
ICANN86 Seville | PF – At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG)
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 11:45 to 13:15 CEST

NATHALIE PEREGRINE

Hello and welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Party Working Group. My name is Nathalie Peregrine. 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 out loud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for the session includes English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. 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, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I'll now hand the floor back to Avri Doria and Olivier Crepin-Leblond, the CPWG co-chairs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much, Nathalie. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and welcome to today's Consolidated Policy Working Group

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.

meeting, hybrid meeting. I'm over in London. Avri is on the ground in Seville. And today we're going to be going through a number of our usual items and of course, the CPWG's activities. And then after that, we'll have a statement to look at as well that is in the pipeline.

The At-Large community has two active working groups doing things on a weekly basis. One is the Consolidated Policy Working Group that deals with policy, all and anything to do with ICANN domain name policy, et cetera. Lots of things happening in the Generic Name Support Organization, but also in other parts of ICANN. The other group is the Operational Finance and Budget Working Group that meets on a different day, and they deal with the budgets of ICANN and many internet governance statements and things that take place.

So, today, we're talking about policy. And the first thing that we will be looking at is our usual reports, not really reports, updates, quick updates from our people, volunteers in the At-Large community that are taking part in the generic name supporting organization policy development processes. These at the moment incorporate the Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group, the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP-1 Working Group, the System for Standardized Access and Disclosure Supplemental Recommendation Team, otherwise known as SSAD-SRT Working Group.

And then the one which is the Registration Data Request Service, RDRS, that before used to be called the SSAD Operational Design

Assessment, ODA. And the Latin Diacritics Policy Development Process, Latin diacritics being these accents that you find in other cedillas, et cetera on the Latin character set.

We do have some groups, well, groups, PDP groups that finish their work. And in the past, the IANA naming function review, the expedited PDP on internationalized domain names, the transfer policy review process, and the registration data accuracy scoping team. All these are now marked as inactive, and you can have a look at their history on the website.

So, looking at the policy workgroups, I can't see the room, so I'm not sure who we have in the room or online that is able to provide us with a quick update. And I'm going to call them up, maybe call up each group, and then Avri is going to be able to help us out. Is there anyone with the Universal Acceptance working group?

AVRI DORIA

Satish, if he's willing. Yes, I see his microphone is on so Satish, please.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Avri. Thanks, Olivier. I think we have already provided an update yesterday on the current status of the Universal Acceptance activities. We had mentioned in particular the UA Day, which is the largest so far in the history of UA Days, which basically for us in ALAC it reflects the kind of active engagement ALAC has had in the Universal Acceptance activities.

So, currently we are awaiting the expert group, which is appointed by ICANN late in 2025. They had put out the draft guidelines and ALAC has actually responded to the public, called for public comments, and we are now awaiting the final guidelines from the Expert Working Group so that we can get more active in the future activities of Universal Acceptance. I'll stop here. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much, Satish. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and thanks for being very concise. Since we haven't got so much time today, we're just looking for light updates so that's great. You set the scene perfectly well. The next one on my list at the moment is the one on the DNS abuse mitigation PDP-1. Do we have someone for that?

AVRI DORIA

Yes, we have several people. Do either Kathleen or Steinar want to start? Kathleen? Later on the agenda, right. So, we do have people.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

We'll talk about it later.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, whatever.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

There's a longer presentation coming about it, so I think it's worth just waiting until then.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Okay, fine. That's good, too. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. That's good, too. Definitely, we can come back to that when you've got your long presentation. The next one is the System for Standardized Access and Disclosure Supplemental Recommendation Team, the SSAD ODA. I know that Allan is usually the person in charge of that, but we've also got Murray McKersher, but I think that we've also got a longer presentation about this later on today's call and meeting, sorry. So, we can bank that for the time being.

Then there's the RDRS, Registration Data Request Service. Again, Allan Greenberg, who is currently in the NomCom, is the person that usually provides us with an update on this. So, I'm not sure, I don't think there's someone in the room. And finally, the Latin Diacritics Policy Development Process, having just heard from Satish Babu, perhaps we can have a quick update on this as well, but I am aware that there was some updating about it already.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Olivier. Satish, again, for the record. Yeah, we did have an update yesterday, but for the newcomers here, the Latin Diacritics PDP is on its last final phase of work. Having put out its draft

recommendation, 54 recommendations, a few months back, we had opened up for public comments. We have received the public comments, it is now closed, and the group is now working through the public comments received.

We did have a little bit of a hiatus when some participants in the group wanted to bring up the issue of the definition of what a diacritic was because the working group had assumed a definition when it started out. It turns out that that assumption was not wrong, but it is not complete. There were other elements which could also have been considered at that point, but those weren't. So, this debate went on for a little bit of time, but right now, we are very close to a formal closure on this. And hopefully by maybe next month, all the work would be done and we'll be on our way to the final 54 recommendations. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks very much for this quick update, Satish. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and that's the part on the policy development process. And as you can see, some of it is going to be talked about in a moment because of the time we have specifically allocated to a couple of these processes. I'll hand the floor over to Avri Doria, I think, or just before -- Yeah, no, we do have also the At-Large policy initiatives. I didn't quite see that. It somehow fell in between the marks here.

So, the two policy initiatives which are currently listed in our working group are the one on DNS abuse, it's an ongoing item and

the At-Large community and our chair have been extremely vocal about this as something that affects end users very much. And I think that we as a group and as a part of ICANN, can take some credit as to making sure that this has now reached the forefront of many of ICANN's discussions. The DNS abuse debate is very different from what it was maybe two years, five years ago, and certainly things are being done.

The other one was the ITF Intellectual Property Management Corporation, where there is a transfer of the IANA intellectual property registration from one organization to another. It used to be under the IETF Trust, and it's now under the Intellectual Property Management Corporation. That's an ongoing thing and the group is -- Well, I've seen some movement on the group's mailing list and there's some discussion and perhaps even some confusion in some still as to how this group needs to proceed forward. But again, it's a standing item, which our community has followed.

I know that we are very short on time, so I'm going to hand the floor over now to Avri Doria for the implementation review team updates, the IRT updates. So, over to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, thank you. And first, to anyone that's as confused as I am, which I apologize for, because being as confused as I am is a

horrible state of mind, but in any case, I seem to be working off two different agendas and I'm trying to figure out where you were.

We have three IRTs that are established at the moment, and I'm wondering if there's anybody here that wants to report on any of those three. So please, you know, because it's difficult to tell if we have any of our IRT, either for the SubPro IRT, was there anybody that had anything? I know Allan is on one of the IRTs, so that one's not going to be reported on and the other IRT was the one that is doing the special IRT, the spurt spirit, whatever its name is, IRT.

And I don't see anybody here that would report on that because -- Unless Cheryl's online and wants to report on it, but I also don't see -- Yup. So, I think on the IRTs we have no reports at the moment and we'll get back to them at the next meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Avri? It's Olivier speaking. If I can just jump in. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just for the newcomers that might be in the room so the policy development process is where the policy is being designed and created and so on. The IRT by its very name is where there is implementation. Usually, implementation used to be undertaken by staff, but now there is a group that actually makes sure that the implementation follows the policy. And sometimes there are a few things that need to be tweaked during the implementation stage, that's why we've got those two things, the policy development on one side and the IRT on the other.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah. Thanks, Avri. It's Olivier speaking. I don't think it's a correction. You just added to what I was saying, but I never said the -- Anyway. We do have the next part now of this session and that's going to be looking at the DNS abuse mitigation. And Avri Doria is going to be presenting this with Steinar Grøtterød, Kathleen Scoggin, Eunice Alejandre Perez Coello, and any other observers. There's 30 minutes allocated to this since there's a statement that's on the table. Over to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, thank you. And I think I will turn it over to Kathleen, who has a set of slides, and then at some point you'll call out the others of us that you wish to have speak. Thank you.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Hi, everyone. Yeah, I'm Kathleen Scoggin. We have some slides associated with this presentation and hopefully will make it up there. Yeah. Perfect. Okay, so the reason why we wanted a little bit of a longer time slot this time around was because the DNS abuse PDP-1 on associated domain checks has published, well, put to its constituencies, a set of preliminary language, straw person language, to answer the first six charter questions that are proposed of us. So, you can go to the next slide.

I'm going to go through each of those charter questions and talk about the decision points that we've talked about at this meeting thus far. We've had two sessions of the PDP and we were tasked

with identifying the aspects of the straw person language that was provided that are things that we can't live with and that the constituency would not approve, basically. And so, each constituency was able to put in their input and then we spoke about it as a group and came to some consensus about it.

So, we have circulated this document through the CPWG mailing list about a week ago, something like that, that has that language and we have provided back to the working group a couple key things that are important to the At-Large so we'll be going through that. So, you can go to the next slide.

This is recommendation one. So, recommendation one talks about the trigger for an associated domain check. So, just for a little bit of background for those of you who haven't been following the PDP previously, the idea that the GNSO came up with was to come up with a narrowly scoped PDP of some specific actions that can be taken to prevent DNS abuse. An associated domain check would be when a domain is identified as being abusive per the RAA that was negotiated last year, being able to check whether it be the registrant information, the payment information, multiple different things to see if that same bad actor is also registering other domains.

So, the first question we were asked was about what should trigger this check? What causes you to look for potential other abusive domains? So, the initial recommendation language was when a registrar has actionable evidence that a registered name is being

used for DNS abuse pursuant to section 3.18.2 of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the registrar must perform an associated domain check.

So, the proposed addition for this was for the avoidance of doubt this requirement does not extend to compromised domains. That was articulated in the GNSO charter, just to make it clear. So, there is no common definition of compromised domains, though, currently in the negotiated RAA and so there were two definitions that were proposed by the working group.

The first was by the registrars that compromised domain means a domain name that was registered for legitimate purposes, but is subsequently exploited or controlled by an -- Oh, sorry, controlled by an unauthorized party to conduct DNS abuse without the knowledge, authorization or participation of the registrant. And then the other definition that was proposed is similar and is from an ICANN advisory on DNS abuse that says when an otherwise legitimate or benign domain name is used as a vector for DNS abuse without the knowledge or consent of the register.

So, the preliminary decision that the members of the group have come to, and just to be clear, none of these positions are set in stone, we have a lot of work to go still in this PDP so if you have thoughts about any of this, please feel free to raise your hand and chime in. We are here to get your input, but our preliminary decision is that the ALAC would support the definition proposed in the ICANN advisory. There was general consensus in the working

group that it's good to use language that already exists and go from there. Yeah, go for it.

MACIEK PIASECKI

Maciek Piasecki with EURALO. You said there's no definition of a compromised domain. I understand this is properly factored, so there are no documents by SSAC, let's say, that provide a definition that we can already use because if we're defining it for the first time, this can be a pretty big precedence that will impact a lot of things in the future. Thank you.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, so there's no definition in the contractual language that registrars have agreed on with ICANN. There are some definitions, i.e. the one from the advisory, as well as it might be referenced as well in an SSAC document, don't quote me on that one, but none that have been contractually negotiated and agreed upon for the moment. So, our preliminary decision is to support that definition and go from there.

We also have a request from the GAC to have some feedback from participants, this is mostly a request for registrars, I just thought I'd include it. That's kind of an action item that we're looking at on the current formulation of this text, the words is being used what that would look like different, interpretations of that. So, we'll get back to you when we're able to talk through those scenarios and the GAC

brings that back up, but just wanted to put that on the radar. Okay, we can go to the next slide, recommendation two.

So, this is about now an associated domain check investigation. So, we decided that now we should do an associated domain check, what does that actually mean? What are we looking at? So, the initial recommendation language from the document was that a registrar must perform a reasonable investigation in order to determine whether or not associated domains are used for DNS abuse per 3.18.2 of the RAA.

So, the proposed change, which I didn't actually include in the initial recommendation language, was to take out something that was previously introduced of reviewing at least one association criteria. The working group found that this might result in ineffective policy, and reviewing only one criteria is more likely to lead to unintentional erroneous association. So, our preliminary decision is to support that and there was general consensus in the working group for that. So, unless there's any questions, we can go to recommendation three. Okay. Next slide, please.

So, recommendation three talks about what is a reasonable investigation. So, now we've decided that we're going to look at things, but exactly what and what are the bounds of said investigation? So, the initial recommendation language is that a reasonable investigation by a registrar must consist of reviewing information reasonably available to the registrar in the normal course of its operations to determine whether it's abusive. There's

a lot of words after that, but that's the gist. And the proposed change for this is to go from reasonably available to reasonably accessible.

So, how this was articulated in the working group, they sound very similar, but the difference that's articulated in the working group was that information that is reasonably available to a registrar is the information that they have on their systems and that they can look up. Reasonably accessible for them is information that maybe their resellers, if they're using another third party, has, but they have to request it. So, this change was proposed by the registrars to make it easier for them to get access to the information that they need contractually to conduct an investigation. So, our preliminary decision was to support this, to ensure that investigations are comprehensive and they're able to get all the information that they need.

And then the other change in recommendation three, the initial language was the registrar will remain responsible for ensuring that a reasonable investigation is conducted as required in the RAA 3.12. This means the registrar is fully responsible for complying with all RAA requirements, including 3.18, even when it uses a reseller.

This is just a clarification because that sentence is scary a little bit. And just to make it more clear and something that we thought as a group was important to push is that the responsibility remains on the registrar, regardless of what resellers or third parties they may

be using, that all of these requirements still apply. And this is just a clarification of that, that they remain fully responsible for complying with the RAA requirements. So, unless there's any questions on that, we skip to recommendation five because there were no significant changes to recommendation four.

So, this is talking about safeguards for an ADC. The initial recommendation language was registrars must conduct an ADC in compliance with applicable law, contractual requirements, and data privacy safeguards. Again, a bit of a sentence change. Registrars must conduct an ADC in compliance with applicable law, including data privacy laws and contractual requirements. Just a clarification that we're supporting and the explicit call out of data privacy laws. Okay, we can go to recommendation six. This is the last one, I promise.

So, this was one of the biggest topics of conversation about a timeline for an ADC. So, we've decided that we're going to do it. We've looked at what is in that investigation and how that investigation will happen. And now the question becomes, how long will that investigation take or should it? So, the initial recommendation language was a registrar must initiate and conduct an ADC promptly following the trigger as defined in preliminary recommendation one, taking into account the specific circumstance of each case.

So, I just included the slide to say that there was a recommendation by the business constituency to put a specific time requirement on

how long an ADC should take. So, their recommendation was 72 hours is the maximum. There was consensus in the working group that promptly allows for some flexibility to be able to have a broad scope for an ADC if you need it, or it can be faster. This is a previously agreed upon term in previous contractual language with ICANN compliance.

So, our preliminary decision was to support that, but also to work with other working group members and constituencies to put together something like an advisory for more specific applications and standards around what promptly looks like. So, we understand it's being used. We'd like to continue with that, but some more specification could be used. So, any questions about that? Okay, go for it.

NATALIE TERCOVA

Yeah, thank you, Kathleen. This is Natalie. So just a clarification, maybe I just missed it. So, the business constituency, what was the main reasoning? They just did not want to stick with any sort of timeframe because I can understand that there can be a range, like promptly, like this is ideal, but of course, there may be situations where it just requires more time. But personally, I would just be worried when it's just completely undefined without just any sort of numbers.

It could create problems and then eventually, if something is taking a long, long time, then you just always say, oh, promptly, but, you know, there's nothing more we could do in this case. So, I feel like

at least some sort of time frame would be nice. I was just wondering if they took this into account. Thank you.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah. So, the business constituency's proposal for a specific timeframe had that exact concern and this was talked about a lot in the group. Since promptly is already being executed by ICANN compliance, they have standards for what that looks like. And putting a specific timeframe that closes the potential to A, if you conduct an ADC and you then see that there's another sort of step that you need to take to look for more information, you don't really have that if you have a specific time frame. So, the idea was it's already being enforced. That's about it. Do you have more to say?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD

Yes, this is Steinar for the record. I just want to emphasize that promptly in the way ICANN compliance use this word is not a signal about or an opening for the registrars to delay anything. So, promptly do you have a historical timeframe, but it's not set in hours, but it's not a signal about delaying anything at all. So, I think I agree with Kathleen and this is good. Putting a timestamp on mitigation or start over investigation is extremely difficult and there will be multiple reasons for the registrar to argue against that timestamp. Thank you.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, go for it.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI

I'm Aftab Siddiqui, ALAC. Can you go to recommendation number one? In the proposed definition, the assumption is that the DNS, the domain was compromised using whatever access provided by the registrar so domain points to an IP address. So, someone logged in or got hold of that access and changed something to point to something else. But domain can also be compromised if the IP address it points to get compromised, which has nothing to do with the registrar, but still the domain has been compromised. So, how do you define that and differentiate that, that it has nothing to do with the registrar, but the domain still has been compromised?

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, that's a tough one. How would you change the definition to encompass that?

AFTAB SIDDIQUI

I can suggest a word, but you can just add a caveat that it only applies when the login system or the way any domain changes can be performed has been compromised or altered without the knowledge of the registrants. Anything beyond that, for example, related to IP compromise or inaccessibility of that IP is beyond that definition and that's so far -- I'll try to minimize it, but yeah.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD

Yeah, this is a Steinar for the record. First of all, the PDP is shorted towards malicious registrations and the idea behind this is trying to find a way to reduce malicious registration and focus on that one and not compromise domain names. So, the debate and the discussion about what is compromise and so on is a little bit out of scope, at least the way I see it from the PDP.

I don't think that answers your question, but that's what we're trying to work on, a certain registration process for malicious registration. And if you were listening into the previous session here with the Intel, what's the name of the company? And they were talking about 20% of all registration was malicious registration, that's the bulk that we're trying to attack and trying to reduce.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI

If I may, Aftab Siddiqui for the record, I was in that presentation and I was looking at the website trying to understand what is the definition of compromised domain for them and that is still vague. For compromised domain, if you are trying to address a compromised domain, domain can be compromised if it is not serving the purpose it was registered for, right? But it can be compromised from the registrar's point of view that now it is pointing to somewhere else, that is what this definition is saying, has been altered without the knowledge of the registrants.

So, if you're going down that path, then we have to clarify there are two possibilities. It can be done through the system of the

registrar, or it can be done outside the system of the registrar. Compromisation happened in both cases.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD

This is Steinar for the record. Yes, it can, but from the registrar's side, they have to deal with it. Whether they have identified DNS abuse according to the contract, they have to deal with it whatsoever. They have to deal with it, even though there's things that has been done that they can't control. They have to deal with it. That's the contract, whether it's malicious or compromised. If it identifies as DNS abuse, they have to deal with it.

AFTAB SIDDIQUI

Aftab Siddiqui, just a last point. I have done enough work on the routing security side. That is one big aspect of the routing security. You cannot control where the IP shows up in the world. So, registrar has absolutely no control over that one, but I'll leave that here. I'll put my comment on that and then up to the PDP to accept it or not.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

No, I appreciate it and I will just say one last thing about that. In my mind, at least if I'm understanding your comments correctly, that still is without the consent of a registrant so I think at least the second definition might cover it. I don't know. We can talk about it later, but I appreciate your comments and would appreciate them in writing as well. Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you so much, Kathleen. My comment or question goes to the last point on timelines. Well, I do understand the group does not want to give a fixed timeline. ICANN has a compliance timeline, but if you look at how GAC is looking at it, they are demanding timelines for mitigation or even investigation because these are issues. There has been pressure from the community that certain things needs to be acted on, you know, a particular thing so at least some kind of time frame.

I get your point that certain things cannot be investigated on time, but that happens in any kind of crime which happens. They take certain more time to, you know, investigate and come back on it. So, not having a timeline, would it be acceptable to the entire non-ICANN ecosystem?

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, point taken. In the previous RAA negotiations, how promptly it came to be was in collaboration with ICANN compliance because if you establish also a floor, I guess, for example, there was a proposal for a range between 24 and 72 hours, an ADC can also happen in 30 seconds for some people. If it's a small enough dataset, a small enough registrar, it can happen very, very quickly. And so, if you're unable to establish a floor and you're unable to establish a ceiling, that makes a range very difficult. And so, the fallback to that is a previously agreed upon contractual term of art

that has been used and enforced already and agreed upon by the community.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thanks. Just to follow up and being the devil's advocate, that didn't work, that is why the discussions are happening that why don't we have timelines, right? The GAC or anyone else has been pushing for it because it didn't work.

AVRI DORIA

Excuse me, just jumping in. What does didn't work mean?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

People are not satisfied that issues are not being addressed within a particular timeframe based upon the intensity of it.

AVRI DORIA

So, you're using didn't work to mean people weren't satisfied?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Yeah.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

The only thing I'll add to that is that the GAC is in support of this language, just for information purposes on how positions may change. Yeah.

MACIEK PIASECKI

Just a quick follow-up, Maciek Piasecki here, to what our friend over there said from the security expert's perspective, I think here at the working group meetings we are allowed to make interventions. So, maybe it would be good to invite your voice to state your concern and possibly get some allies from SSAC, let's say. So, up to you to decide.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yes, please. Works for me. Okay. So, can we go back to the slide after recommendation six? So, this is when I'm going to call upon Avri because the next step, now that we have come up with these initial recommendations, next steps for the working group are to look at Human Rights Impact Assessment and also a metric system. So, I wanted to bring up both of these.

We haven't had a lot of substantive discussion about this yet, but want to have input from the community on what we think that we should really emphasize in these talks. So, my question to Avri is to give a little bit of background on how we got to the point of having a Human Rights Impact Assessment in the PDP and why we should prioritize it, what that might look like and then we can get into

more specific questions in the context of this PDP, what that will look like.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. Avri speaking. Sort of an impromptu discussion as I found out I was going to be doing this pretty much when we started this particular session, but I have been a proponent of Human Rights Impact Assessments on what we do probably for about 20 years now in terms of the notion that ICANN could be making policies that affect people and hopefully of interest to those who care about end users, who frequently are people in terms of their human rights.

And by and large, I mean, it's not just ICANN, it's all over the place. Policies are put into place, not with any bad intentionality and ICANN, I would dare say never had bad intentionality in any of its policies, but if you don't stop to do an impact assessment, you really don't know. You know, it's easy to assume that something is well-intentioned and yet it happens to, you know, really hurt some population, some type. So that's why we've been sort of saying that there are human rights.

We now have, within limitations, a commitment to paying attention to human rights within our bylaws. Because we finally were able to get that into the bylaws during the transition, but it had to wait a while because ICANN wasn't really willing to accept a general statement about human rights, we had to basically make it

specific to the purposes of ICANN so there is a framework for how we look at human rights.

We've finally gotten to the point where we can now look at the policy development processes and this ties to, but is not directly connected to, the work that we did on global public interest. And as it's difficult to say you met the global public interest if you've got no idea whether there is an impact on the human rights and the Global Public Interest Framework acknowledges that. So, the reason we're getting to it now in a PDP.

The other thing that we noticed is when we first came up with some of this work is doing it at the end of a process is too late. In other words, you get to the point at the end of a process where you say, "But you didn't take care of this human rights impact." Yes, but so much work went into it, so many agreements, so many hours, it's too late. And therefore, basically, the notion really developed that you need to think about the human rights as you've been moving along.

So, I think that's one of the reasons why asking me, why is it important and why are we asking that people start? And of course, I wasn't part of putting together, you know, the charter that included it, but was elated when I saw that it was going to happen because this is one of the first times that a PDP has actually, I guess it's even willingly taken on the challenge of, technically, not only doing things because it's right, vis-à-vis registrar's responsibilities and their contractual agreements, but right in terms of we know

whether it has a human impact. I could stop sort of there. I think that's a hand up.

MACIEK PIASECKI

Maciek Piasecki, EURALO. I'm chiming in a lot because I'm an observer in this PDP and I want to support you in your work. I think to the narrative of the human rights that also the NCHG is bringing up a lot, we could add the ideas of consumers' rights and the freedom to do business, which is part of the European Charter on Fundamental Rights, because these decisions here will affect the vendor lockout, which is an increasing problem.

So, small businesses and individual consumers can be locked out of their accounts for months and they will need to spend a lot of resources to challenge those decisions. And they will only know that the decision was made by breaching the terms and services. There's also a big discussion in the background about how transparent or opaque the internal procedures of the registrars should be. And the counter argument for opaque procedures is that if they're transparent, the criminals might use them to learn and circumvent them. I would say we should stand on the side of transparency of rules that are able to be understood by an average person from a country. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

No, thank you. You saved me from having to take the next steps and sort of say, what is there in this PDP that is relevant to that? I

was still working on the background, so I very much appreciate and I very much --

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Can I caveat one thing very quickly?

AVRI DORIA

Sure.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Just I think it's an important clarification in this PDP that we're focusing on malicious registrations. And so, an individual who's had their registration compromised, that's a different interest that is not necessarily within this PDP in the same way.

MACIEK PIASECKI

So, at [inaudible - 00:45:27] here in Dublin, we were talking about AI-based ways of detection of malicious domains, and it has been said at the ccNSO session that the false positive rate is about 10% right now so that's a lot of users being affected.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, just that we maybe should frame and continue to frame the human rights impacts or the purpose of the impact assessment on malicious registrations because it's been very specifically scoped by the GNSO for the PDP. It was just a small clarification, but I'll let Avri continue.

AVRI DORIA

But it's probably worth if the PDP, and this is of course me speaking out of turn, if the PDP is going to exclude a certain set of concerns because they don't apply to the specific scope, it's still worth indicating within the PDP that we did not look at those particular human rights.

In other words, I think within human rights and practice statements, if a PDP makes a certain decision that sort of says, "We're not looking specifically at these cases because they were out of scope," at least say so, so it's not forgotten about.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, I did and Steinar made a good point that there is recommendation seven that wasn't included here because it hasn't been finalized in any way. It's a list of things that have come out of the PDP that fall out of scope, but we think are important. And that's something that we can also add specific language from the At-Large perspective, saying that we find this important, even if it falls outside of the scope of the PDP.

The other one that was big and important, I think, for the At-Large was also about recourse mechanisms, DNS abuse recourse mechanisms, and that that's a broader problem. And there is no standard for recourse mechanisms for DNS abuse, whether it's associated with an ADC or not, and that the GNSO should prioritize

policy work in this area. So, I think that's a good point that we can include in that section.

MACIEK PIASECKI

If I can do a quick advice. I'm Maciek Piasecki. I have seen that other stakeholder groups have been putting up that other human rights rather than Article 19, the freedom of expression should be included in our work. So, I think it's a possibility to build allies to make sure consumer and business freedoms are included here.

AVRI DORIA

Yes, that and I'll stop now pretty much, but yes, that other emphasis that whenever somebody wants to respond to one human rights, they say, "But, but, but, but there are many and they are all equal and they all," et cetera. It's an important consideration. I'm just glad that the discussion is ongoing in the PDP. I expect NCSG, which I do have a passive relationship with or a past relationship with, to continue their advocacy in it. So, I'm very happy that this has happened.

I don't know if there was more you wanted out of me than I've said, but as I say, I'm not paying attention to the PDP itself and I'm not even on the front line of fighting for Human Rights Impact Assessments anymore. Though I guess I was among those that started it way back when so I'm really happy to see it's happening.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Here's what I will say. In the same way that we've circulated the initial recommendations for the charter questions, there's also a draft of the Human Rights Impact Assessment that we will circulate to this group after this meeting. And if they're specific, we would love more feedback from the community in general, but specifically about this because we know how important it is. There's lots of different specific privacy provisions, data minimization provisions, et cetera, so please provide your feedback to us and we will circulate that today.

AVRI DORIA

Be happy to review it once I've seen it.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Great.

AVRI DORIA

So, that's it for me.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Perfect. And then I just have one more slide that perhaps not a ton of discussion has to happen on right now, but I wanted to bring it up. Since we talked about chart of questions one through six, the logical next step is what about questions seven through nine?

So, I put those on the screen. These are about metrics to measure the success of this PDP in different ways. So, we've had some preliminary discussion that has pointed towards measuring not

instances of DNS abuse going down because that can mean a million different things. Even if a registrar is doing a great job at implementing this policy and doing ADCs, if they suddenly have an influx of malicious registrations, their amount of DNS abuse in that way will actually be going up. So, our question is, how do we capture success?

And some of the initial discussion was focused on whether ADCs were conducted as directed and whether they followed the advice of the working group recommendations, i.e. the trigger, whether they followed the promptly standard, et cetera. So, these are the topics that are coming up in the PDP. If you have thoughts on it, we will happily, again, take your feedback. And yeah, we have meetings every Monday and you can be an observer if you would like. And if you have interest in it, come talk with me and the rest of the team. But I think I may have already gone over my time. So, I will stop there, unless there are other questions.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I don't see any questions here. Let me look at the -- Oh, is there a flag up?

NATALIE TERCOVA

No, it's fine. It's been an old one, but now that I have the time, I will speak. It's Natalie. Now, I just had a little clarifying question on the document that will be circulated on the Human Rights Impact Assessment and anything around it. So, this one will be based on

already some existed preliminary discussions you had within the PDP group or -- So, my question is, because it said like future steps or next steps, so like is there already some discussions happening? Is there also another way not just formally becoming an observer to join mainly discussions on this topic? As you know, it's close to my heart and expertise, I would like to maybe chime in more than just going for the document. Thank you.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, so we've had a little bit of discussion about it. I think it there's been offline input from constituencies into this document. I think the NCSG is a big one, obviously and that's how they've come up with this draft, but it is still in very early stages and has a lot of room for change. And in terms of participating, we also brief on this probably every week at the CPWG, but just come talk to us. There's lots of work to be done and we're happy to distribute it.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. Thank you and I'm really happy to see the discussion of human rights in a CPWG meeting and an ALAC meeting. I feel one of my life's dreams has been met, that it's being talked about more in more places so thank you all for that. And let me get back. Okay, now we're going to go back to a previous item that that we skipped over earlier, but it's good to get to. Although we did already have a little bit of report on it and that, let me get it in front of me, was item five.

What about four? We did four, didn't we? Review of implementation review team. Yeah, I did that. There was just nobody to speak to any of them. So, I did do that, but I sort of skimmed through. Unless there's somebody here that would like to talk about the implementation review team they're on that I didn't give you a chance to speak on earlier, but no. And we're not yet talking about implementation review teams in other things, that's yet another topic. It's a very confusing day, I know.

But anyhow, five, which was, and I don't know how we're doing on time so Ozan, you'll have to put me on the right --

OZAN SAHIN

Three minutes.

AVRI DORIA

A whole three minutes behind? Way cool, but that's as if we had already done five, right? Anyhow, policy statement updates on presentation of a draft statement on additional reference label generation. Satish, you did talk about it before. I know you said some of your co-workers on this aren't here so I guess it all falls on you as usual.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Avri. Satish, for the record. So, why am I getting an echo? Oh, it's still there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Satish, you're also on your computer, it's Olivier speaking, yeah, there you go. You mute your computer.

SATISH BABU

Yeah, okay. Yeah, so this one is about the additional reference label generation rules. Normally, ALAC does not respond to these public comments for two reasons. First is that LGR is a very technical area and we don't have the expertise often to respond to that. Second, it is very language specific. Language, I would mean language slash script and we don't have the expertise to go through the scripts and all that so normally, we don't respond. But in this case, the small team that met felt that there is a case for talking to the CPWG and to see if there is a case for us to respond and there are two reasons for that.

The first reason is the timing of it. This is coming while the new round is in effect. So, that timing has got some importance there. The second is that this is of importance to ALAC and a little later, I'll be calling my colleague Lance to speak about his experience, although it is not directly connected with this. So, there are two new scripts which are being included and the first is a Javanese script from Indonesia.

Normally, we say that language and script are very different things and it's a very good example of that because Javanese script, there are about 80 million Javanese speakers and the default script they use is Latin. They use English alphabet, not the Javanese script, but here we have ICANN bringing in the old script, the traditional script.

Although the number of users are not very high and the net effect of that is that we are helping conserve this script.

The second is that we have something called Unified Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics, UCAS. This is again a kind of marginal or a kind of little-used minority script which this LGR is actually bringing into the mainstream. So, these are the reasons why we thought we should probably talk about this. And the other side, there are two more scripts here. One is from Indonesia, the other is from the Algonquin characters from the indigenous languages of North America.

So, on the whole, this collection of four scripts is somewhat different because in these two, the Indonesian Pagan script whereby you're adding a new script to the existing Arabic script, which is somewhat unusual again and the last one is also existing Latin script and this new script is being added to that. So overall, there is a kind of difference in the way this LGR is working.

And Lance here, from At-Large, of course, from LACRALO, he is trying to help two indigenous scripts in Guyana to be brought into the Indianist. Lance, can you please talk to us for two minutes and let us know what it is all about?

LANCE HINDS

Yes, sir. Thank you. We have 10 indigenous languages in Guyana, which are underrepresented in various forms. And the two that we have chosen are really the lowest hanging fruit because you can get

them to do documentation. They can help you with translation. So, we've been doing that for about four or five years now and what is now happening in that space is that, especially -- UNESCO is also interested in this, where they're looking to see whether the use or the implementation of the IDN could be an extension to language preservation and sustainability and protection. So that, in essence, is the experiment to use two languages extracted, well, luckily, except in the case of about two or three of them, they generally follow Latin diacritics.

So, what we have been doing is looking at the languages, extracting the diacritics, and looking to see if we could get it to a point where we can get to the LGR document that could be submitted to IANA. So, that's the experiment. Of course, we have to go through the various processes because along with the technical part of it, there's the consultation part of it in terms of us making sure that the elders in the village and also the languages are fully up to date in terms of what we're doing and we're not stealing their language and giving it away and selling it. There's all of that that you have to go through.

So, we are now going through that process with two of them and especially with the help of Satish, we're hoping a little later on this year to be able to present that to IANA and also our local .gy domain and these two languages will be able to have their own IDN h sometime by the end of the year. The overall plan is to do both, but

that depends on other issues to make sure that we get it done.
Thank you, Chair.

SATISH BABU

Thanks very much, Lance. So, I'll close by saying, what are the action items that we see in this particular round of new LGRs? So, we need to differentiate between LGR as a technical accomplishment of a kind of technical problem as opposed to a human or a social problem whereby, we have to take it to these communities. The communities do not maybe know that it is now feasible for them to get domain names in their own scripts.

So, there is an outreach component here which ICANN should take up. There is a coordination requirement with registry operators just to ensure that they're all ready. We need visibility of these kind of changes because this example of Guyana is a good example for At-Large so that other communities which want to kind of get their scripts into the DNS can also follow this. And overall, the role for At-Large in ensuring that the word gets around, that it is possible for us to influence.

So far, we have been treating this whole LGR process as an opaque black box over which we have no influence, but that's no longer the case and we do have influence. We can ensure that these scripts can come into this. So, the draft statement is there. Ozan has been kind enough to fit it into the framework. It is there in the link to the agenda. So, if there are any comments, we can pass it on, not right now. If there are any questions right now, we're happy to answer.

Although my colleagues, two of them were there with me in the small group, they are not here in the -- Oh, sorry. Oh, okay, you're there. Okay. So, there are two of us. Yeah, so if there are any questions, we'll be happy to answer. Otherwise, I'll stop here and pass it on back to Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Before I get to your comment, can you remind me of where our time schedule is on needing to have a statement in front of the ALAC for approval for sending on? So, how are we on the schedule?

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Avri. This is Ozan Sahin from support staff for the record. So, this public comment proceeding is closing on the 23rd of June. If ALAC would like to proceed with submitting a comment with a statement, then I believe we should finalize this statement by the end of the week so that it can go through the ratification process next week and can be submitted the week after.

AVRI DORIA

So that means this meeting that we're having now is the one where I need to get the assent of the group to send it on. And we have on occasion agreed to send something on, but change A, B, C is needed so if any of those, but I just wanted to make sure everybody knew that this statement isn't purely theoretical or for future discussion. It's for determination now. Yes, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN

I should just add one more thing, I guess, Ozan, again, for the record. So, when the bullet points were discussed in the CPWG meeting two weeks ago, the CPWG members who did not suggest submitting a comment came up with the argument that the broader comments from ALAC on IDNs could be directly communicated to the board alternatively. So that was one alternative suggestion in these discussions. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. Yeah, I'll get to you. There's absolutely no deadline on communicating to the board, but if we do want to communicate as part of the PDP, as part of this, then we need to do it today. Okay, please.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Thank you, Claire Craig, for the record. I haven't had a chance to read through this, but just skimming it, I see at the end that the small team is recommending that we submit a public comment. What I would suggest, based on the discussion that we have had here, is that if we agree that we're going to submit a public comment, we need to say somewhere in there -- I'm seeing all the technical reasons for submitting it, but I think we also need to talk about the fact that there is end-user impact to submitting this and what is the end-user impact. That would make a stronger case if

we go with that without just saying we're going to send a comment to the board. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Avri, again. I have a question on that. If we're sending it to the comment review, which seems a reasonable thing to do, one can also add the note that you were speaking of as a cover note to sending it, to bringing it also to the attention of the board.

In other words, and I don't know if that makes sense within the context that you all thinking that now here's a comment that really should be sent to the review comment because it's part of the whole consideration and you want to get it in there. But then also, if you want to turn it in, for example, are you turning it into advice to the board or just a letter to the board? But in any case, what you're talking about is the imports.

And as you mentioned, sort of the change in the way of looking at it, that we aren't doing these as just mechanical exercises to add scripts. We're doing it because it is important to the end user and it's important to have a process that takes the whole discussion that Lance put forward of how we talk to the people themselves who live by these languages. To the elders, to the village, to whoever else cares as part of that process. So that becomes almost a letter of ALAC advice on this and you could basically build a separate thing on that. So please.

SATISH BABU

Thanks, Avri and thanks, Claire. Yeah, I see your point that although this statement was not drafted as an advice to the board, there are elements which can also serve as advice to the board. So, currently in the statement, the small team can strengthen the impact on At-Large that Claire is mentioning so that it is ready as the public comment response. But further, even for the board, we can prepare something out of this at a later stage. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

So, what I'd like to get now is basically an agreement. Do we have an agreement on just sending it pretty much as written, I don't know if this fits in, pretty much as written, unless there's, you know, things to be fixed, as a public statement, I mean, as a review comment? And then we can talk at a next occasion about how to turn it into advice to the board on the more critical, because I don't really expect the PDP to care that much. They should, but I don't expect them to care that much about the larger social context, but putting it in the larger social context, as Lance initiated and you commented, would be a next step for us to actually take.

So, I'm suggesting that I'm looking for comments of anybody object to this going in pretty much as is as a comment, get it out there, get it in there, and then work on how we turn it, build a cover around it to make it advice. And you have your hand on the button so.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Claire Craig, again. What I would like to say is that because it's a public comment coming from At-Large, I think we always need to look at the fact that we are looking at it from an end user perspective. So, if there is just that one change, we add to it before submitting it.

AVRI DORIA

And I get a thumbs up from Satish. So basically, I'm looking, is there any objection from any of the folks here that are CPWG and anybody who is CPWG for the sake of this to sending it forward with the addition modification recommended by Claire that we explain why this matters to us and then later we'll go beyond on advice on this particular? Does anybody object to that? No? Okay, so there is the writing of that statement.

Satish, I don't know if you need to get Claire involved, you know, since she already framed the wording out for you and has been so determined, maybe she can give you a hand on doing it and Lance too, basically. And so, no objection. We've got a plan.

Okay. Remember, you don't have that much time, finishing it this week because it's got to get to ALAC, et cetera. Okay. Thank you on that one. And we can even talk about at our next meeting what to do in terms of crafting advice that builds on this, that is directly to the board and goes into that whole advice to the board cycle. Okay, so we got that one. Anything else left on this one before I move on?

Then the next one we had was the SSAD, SRT, and that was Allan who has been eaten up by NomCom, but we have Murray McKercher here, or I guess online, well, here, he's at the meeting.

MURRAY MCKERCHER I'm online. Thanks, Avri.

AVRI DORIA So please.

MURRAY MCKERCHER Yes. Can everyone hear me?

AVRI DORIA I can.

MURRAY MCKERCHER Very good. Thank you. It's Murray McKercher for the record. If you'll bear with me, I'm just going to read from my briefing notes, but feel free to interrupt if anything's unclear in any way. Actually, I need to share my screen, so give me one second here. All right. Okay.

So, SSAD SRT policy briefing. So, for those of you who don't know, SSAD is System for Standardized Access Disclosure, and the SRT is the Supplemental Recommendations Team. So, this has been fairly brief early in its stages of work. We've only had one meeting, in-person meeting, in Seville so we're at early stages here. So, I

have 15 minutes, if anyone needs to interrupt, please do so. So, at the moment -- Sorry, go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Sorry, we have about 10 minutes left as opposed to 15 if you can squish it down.

MURRAY MCKERCHER

Okay, Avri, I will zoom through it here. Okay, so basically the baseline here for RDRS is the metrics reveal that there are gaps that threaten end user and consumer security interests. So, you see that in this test that's been going on, the registrar participation rate is less than 25% so that's note that the vast majority of registrars remain outside the pilot system. But there is a greater than 50% average refusal rate against legitimate requests so they're closed with zero disclosure.

So, I just want to put this up with respect to our ALAC's position and RDS realities. You'll be able to read a lot of this and I'll have this posted later. I think the important thing from ALAC's perspective is that we need a unified approach. For registrars, it should be mandatory because volunteerism to do this work, it's really important that we have a predictable baseline to apply to all contracted parties.

There are refusal bottlenecks. From our perspective, standardization validation is needed. We require a centralized credentialing body to clear requests before they hit the registrars

and that lowers the risk of safe harbor denials. There are specific financial and identity barriers in place, so it's complex.

The complexity of doing a manual verification does inflate costs, and this is obviously of concern to contracted parties and it would cause the length of response times. So, it discourages civil society and small-scale security investigators. So, it's important that we have some equitable cost structures. There needs to be some kind of financial recovery and ensure that access remains open to all the public interest entities.

So, I think my core takeaway here, and I'll just read it, is that the RDRS pilot clearly underscores that technical availability does not equal functional accessibility. Without an organized, predictable identity verification structure that removes arbitrary registrar-level blocks, the final SSAD implementation will fail to protect the public interest. So, we're early again in the discussion of this process.

So, we do have some suggested areas to move forward. I'll just read these out quickly. To push for mandatory participation frameworks in future policy cycles rather than optional pilot systems. Refine the automated identity validation criteria within the SRT to lower operational friction for public interest requesters. And to coordinate localized telemetry and reporting structures by regional At-Large organizations, RALOs included, to identify any regional variations. Because we're talking about implementing this globally and there are a lot of different things we need to

concern ourselves. So, I'll stop there and let's see if there's any questions at this point.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, thank you. Let me see. Do I see -- Okay, yes.

MACIEK PIASECKI

Maciek Piasecki with EURALO. You pointed out the high rejection rate, but does it apply to the entities that have been previously verified as, for example, academic structures or law enforcement agencies? Or do we refer to non-authenticated entities as well?

MURRAY MCKERCHER

Yes, important question. So, authentication in this entire process is creating a lot of discussion within the group. So, how people are authenticated to join this process, it's an ongoing discussion and it's certainly an important point so I take your point. Don't have an answer for you at the moment, but it's definitely taking up a lot of time of our discussion.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. Thanks. I don't see -- So, this is an ongoing thing now so we'll be able to come back to this topic frequently over the next couple of months. Is that a correct assumption? I don't see anybody else with hands or flags up. Oh, Olivier's got a hand up. Okay, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and it's one of these interesting things where I guess we've been through these discussions for, how many years now, double digits. I hope we're not going to reach triple digits regarding these discussions because I'm not hearing very much advancement based on what we had before.

Let me play devil's advocate. We heard earlier that the baseline now for the sale of a domain name, is it \$2 or something? The margins are extremely small and registrars and registries see anything that requires manual intervention or anything that they need to do as being a cost where it's a loss. So, it's a total loss for them.

The second problem is that ICANN has not provided any kind of framework where they would indemnify the registrar or the provider of the information should it break the law of them providing the information and stuff. There's a whole, you know, question mark around it all and saying, you know, am I safe in providing you the information that you're asking for, et cetera, and so, they really see this as a risk. And unless we can actually go to the reasons why we're blocked in the situation, we've been blocked in the past 15, 20, 30 years, I'm not sure that we'll be able to get a solution with this supplemental recommendations team. I don't know whether that is addressed by your group, Murray.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, Murray, you've got a whole minute.

MURRAY MCKERCHER

Okay, very good. Yes, Olivier, it is being addressed by the group. The group is expected to meet for some months going forward. It's a very large group and there are a lot of experts in the room and I'm impressed by the process it's going, but for sure that is something that's being discussed and happy to report on that as we move forward.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I look forward to the continuing discussion at this point given the time. I pass the baton back to you, Olivier, for your any other business closing and whatever else it is you want to do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much for this Avri. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and we just need to check, because, of course, this is a working group, when will our next call take place? Do a little bit of advertising. We've seen that there are quite a few people in the group now that are holding the pen and producing statements. It's not the usual suspects. It's really great to see more people involved in this sharing of the workload in producing policy comments, et cetera, on behalf of the end-user community being shared among more people.

Thus, the next step for anyone who's interested in this is to follow the working group. There is a mailing list, but also to be able to be

on the next call. I don't know who wishes to announce that. I can see it is in the chat.

OZAN SAHIN

Hi Olivier, thank you. This is Ozan speaking for the record. As Gisella noted in the chat, the next meeting of the CPWG will be on the 24th of June at 1900 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks very much for this, Ozan. And just for Gisella who is collecting the action items, Avri and I will check on behind the scenes and so on. We'll check with you on the action items from this call and this meeting. I think that's it really.

I think it's rained and it's been beautiful here in London. I don't know what it's like over in Seville, but over to you, Avri, to close it all off and of course, to thank the interpreters, et cetera.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Olivier. Thank you all for participation in this meeting. My apologies for my confusion with parts of the agenda along the way, but you were all really nice about it so thank you all and good luck with the rest of your meeting. Thank you to everyone. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]