever it's useful. And if that kind of philosophy does hold, have we taken that into account, that this won't cause any adverse effect in anybody that decides to use this wrench on a different script? Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW

This is Justine. So, that's a difficult question to unpack because the reason why we had this Latin diacritic script PDP was to come up with an exception to the rule, and the rule being for treatment of variants. And as far as I know, the diacritics issue is only applicable or relevant to Latin script. I'm not aware that diacritics is a factor

in any of the other scripts, because there are rules as to what diacritics can be used or cannot be used?

AVRI DORIA

This is Avri again. One of the reasons I'm asking is, I had heard that, I had thought that, but now I've seen conversations that no, there are other scripts have a notion similar, if not diacritical, that might have similar behavior that aren't indeed variants but have markers that may or may not be used. And so, it's not a variant. For example, if I look at Hebrew, there are markers that can be stuck on everything to indicate something. It's not a variant. It's the same script, it's just the same script using a feature sometimes, but not always.

And sometimes those change what letter is indicated. And I don't know a lot about this. I mean, I'm just a hand-waving dilettante, but it occurs to me that, have we actually looked at it says, no, there is no other script that has anything remotely like diacritics that we might decide to use this kind of behavior for?

JUSTINE CHEW

This is Justine. So, again, I don't have a definitive answer for you. If there are parts of the community, the language script community, wants to raise this issue, then they can raise it, and then we may have to see whether another exception for that script needs to be done up. So, as I said, we have the rule, and if there are things that need to be accepted from the rule, then we have a

separate policy process to create that exception, which is what the Latin script diacritics does for Latin script.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, Justine. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I remind everyone that this is indeed the Latin script. So, whether we're looking at the Hebrew script or Arabic scripts also have these diacritics, I'm sure these language communities are also working on them. And I'm not knowledgeable enough, perhaps they have already dealt with those.

AVRI DORIA: You have Siva in the room raising his hand. He didn't do it with a flag and he didn't do it with the other, but he did use his hand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Now, before Siva, I have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who has been very diligent in having a virtual hand up for quite some time. I guess she's getting tired. So, I do need to turn over to Cheryl first and then we'll have Siva afterwards.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, thank you. So, exhausting keeping my virtual hand up. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record here. Just on the opportunity for SPIRT, the Standing Predictability Review Implementation Team, to do any sort of particular insertion regarding the Latin diacritics policy when it's done, the quickest way that SPIRT could deal with

this particular issue once it was policy but not yet integrated into the current guidebook and rulebook for the next round would be for the GNSO Council to bring it to the attention of SPIRT for it to be dealt with. Because the primary way that issues come to spirit is actually directly from council.

So, it may be that the CPWG and the GNSO, ALAC-GNSO liaison might want to have a little think at the right time about how the best way would be to improve the opportunity for this issue to be properly or at least partially integrated a little bit further on in the process during the round, which will be, yes, opening momentarily. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much, Cheryl. Let's turn to the room then, and I've got two people at the moment queuing up. One is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY Thank you, Olivier. Is the guidebook or any policy in ICANN ever set in stone? It is not. Usually, it is typical practice, even when a chartered accountant certifies a company's accounts, with the caveat that errors and omissions are exempted, meaning if there are any errors, we will revisit that.

So, when a policy item is not covered, especially something that is actively debated by the working group or the community, and some recommendation might come up that might not have been

included in the policy or could have been mentioned in a contrary way in the policy, there should always be room for the Board to correct that or to take it through an ongoing working group or ongoing policy revision team and that is not only for the new gTLD applicant guidebook but also for ICANN policy in general.

So, to say that the book has been published and there is only eight weeks for the application round to open and there is no time for the Board to look at that, on this matter or on any other matter on gTLD process or any other process, is not correct.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much, Siva. Justine, would you be interested in responding to this since you're, I could say, perhaps queen of the PDP, although there are several queens of PDPs that I can think of.

JUSTINE CHEW Thank you, Olivier. This is Justine. So, I hear what you're saying, Siva, but the process is that any recommendation has to be approved by the Board at the end of the day. The Board is also, I think, quite cognizant to not intervene with the multi-stakeholder process of the PDP.

So, any reversal or renewal or adding on of existing policy recommendations will have to probably be dealt with by the GNSO through another PDP. For example, when the 2012 round was completed, we have the subsequent procedures PDP to review what happened then and then change the policy.

So, there was already existing policy that supported the 2012 round. The subsequent procedures made new changes to the policy to enable the 2026 round. That is the process. So, the Board, I don't think they're in a position to intervene that way unless they decide to not accept a policy recommendation.

And the Board resolution that approved the applicant guidebook was very, very clear that they are not going to entertain any more changes to the applicant guidebook except for the parts that remain incomplete. So, if you're not happy about that, then you have to take it up with the Board. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much for this, Justine. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I understand there is also Frederic Taes with his hand up in the room.

FREDERIC TAES Indeed. Frederic speaking. Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, all the team. I spoke with the chair of the PDP on Latin Diacritics the last days. About the planning, it's foreseen to have the final report ready by September this year for GNSO Council. That's just about the timing.

And he mentioned to me that in the many feedback from the public consultation and the comments, the majority is linked to points that were closed already in the past, but if you see just this document, just this policy, some questions raised, and that is

slowing down the process, and maybe an idea of improvement for the future is to have complementary documents for the commenters and the reviewers.

If you have comments about this, please refer to those other policies, all the decisions already taken to not reopen closed case, I would say. That was the main point about the timing impacts and the status. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Federic. Much appreciated. It's Olivier speaking. And I gather we have covered now most of the first part of the policy workgroup and small team updates. What we also do have then immediately after that is the At-Large Policy Initiatives of which there are two that we follow.

One is on DNS abuse, a constant agenda item, and the other one on the IETF, Internet Engineering Task Force, Intellectual Property Management Corporation, IPMC. On DNS abuse, I guess that we usually ask Jonathan Zuck for a few words on this. I know there's a lot going on at this meeting, isn't there?

JONATHANA ZUCK: Yes, an awful lot, none of which involves me. But we have a team of folks that are engaged in the first PDP on DNS abuse on Associated Domain lookups. I don't know if somebody's been designated. Steinar or Eunice, do you want to say something briefly about it?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Actually, Jonathan, just jumping in. It's Olivier speaking. The second part of this session is all going to be about DNS abuse mitigation. So, no doubt Steinar will have plenty of time to speak at that point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Well, then there's nothing more to add for this section then.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you so much, Jonathan. Thank you. So, that's one, and then the other one was the IETF IPMC, a process that's taking place in the IETF with no updates at the moment. Then we have the Implementation Team Review Updates. And in fact, in your agenda, this is a separate agenda position because it's Avri Doria that usually does those.

And also, she also follows up with our policy statement updates, the policy pipeline, the pipeline by which the ALAC and the At-Large community write these statements that then get sent to the Board, get sent to the policy development process consultations, etc., etc. So, I'm going to hand the baton over to Avri for her to take us through this. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Olivier. Avri speaking. But don't get too relaxed because I'll be giving it back to you right soon. On the review of Implementation Review Team Activities, just to point out how important that one is, that's sort of after everything's been approved and the implementation has begun. And then we get to a point of what did they mean when they said that in the policy?

Oh, when we're implementing that, it doesn't quite work the way it was assumed to, so how do we take this policy and make it work. And often it's the discussions in the Implementation Review Team that lead to those occurrences we're starting to see of the Board having to look at its decisions again, of the GNSO having to ask the Board to look at its decisions again.

So, that's why the IRT is really, I think, among the most important steps in the process because it's, can we actually build something that meets the policies we just spent three years agreeing on? So, we have two of those that are in that particular mode at the moment. One of them is PPSI, the privacy and proxy work that has been on hiatus, and I assume is still on hiatus unless Alan or someone else wants to tell me otherwise. Is that correct? Nobody is telling me I'm wrong, so I'll use that as an indication that I might be right. Never more than that. Just might be.

Okay, the next one is the new gTLD, the one that's the topic of the day for many. It's the future that is imminent and upon us. But because there are items that were not included in the first application guidebook and are therefore being worked on, things

to do, for example, with Trademark Clearinghouse, and I'm not sure what else at the moment, there have occasionally been IRT meetings for that.

I'm an observer on that, not active, but that I think we have another one coming back. Justine, who is not here at the moment. Oh, she is here. She just wasn't where I was used to looking for her. Is there anything going on there that's worth reporting on?

JUSTINE CHEW I'm not aware of any other IRT calls that have been scheduled, but I think there will be after ICANN85, as you mentioned. And I mentioned just now that in terms of the Board resolution, there are a few things that are still missing from the applicant guidebook.

So, we have been working through those things with the ICANN Org team, and I think they should be coming back to us with the final copies for inclusion into the applicant guidebook. So, things like Avri mentioned trademarks clearinghouse, name collisions, registry fees which is part of the base registry agreement and that sort of thing.

AVRI DORIA Thank you. Okay. So, if there's any questions on IRT, otherwise I'll move on. So, then the next thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR Avri.

AVRI DORIA Yes. Am I missing a hand out?

CHERYL LANGODN-ORR Thank you. Just me waving from the great beyond.

AVRI DORIA Yes, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Okay, just a little adjunct to what Justine was saying, something very near and dear to ALAC At-Large as art is the Applicant Support Program. And I did notice in recent email exchanges they were still open and looking for mentors to assist any successful supported applicants under the ASB. So, some of the people here may know people or be even interested themselves to offer this type of structural support for potential new gTLD applicants.

But while we're talking about Applicant Support Program, we might want to come back at a future CPWG call and just have a little look at where we are in terms of how the progress is going with the number of applicants who got in by the deadline and how the progress of being approved or otherwise as a supported applicant is going as well, because it's certainly something that our communities put a huge amount of effort into. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I want to thank you for having brought that up. I know at least one group of people that has made it through to approval for that, and they're counting on that help. In other words, it's not just the money and the reduction of fee that they're counting on. They are counting on that promise of help that makes it possible for them to not have to spend a lot of time on consultants that understand all the ICANN arcana and can actually help them through the application.

So, if you're a person that can volunteer and can provide such expert help for no fee but a lot of thanks, this is an opportunity, please do it because those people are counting for you. You are part of the reward that they were applying for or part of the, yes, part of the award they were applying for. So, thank you for bringing that one up. Okay.

The next thing that would normally be in our meeting is to go to the review comments. And part of that that we're going to go to is the special one on DNS abuse. I just wanted to mention that we do have one. We're not going to go into it to any extent, but we have one on draft guidelines for advancing UA adoption, an important subject, as we saw in our earlier meeting, and one that's active. It's being reviewed at the moment, it's got a small team working on it, and what's their next schedule?

So, they're working on their bullet points. Bullet points, anybody that hasn't been following CPWG, is the first step in deciding this is

important enough for end users to comment on. This is important enough for the work that ALAC does to comment on, and the bullet points explain why this is important enough for there to be an ALAC response, an ALAC comment response.

So, it's the first step in, do we write something? And then after that, if the bullets say, yes, we must write something, and the group says, yes, we agree with you, you should write something, then something is written, and we go through a process of approving it and then sending it to ALAC for further approval. As I said, this is sort of an encapsulation in part of the tutorial of what CPWG does, and it isn't just party. So, that is being worked on, it has a small group.

At our next meeting, we'll be going through the bullets, assuming they produce some, to decide where to move next with that. I just wanted to not ignore it, but don't want to get into it at the moment. So, the next thing on the agenda, unless there's a hand or something that I'm ignoring. It really is fun to pay attention.

Usually when I do CPWG meetings, I have four screens in front of me, and it's almost easy to keep track of. But with just one little screen here, but carrying four screens is just too much. So, anyhow, DNS abuse mitigation. I know it says that I'm going to be leading that conversation. That's not true. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I actually put my hand up just to close off on the policy pipeline, because I think, so you mentioned, well, the last statement that was indeed agreed was the Latin Script Diacritics PDP initial report. We've got the name collision procedure documentation, and we've got the proposed root key signing key algorithm rollover that's also opened in this at the moment.

I would just refer people to the last consolidated Policy Working Group call for links to these processes. And policy keeps on happening, so the pipeline never ends. The thing keeps on moving forward and forward. Anyway, that's just to close off on this section. So, thank you very much, Avri. And now we've got the second part of our meeting today, and that's about the DNS abuse mitigation.

As Jonathan mentioned earlier, there are quite a number of points that, well, quite a number of sessions that deal with this. And we felt that because this is going to be a hot topic during this meeting, we have meetings with the other parts of ICANN to discuss this, we've also got a plenary happening later on, which no doubt we will be making marketing in a moment. The DNS abuse mitigation topic is one where we had a small group that looked at it with Steinar Grøtterød, Kathleen Scoggin, Claire Craig, and Eunice Alejandra Pérez Coello.

And they have put together a presentation. In fact, Eunice put together a wonderful presentation. And as Steinar is in the room,

then we're going to be able to start, perhaps not with the end of the presentation, but with the beginning of it, which I believe is going to be uploaded.

And Steinar Grøtterød will then start to provide us with a background of what this is all about and about this new PDP, Policy Development Process Group, that is being created as we speak and that will start its work soon. Over to you, Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD Good morning, good evening, everybody. This is Steinar for the record. I think that we should actually go straight to the presentation done by Eunice, because that highlights things that we want to inform CPWG about and also creates some questions to At-Large in general, and end users about what we hopefully will achieve with this PDP. And as you said, Olivier, there will be very hot topics on DNS abuse mitigation at this meeting also, and I assume it will continue for several ICANN meetings. So, with that, Eunice, over to you.

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ COELLO Thank you very much, Steinar. Hello, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and thanks for joining this CPWG session. The purpose of this short presentation is to provide At-Large a brief introduction to the Dines Abuse Mitigation, PDP 1, which is the policy development process. One minute. Can we pass to the next slide, please?

Thank you very much. With this context, the GNSO initiated a formal policy process to examine whether the current framework of policy and contractual obligation adequately addresses some of these issues. And in this presentation, we will look at many aspects and how we go to this PDP and to understand the original PDP 1. Is it useful to briefly review the recent policy development?

In 2025, the GNSO Council established a DNS Abuse Small Team to review recent development in DNS abuse mitigations and evaluate the areas where the existing policy framework might require improvement. This analysis considered several elements, including recent data on abuse campaigns, operational experience from actors within the DNS ecosystem, and prior discussions with the ICANN community.

The small team report identified several potential areas where policy gaps might exist, meaning situations where the current policy framework might not fully address a particular problem. But in that report, the GENSO Council requests the preparation and issue report, which is the document used with ICANN to determine whether a topic should be moved forward into a formal policy development process.

The preliminary use report was published for public comment, allowing different parts of the community to share their views on the potential area of policy works. Following this public comment period, the final issues report recommended initially two

separated policy development processes to add us to different topics. And we can change. The next slide, please.

So this first PDP, which focuses on associated the domains checks, and the second PDP, which we examined, safeguards related to automatic ledge scale. I think we passed another slide. The last slide is a timeline about this. But thank you. Yes, the next slide, please. This is what I'm talking about, okay.

Well, another important feature of the PDP is that the scope to deliver it is limited, hence the council chose to approach in order to assure that the policy process remains manageable and focused on clearly defined questions. PDP 1 is strictly limited to examine associated domain checks. This means that the working group will know attempts to review the entire DNS abuse mitigation process framework or redefine what constitutes DNS abuse.

Another topic is identify during the issue report process will be addressed through separated process. For example, issue related to server around automated domain registration tools will be examined under PDP 2. Could you pass to the next slide, please?

And the core questions. Oh, the next slide, I think. Thank you. The charter of the working group established the central question that we guide the discussion. The first issue the group must examine is whether a policy gap actually exists regarding associated domain checks. If the analysis concludes that such gap exists, the group will then consider whether it would be appropriated to introduce additional requirements. And if so, what safeguard might be

necessary to ensure that any measures adopted are proportionate and effective.

So, this analysis may involve examining several factors, including the effectiveness of possible measures, their technical and operational feasibility, and the potential impact on different actors within the DNS ecosystem. And in this context, discussion may also touch on broader consideration such as proportionality, the process or potential implication to the internet user. Next slide, please.

The working group has been formed following ICANN's multi-stakeholder models. In this table, you see all the groups that could be participants. This means that representatives from a wide rank of stakeholder groups are participating in the process, including registrars, registries, commercial, and non-commercial use groups, governments, as well as advisory committees and members of the technical community.

This presence of this diversity of perspective is a fundamental element of ICANN policies, development models, and it's helped to ensure that different viewpoints are considered during this discussion. So, in the next slide, can we see what is the participation on the members of working group and At-Large also has active representations, members of ALAC community, participating the PDPS member participants and observers.

The role of At-Large, particularly important because their mandates is to represent the interests of Internet users. Can we

pass to the next slide, please? Well, during this ICANN85, the working group will hold the first meeting. This session will mark the formal beginning of the PDP substantive work. And this early stage is likely that discussion will focus on organizing the work of the group, reviewing the scope, define it in the charter, and agreeing on the methodology that will be used to examine the question raised in the process.

In many PDPs, the initial meetings are devoted to building a shared understanding of the problem before moving toward possible policy approaches. Can we pass to the next slide, please? Thank you. And in addition to the working group session, At-Large will also host a plenary session. I think I just mentioned in the first session yesterday, it's a plenary session focused on DNS abuse mitigation. This session could provide the opportunity for a broader community.

Discussion involving multiple stakeholder's groups among the topics expected to be discussed is a reflection on the PDP process, coordination around other forms of DNA abuse, such as domain-generated algorithms, and identification of additional areas that might require policy work in the future. Can we pass to the next slide, please? Thank you. Since the PDP is only beginning, it's still too early for the community to adopt a firm position.

However, it is useful for the At-Large community to begin reflecting on a number of important questions. For example, what outcome the community hopes to see this policy process, what concerns

might arise from the perspective of internet end users, and what principles should guide the participation of ALAC representatives in the working group discussion. These early reflections can help shape the engagement of At-Large representatives as the PDP progress.

And can we pass to the next slide? And I want to give the floor to Kathleen to present this last slide. And this slide is the community discussion. Kathleen, the floor is yours.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Sure. Thanks, everyone, and thanks, Eunice, for a really great overview on what is going to happen in the next few days. We start our sessions, as you said, this afternoon, so there will be some more logistical areas as well, too. Oh, sorry. There will be some more logistical things to begin with as we start the PDP, but a good time for the community to start reflecting on this issue. So, we put a couple questions on the screen.

I know we talked in previous ICANNs about the issue report and a little bit about a summary of that. So, if there are concerns highlighted out of that early on in the process and anything that we should know as the group representing the interests of the At-Large in the PDP as we continue on. So, I think these questions and also the questions in the last slide are good ones to open for discussion if anyone has thoughts. Yeah, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK I don't know if it directly sends some of these questions. My first concern, I guess, is the idea that there's an exploration about whether a gap exists. Do you anticipate a lot of pushback on the notion of there being a problem needing to be solved? I had the impression with this particular PDP that everybody was kind of going in with the idea that we knew the problem and we were going to try to solve it as opposed to this gap analysis. This seems to suggest it's an open field question whether or not we even have a problem that needs solving.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN From my understanding, at least, they've identified that a gap exists, the question is, how do we move forward? So, there's some gap analysis to ensure that the scope of the PDP is appropriate as they've check in what they've already decided in the initial issue report. But I'll let Steinar, too, if he has other things to add on that front.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND All right. Thank you very much. I was going to let Steinar, yes, take the floor. In fact, I think we've got a couple of the representatives who are involved in this who might have a few words to share as well, and some then who are not involved. And obviously, the floor is being open to everyone now to comment as well from what you've heard, what you've seen, and what the concerns are and the

questions that Kathleen has enumerated and that are currently on your screen. Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi, this is Steinar for the record. First of all, Siva has his hand up. I'd like to hear his comment first.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Sivasubramanian. If this PDP is about possible gaps, shouldn't the scope again be open-ended? It's the same question, but it makes sense to keep the scope a little open-ended until it becomes very clear that all gaps are identified.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: And this is Steinar for the record. Thank you, Siva. Will we ever identify all gaps? That's my initial question. I'm not sure about that. First of all, I'd like to pay attention to the last question here, because as one from At-Large, it's of importance, at least for me, to have some sort of feedback what we should kind of focus on in this PDP.

So, I really hope that there are people in this room or attending this session that can give us some sort of bullet points that we should take further into the discussion. I also think I would like to mention, and first of all, Eunice, thank you for the presentation, and Kathleen, I'm looking forward to work with you all.

But I think this is one of the things that are more in the proactive area of DNS mitigation. We have, in the previous contractual work with the registries and registrars, kind of focused on what to do when things are being identified. My understanding here with this PDP for associated domain names is also that, first of all, this is more or less on the registrar's side, and this has been also signaled in the number of representatives from the registrars.

That is four, normally it is two. But this is something that the registrar has to do and they discover something that is suspicious one way or another. And my understanding is that this policy is trying to create a process where the registrars are obliged to trying to find if there is a pattern and then action those domain names that are in this pattern.

Most likely, these domain names are registered, but the key thing here is to actually keep the time live on the internet as a minimum. Because then the idea, as far as I understand, is that as soon as we manage to mitigate a suspicious domain name, the harm is less than if it stays there forever.

So, the outcome here will most likely be some sort of a policy that sets requirements on the registrar's side what to do. And that creates, at least in my mind, a set of sub-questions that are yet to be defined. But I think one key thing here is what is the tools that are mandated or required for the registrar to do. Now, I see a lot of signals that someone wants to talk.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I'm just jumping in. Thank you, Steinar. I wanted to actually before that give the floor to just two people. First, Claire Craig, who is following us remotely, because I know that she had a few points to make as well. She was part of the prep team for this session. And so, if she's able to speak, that would be great.

And then Avri Doria has also put her hand up, and I know she also has to intervene. And we can open the floor to then everyone and continue the flow. I hope not to break the floor like this. I can't see the whole room. Claire Craig, are you able to say a few words?

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thanks for this opportunity, Olivier. This is Claire Craig. Sitting from where I sit, I am just concerned that there is a mailing list right now, and as the presentation spoke to, there are four sessions this week.

And I think part of those sessions would be to help us to define how this PDP is going to move forward, particularly right now, there is a desire, let's say, by some of the person, the chair, to have two-hour meetings over the next, I mean, two two-hour meetings a week, which persons are actually saying that that is too much and we need to really define what we want to do, what we want to accomplish, how soon we want to accomplish all of those things.

So, at this stage, I am just kind of waiting to see where this goes before I jump in and have very much to say on this. So, thank you for giving me the opportunity just to say that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Claire. Claire, of course, is joining us remotely. Avri Doria is next. And then in the queue, just to acknowledge, I have Justine Chew and Jonathan Zuck who are queuing up. And if there's anybody else, could they please wave their hand around and someone. magically will inform me of them putting their hand up. Over to you, Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking. I'm going to bring up what has been, as I said earlier, probably my favorite subject at ICANN since I first walked in the door in 2005, and that's the notion of human rights. At that point, we didn't say human rights impact assessments. We used to just talk about human rights, and everybody would shake their head and said, human rights, what do we care about that? That just gets in the way of profit-making.

Actually, they didn't say that last part. I just assumed they were thinking it. And I should admit that. But the people that work on it keep putting it forward. And so, it's really exciting to me to see that we now have a PDP that includes specific statements, specific instructions on the notion of doing a human rights impact assessment.

Now, those have become somewhat popular these days. They're doing more and more of them in AI, and indeed they're becoming checkbox exercises. So, I'm really hoping that ICANNs ends up more than just a checkbox. One of the important parts of it, and this even shows up in some of the discussion is when we're talking about the remedies, we're also talking about the proportionality.

And one of the things that becomes an issue within any of the human rights issues is, one, the legality of it all. But legality is kind of hard to deal with because, look at who makes the laws. Is legality always good enough? You can make many awful things legal. So, that's important. The proportionality, though, is an interesting one, and it's an interesting one that I think ICANN may be able to actually contribute to the discussion because proportionality looks different depending upon what side of the argument you're on.

There are many human rights. There isn't just the human right of association, just the one of speech, just the one of being safe in one's property. So, it'll be important now to watch as the commercial interests and the human interests, the user interests, are indeed juxtaposed against each other in the proportionality discussions. Because the proportionality discussions can be hand-waved as somewhat subjective. I see it as a big penalty to cut me off quickly, whereas you see it as necessary to protect.

And both of those are indeed you do have a right to be protected in certain sense, and you do have a right to speak and use things in certain non-harmful ways. So, how are we going to adjust those?

When we're talking about human rights, I know people say it bears on the registrants, it bears on the registrars, and yet human rights are always about the individual end user.

When you get right down to it, when you're talking about rights, you're talking about the end users. So, I actually see a very important role for ALAC and At-Large, not that we all have the same common view, we all come at this notion from very different perspectives of what is proper, what is proportional, what is legal, etc. So, I can actually see us having some very substantive and good conversations on what do we need, what do we need to do, what do we need to argue for within this PDP.

So, I just wanted to bring that up. I think those were the points I wanted to make there. But, yeah, so, I don't mean to start the proportionality discussion right now because I think that's going to be an interesting discussion over time. And it's one I've often wanted to see discussed because the people on both sides of this rights discussion can make arguments about what is not proportional, what is not proper to do because that's a way over-the-limit obligation or that's way under the limit need for protection in terms of protecting our rights.

So, I'm really hoping that we will be able to sort of structure some discussions going forward so that we have at least a learned view of where this group, which is very interesting because it's all people with a declared image in the end user, all a declared interest. I

know sometimes people talk about states having rights. That's not what we mean. But all these human rights belong to the humans.

Our end users are humans, and there's a certain coordination between the two. There's a certain correspondence between those two sets of individuals. So, I'm really hoping that we can actually get into this with some depth going forward. And I really just wanted to take, and obviously I'll be happy to engage in those discussions. I have my own views about what's proportional and what's not. That's not the point.

We all have our own view about what's proportional and what's not, and it's a wonderful opportunity for us to have a really in-depth conversation on something that's critically important to the Internet going forward, etc. So, I've done my preachy speech, and let's talk about proportionality, folks. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you, Avri. Next is Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW Thanks, Olivier. I just want to make two points. One is in response to Siva's original question. If I understood you correctly, you're talking about open-ended gap list. That list still exists, but we're just picking the top one off the list at the moment to deal with, and that's what this PDP is about, which is associated domain checks. That does not mean that the other gaps have fallen off.

As I said earlier, GNSO Council has identified three based on cross-community input as the top three to take a first step with. So, the first one is associated domain checks, the second one is the API access for bulk registration, the third one is supposed to be the domain-generated algorithms, or views out of that, but that one, as I said, there's a question as to whether that should be put through a PDP or just come up with just community best practices. And that list is not limited to these three.

There are about 30+ gaps that have been identified, not just by us, but across community, from registries, registrars, NCSG, CSG, and GAC even. GAC mentioned things in the communique. But we have to take the reason why GNSO Council is now going to a trial, a PDP, just to focus on one narrow issue is to try and improve the process of PDP to speed things up because they do acknowledge the fact that people think PDPs take too long.

So, they've come up with this new format to make it narrowly scoped, just dealing with one issue, and hopefully we'll get it done faster. And before I let you talk, just in response to Avri's point about human rights, my understanding is that there is an existing human rights impact assessment that is applicable, it's an ICANN thing. It was done in association with the transfer policy review, but my understanding, it was done at the, if I can put it simply, it was done at the back end.

So, it was a check at the back end. So, once the policy recommendations were created, then they did a check against this

list to see if there were any egregious, what do you call it, violations of the checklist. And it's not just about human rights, we also have a global public interest framework checklist. So, there's two very important checklists. This particular PDP on associated domain name checks, my understanding is those two checks are going to be integrated at the front end rather than doing at the end.

So, it's going to be a very vast improvement of how we deal with these issues under human rights and global public interest. And just to end, I don't know that we can have a proper conversation about those two checks, those two lists of assessment, because they have been incorporated into the charter, so I don't think it's going to be changed.

There was actually some, if I can just impart, there were some discussions on GNSO Council that some people wanted to change the human rights assessment impact, but I think we came to the conclusion that we did not want to delay the start of the PDP. So, we came to a consensus that we will use the existing human rights impact assessment as well as the existing global public interest assessment framework for this particular PDP. But that's not to say that these two documents are set in stone.

So, I would like to have a separate conversation on how well these two lists work in general. And I have already put into our capacity building calendar those two items, so it's a question of timing. And I want to do that later part of the year because I want to see how the PDP functions with those two checklists at the front end, and

it's going to be vital to have the input of our team members as to how well these things are working. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK Thanks, Olivier. A lot's been said. I wanted to just come back, I guess, to these questions, the three questions that were sort of asked of us. And my first thing that I want to say may be part of that proportionality discussion we'll eventually have, which is this issue of timing. I think that one of the things that seems to continue to plague discussions of the Contracted Party House is being able to set expectations about the time frame in which things should occur.

As Steinar mentioned, this is being a proactive tactic, but it's different than sort of devaluating things on the way into the registration process. This is still reactive to a problem being identified in one website, and that then being the trigger to go check other websites associated with it that may have been up and running and unreported prior to look for similarly maliciously registered domains.

And so, I think time frame is something that's going to be critical to success in this. We went for years and years on a vague recommendation that registrars needed to have a policy to deal with reports, and there was no explicit requirement to mitigate

until the contract amendments that took place very recently. So, somehow the requirement to actually take action took something like 16 years to actually be put in place.

And so, I think, again, a requirement to take action within a particular time frame and a quick time frame has got to be part of this conversation. And that may very well be where a conversation about human rights will come into play. And so, therefore, the counterbalance to that is that the conversation probably also needs to include some sort of appeals process or remediation process to account for that.

That's going to be a constant tension. If things happen quickly, it's going to be more likely to create mistakes that have human rights implications. But if they happen slowly, then it means that the actual efficacy of the policy will be impacted significantly. And so, I think that's going to be one of the areas of tension as we try to address these questions as the At-Large community.

So, I would look to both of those things, a requirement to take action and within a particular time frame are things that we should… hopefully our representatives are taking into serious consideration, because there are things that seem to continue to go up. I mean, even the request for data under urgent circumstances, life-threatening thing, the time frame on that is this incredible discussion that's still taking place. So, I can only imagine it being worse here.

Those are things that pop into my mind. But I share Avri's desire to bring this conversation of human rights assessments into the At-Large. I think it is something we care about. We've had this distinction between registrant and non-registrant and users, and there are, in fact, more non-registrant and users than there are registrants. And that becomes part of the counterbalance, but at the same time, there are implications broader that affect everyone to human rights deteriorating around the world.

And so, let's definitely have those conversations as a community so that we speak as one voice on them as we move out into the ICANN community. So, I support Avri in bringing that conversation into this room. So, thank you, Avri. And thank you for representing us.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. So, I understand Avri wishes to respond directly to Justine. And then after that, we'll have Hadia Elminiawi and Siva is also in the queue, and I see Eunice is also in the queue, and we probably will have a full queue until the end of this call. So, perhaps of this call, this meeting, sorry. So, perhaps we will close off with Eunice as she started it and she'll be able to close it off. So, over to Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. Yeah, I think the fact that we're starting this at the beginning is actually quite wonderful. I mean, one of the things, it was exciting when we got one in last time, and

it was done by a staff member at the end doing an analysis, and they did an interesting analysis, but yet it was at the end, and their comment was, doing it at the end is really impossible.

So, I'm really glad that we're doing that. I personally do mind that we're starting with a framework because starting with a blank piece of paper is really hard, and having a framework now that we can change, amend, argue about, and the framework, it's full of words. And anything that's full of words, there's a lot we can argue about and find nuances in. So, I'm not too concerned about having a framework that will restrict me too much. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Avri. Hadia Elminiawi, thank you for your patience. Over to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia Elminiawi for the record. So, I raised my hand because Jonathan, in the beginning, and I guess we had on one of the slides, it said maybe defining if a gap exists in relation to associated domain checks. And I was looking, and Jonathan did ask about this, and so, I checked the charter and the purpose, and I did not find this.

So, the questions and the charter questions, as well as the purpose, do clearly state that there is a gap when it comes to associated domain checks, and they're looking for the purpose. And so, the

purpose clearly says defining the scope and triggers for requiring an associated domain check.

But then again, in response to the questions that we have in front of us where it says are there areas of concern that should be highlighted early. And Jonathan, for example, mentioned timelines. And I do find this within the charter questions. So, we do have what are appropriate timelines and thresholds for initiating and concluding the associated domain check?

Potential also, outcomes and careful consideration. I'm just mentioning this in order to ask if there are any other concerns. So, for example, the charter says, you what data access and privacy safeguards are necessary? So, privacy. If the associated domain checks have an adverse impact on domain name registrants.

So, those are things that require careful consideration. So, other than privacy and negative impact on registrants, do we have any timelines, as Jonathan mentioned? Do we have any other concerns related to this, to the implementation of such a policy? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you for this, Hadia. It's Olivier speaking. Does anyone in the… any of our leaders in the PDP wish to respond to this? Perhaps Steinar, do you have any words, or should we just go through the queue and then you can do your final words after Eunice?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD	Steinar for the records. Let's go to the queue and take it from there.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND	Okay, thank you for this. Next is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.
SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY	Thank you, Olivier. This PDP is indeed a very good step in the right direction. And by talking about not being open-ended, what I meant is that we should be open-ended about the chosen three items. That could be a fourth item or something else that comes up. The idea is not to straightjacket or harsh-sight a working group. That shouldn't be done to a working group, that shouldn't be done to an AC/SO, that shouldn't be done to a Board. So, there must be some room always for anything related to the well-being of the ICANN processes. Thank you.
OLIVIEER CREPIN-LEBLOND	Thank you for this Siva. And finally, Eunice, please. Eunice Alejandra Pérez Coello.
EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ COELLO	Thank you very much. I will speak in Spanish. Thank you. I'd like to answer Hadia's question. In the document that you shared, which is version 3 at the beginning, when you talk about the questions and the scope in this PDP, when the gaps should be identified. Well, it's not before when the proposal is talked about,

about how it should be specified, for instance, which domain names are associated, etc.

Right at the start, scope and charter questions is the title, and in that part, you can see that first we have to identify the gap so that afterwards, we can then specify the questions. So, against this backdrop, from what I've understood in this PDP, is that we're talking about the terms of the registry agreement or the contract between ICANN and a registry operator.

What we have to understand is, well, if I make a mistake, please do correct me, the registry is operating the TLD and the registry agreement establishes that the obligations that the operator has basically establishes what those obligations are before ICANN. So, the contract that exists between registrars and ICANN, and that is the company that sells TLDs to final users, and that is where we have to identify in accordance with the contractual obligations that have already been signed if the registrars meet these obligations in order to sell TLDs.

This is important because ICANN can't force obligations on users who register domain names. ICANN can only impose obligations on the entities with which it has a contract. I think we have to be very clear about that, because that's what we have to analyze during this PDP. We have to identify which gaps exist.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eunice, for this. And I'll hand the floor over to close in or close off, I'm not sure which one of the two, over to Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi, this is Steinar for the record. First of all, thank you very much for all the input and the good points here. There will be hard times ahead, I guess, in many ways. We're going to be very interested to see how the other stakeholders and advisory committees are approaching this PDP. I don't think the way we see things is necessarily the only way? Definitely not.

So, let's see. And we promise to keep CPWG updated and ask for feedback when needed. And again, thank you for all those who have volunteered to spend a lot of free time in this. We are in the group of non-paid workers, so here we are. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And thank you very much to all of those people who are volunteering to be in those policy development processes. As you mentioned, we are all volunteers, and some of those works take an enormous amount of time. We heard earlier about the GNSO wanting to shorten the length of PDPs. I think they had a PDP on PDPs to shorten them and that PDP still hasn't ended for some reason, it seems.

So, that goes on into this open-ended thing. But I hope this was helpful, this session was helpful for the input to your team, you and others. And thanks very much for everyone to take part. Now, I'm going to ask just Ozan, when will our next meeting be, the next meeting of the Consolidated Policy Working Group?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Olivier. This is support staff Ozan Sahin for the record. So, the final day of ICANN85 is 12th of March. Unfortunately, we will not have interpretation services in the week immediately after ICANN85. That's why the next CPWG meeting will be scheduled on Wednesday, 25th of March at 1400 UTC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Ozan. It's Olivier speaking. And I'm going to hand the floor, I guess, to finish this meeting, to Avri Doria for the last words. And then she'll have to hand over to staff for logistic, local logistic reasons. Over to you, Avri. And thank you, everyone, for attending this.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Olivier. At the beginning, I had said there was another business topic, that will be put on the next agenda. Perhaps we'll get some conversation. So, Steinar, this is an early warning that I will be coming to you next time to talk to us about .radio and what it means to be a community TLD that passes to a different regime. So, with that, I thank you all. It was a good meeting, it was good

conversation, and that's it for me. So, is it Gissela or is it someone else doing the logistics? It's Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH

Okay, this is Heidi. Thank you for closing the meeting, Avri. Just to let you know, there's now lunch until 13:15. The next meeting will be in this room. It's the Art of Productive Meetings. I've just heard that at the NIXI stand, which I believe is immediately outside, they are giving away some goodies, so you might wish to go there. And also, directly outside in the main hall, there are a couple of food stands, Mumbai street food stands that you can, I believe, purchase some food there. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Yeah, and food would be available, I think, from tomorrow. NIXI would be giving coupons. I'm not sure how it would be, but not today. But there are bags and some goodies they have, you can collect it from there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]