
ICANN79 | Prep Week – GNSO New gTLD SubPro Supplemental Recommendations Community Update
Thursday, February 22, 2024 – 4:30 to 5:30 SJU

JULIE BISLAND:

Hello, and welcome to the new gTLD SubPro Supplemental Recommendations Community Update. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments will be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. When speaking during the session, please be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Interpretation for this session will include Spanish, French, Arabic, Russian, Chinese, and Portuguese. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN’s multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. Thank you. I will now hand the floor over to Paul McGrady.

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.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you, Julie. Hello, everybody. My name is Paul McGrady, and I am happy to be the team leader for the Small Team Plus, which has taken up looking over the recommendations that Council sent to the Board that the Board wasn't comfortable with, to see if we can come up with some supplemental recommendations that do honor to the goals of the community and also are respectful of the Board and its unique duties as Board members.

We hope we've come pretty close. The purpose of this particular webinar is to let you know where the Small Team Plus is and talk a little bit about the continuing community interaction on these topics that we are looking forward to in San Juan. Well, it looks to be about a week away, I can't believe it. So if we can go on to the next screen, and just going to share a bit of background.

So how did we get here? I always think that most people don't like these kinds of slides because a lot of people know these things. But then I attend these Prep Week calls for other topics which I'm not so intimately involved in, and I always then I think to myself, "Well, that was good." So for those of you who are bored with this particular slide, apologies in advance, but I hope it's helpful to some folks.

So back in February of 2021, the GNSO Council unanimously adopted the Final Report of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. In about almost a year later, in January 2022, the Board and staff kicked off an Operational Design Phase. And that concluded with the delivery of the Operational Design Assessment, the ODA, about another year after that, so December 2022. Three months later, in March of 2023,

the Board adopted the majority of the Subsequent Procedure recommendations.

I think that's an important thing to know that what we're dealing with here are some odds and ends. But the overwhelming majority of the recommendations were accepted by the Board and had been sent on to staff who have been dutifully working on implementation through the IRT, and there'll be updates on the IRT on SubPro or the next round, as I like to call it, because nobody knows what SubPro means outside of ICANN land, but the next round of new gTLDs. So I encourage you to get caught up in San Juan on that work because staff and the IRT team generally are doing a lot of work very quickly.

So the Board did place 38 recommendations in pending status. So the GNSO Council established a small team of councilors and the GAC liaison. We collaborated with the ICANN Board to resolve as many of the pending recommendations as we could. These were resolved in usually one of two ways, one, which was reaching just a mutual understanding that an issue could be resolved in implementation, or Council on some of these did a clarifying statement that was Council work, which would then be taken into account during implementation. That seemed to satisfy the Board. So that that takes us through a few months ago. Let's move on to the next slide.

So, in September and October of last year, the Board did not adopt seven (7) and three (3) recommendations respectively, which basically boiled down to six different topics. These non-adopted recommendations have been the focus of the scope of the work for the Small Team Plus. Now, we move from Small Team to Small Team Plus.

We'll have a slide on who participated in the Small Team Plus, but let me give you just a little background on it.

The Small Team consisted of councilors, but we came to a sort of a fork in the road where as a Council we said, "Well, we know this work. We're comfortable dealing with the Board. But we also really would like to have input from the broader community on these." So the Council invited the GAC and ALAC to send us folks to participate, and also the other constituencies and SGs to supplement our work. So we became the Small Team Plus. And the reason why that's important is because I do think it has given us a broader understanding of where the community overall is coming from on these things and helped us get creative in solving the problem. Importantly, neither the Small Team nor the Small Team Plus have any particular authority of their own. All this work is work that's meant to go to the GNSO Council ultimately, who will then decide whether or not to accept our work and send it on to the Board. I know there are concerns in the community about small teams perhaps being not having accountability or transparency or structure. We tried to deal with that issue head on by having open meetings, recorded calls, having others in the community join us to form the Small Team Plus, and also reminding ourselves on almost every single call that we're not the deciders, we're just a team putting together what we hope is good work.

So the Small Team Plus charged it with potentially developing and proposing supplemental recommendations to address the Board's concerns. And those will subsequently be considered at the Council

level for approvement. For approval, rather. I'm not sure what approvement is, I've made up a word, but approval. All right, so let's jump ahead.

So, the non-adopted recommendations are generally a subset from six topics. The topics were Topic 9: Registry Voluntary Commitments/Public Interest Commitments. That seems like a big item, but the bigger item on those I think have already been handled. We have a sort of narrow band in that idea. We have Topic 17 on Applicant Support. We have Topic 18: Terms and Conditions, Topic 22: Registrant Protections, Topic 24: String Similarity Evaluations, and Topic 32: The Limited Challenge and Appeals Mechanism. So those are the things that we've looked at. Moving on to the next slide.

I won't read all these names. But you can see on the left-hand side, we have the original GNSO Council Small Team members listed here on the left. On the right, we have those who joined us to make us Plus. So those are good names to see there. Why not reach out to your colleagues within your own groups and thank them for participating? Everybody has been really terrific and have attended a lot of calls and have made a lot of good suggestions and were very, very creative. So I'm very, very thankful for that.

Missing on this list and I would be remiss, which is, although Avri Doria is no longer on the Board, she was very involved in the Small Team's work and has since I think joined the Small Team Plus as an observer. In addition to the great work of Alan and Becky, we would be nowhere near where we are if Avri hadn't donated her time to our work. So thank you, Avri, very much. All right. Let's move to the next slide.

So what are we doing? You'll see this slide again. I love redundant slides, especially when it comes to next steps because it's good to have a reminder. So today, we're having the Community Update Prep Week webinar. On Wednesday, March 6, in Puerto Rico, we will have the SubPro Supplemental Recommendations Community Consultation, which means that everybody that's on this call and others who maybe couldn't make it to listen to the recording or those who've been following along will have an opportunity, will have 90 minutes to go over all of these, and to make sure that we have heard from the community before the Small Team Plus finishes its work and sends it to Council. We're going to jump right on that on March 7, the next day, with the Small Team Plus on its working session. We will be integrating what we heard on Wednesday, and then we'll continue to work on any necessary amendments through the week of April 1. And we will then pass along what we hope to be the supplemental recommendations to the GNSO Council for consideration during the April Council meeting. I know it's February and April sounds like it's far away, but all of us know how quickly time flies, and so it's really not. So the big takeaway on this screen is that we are getting close here. I'm not quite ready to call it homestretch. But we're getting close. All right. Well, we'll visit this slide again on our way out at the end of this talk. All right, let's go on to the next slide.

We're going to dive into the supplemental recommendations themselves. With me today are Nigel Hickson, the UK GAC rep, and Justine Chew from the ALAC. They are going to be helping me talk through the supplemental recommendations. Both have been wonderful participants in all of this work. They brought a lot of

wisdom and energy, so I couldn't be happier to be co-hosting with these two. And I do believe we start with Nigel on the next screen. Nigel, Topic 9: RVCs and PICs, take it away.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you very much and good evening. It's always difficult to follow Paul, isn't it? Thank you very much. Paul is a very modest chap. What a tremendous job he is doing, shepherding us through this task. I am no expert at all. Some of you might know me. I work for the UK Government on the Internet governance issues. I represent them at the M3AAWG, sort of, the GAC, and I'm a member of the GAC leadership team. It's been a pleasure to work within this role. As Paul said, I think it's worth stressing that the Small Team Plus is a vehicle. And thanks to the GNSO that allows other community members to participate in this important work. And I think many of us are very grateful for this.

So very briefly, this topic RVCs and PICs, many of you will be experts on this, what's it all about? So as Paul has said, what this work reflects is some concerns of the Board on particular recommendations. This is Topic 9. And the Board concern was essentially about the waiver to Specification 11 (3)(a) and (3)(b), as recommended in the SubPro process. The concern was that the waiver which would essentially allow some applicants not to follow the PICs in section (3)(a) and (3)(b) could lead to DNS abuse. The work on this is highlighted by the Small Team Plus that the waiver is not automatic, as you can see, and that all domains are registered to and controlled by the registry operator or its affiliates. So here we're talking essentially about a subset of new applications that are primarily concerned with the applicants where

the rezoning one operator where it's a business domain or a closed domain in some respects. And specification (3)(a) concerns registry to registrar agreements to ensure what to look at issues of phishing, etc., (3)(b) relates to the obligation on a registry to carry out monitoring of their registrants in terms of the activities they do concerning any DNS abuse activities, and also to do a statistical analysis. So if we go to the next slide, if we could.

This is the first one of these. Colleagues will outline these later. If you're like me and you've got glasses on, you can just about see the print here. If you were sitting at the back of a room, you might have an issue, but hopefully you can see some of this, of course, as you can read this in leisure. Essentially, what this is, and you'll see this on the other recommendations as well, what this is the updated text that the Small Group Plus has come up with so far concerning the particular recommendation that the Board had a problem on. Here we are in Recommendation 2 by both an update to the text of the recommendation itself, noting that—well, as I said, that certain requirements are still applicable in these waivers.

We also have Implementation Guidance which you can read below as well. The Implementation Guidance sets out the conditions under which the waiver would be applicable and also, of course, sets out the terms and conditions on how the registry operator has to work with its affiliates. So I hope that's instructive in pointing out how this would work in practice. This is a controlled exemption for certain types of PICs, those laid out in Spec 11 (3)(a) and (3)(b).

I'm happy to take any questions and other colleagues will no doubt be able to answer questions. But unless we want to go on to the next one, and then we come back to questions at the end.

JULIE BISLAND: Nigel, if we could just ask you to speak closer to your microphone. Are you wearing headphones or just your computer mic?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Well, just the computer mic, but yeah, I'll speak a bit louder. I am sorry.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Perfect. Thank you, Nigel. I see a note here from Julie Hedlund that Questions and Answers will only be read aloud if submitted through the Q&A pod. Then she will read them aloud during the time set for questions. If you put them in directly into the chat, they're going to be considered chat. So just a reminder on that, there will be time for questions. But there are currently no questions. So, Nigel, if you don't mind, if you can go ahead and take us into everyone's favorite topic, Applicant Support, Topic 17. It really is everybody's favorite topic. It's so funny. It's one of those things that the entire community has rallied around. So it really is fun. But Nigel, go ahead. Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you. I'll try to be a bit clearer. So yeah, Applicant Support. I think Paul makes a really good point here. It is a favorite topic of many, but also I think it's a very important topic indeed. And it's certainly important for us as in government, as we discuss the geopolitical situation that ICANN find itself in, because of the debates at the UN, etc., about the whole ethos of the multistakeholder approach to the governance of the Internet. The support that ICANN gets for its incredible efforts to, if you like, ensure that it's a global organization, and that the benefits of the identifier system are felt globally through the IDNs and through other instruments. And that will be part of this endeavor. If the eyes of the world will be watching ICANN to see in this round where applications come from, and certainly, hopefully, that through this Applicant Support Program and the work that ICANN Org and the Board and many other parts of the ICANN community are doing, we will see many applications coming from all over the world in whatever script, in whatever language for new gTLDs. This Applicant Support is part of that. But stop waffling, Nigel, get on to the subject.

In this case, there was a recommendation topic, Recommendation 17.2. The Board were concerned that this particular recommendation that essentially said that ICANN should consider paying or supporting applicants that qualified for the Applicant Support Program throughout the lifecycle of their work as registries to be slightly open-ended, the Board were concerned that this could sort of, if you like, open the doors to a financial situation which wasn't necessarily capped. So the Small Team Plus and others have been looking at this, and they have suggested language in this particular part of the

recommendation that, if you like, ring-fences to the extent to which other activities beyond the application fee will be provided by ICANN for those that meet the Applicant Support criteria. So I think that's the essential part of all of this. So if we go on to the next slide.

I'll be very quick, I'm talking too much. This slide I think really clearly spells out what this is all about. It's very clear in that it now clearly delineates that in addition to the application fee, the applicant should have access to an array of resources, etc., through the lifetime of the application. But it says for the avoidance of doubt, this recommendation does not obligate ICANN to provide support for all phases of the lifecycle of the application process. So depending on the agreements reached, it could, for instance, be support during the first few years of the operation other gTLD that meets this criteria, but it would not necessarily be open-ended.

Now, of course, for those eagle-eyed on this call, many of you will know that a couple of weeks ago, just under a couple of weeks ago, the consultation on the Applicant Support Handbook was launched. This is an incredible exercise in laying out a process and a procedure and a criteria through which registries can apply for this applicant support. So, really, these two things go hand in hand, there's going to be more work on Applicant Support. There's going to be more financial details from the ICANN Organization about how it's going to come together. But this is an important part of the work of our Small Group. I'll stop there. Sorry for talking too much.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Nigel. No, not at all. Thank you very much. The level of detail on this topic is extra important. Thank you for drawing attention to the fact that there is other ongoing community work in the form of reviewing that draft Applicant Handbook. Because the two topics are moving side by side, right? And so it's important. Yeah. So thank you for that.

On the Implementation Guidance, just a note. These were the ideas that the community came up with before the Small Team Plus was even formed. We wanted to make sure that that was passed along to the IRT. I don't mean to use the word Christmas list because these ideas were thoughtful, but the big takeaway is—and hopefully you can tell from that the revised language—is that the community remains committed to asking the Board for whatever we can get, that we all want the Applicant Support Program to be a big success. And the way that the Supplemental Recommendation was written is meant to give the Board the flexibility they need, while at the same time, not sending the message that we're not going to come knocking and continuing to ask for more for our applicants that need support.

Importantly, you'll see it goes all the way back to capacity building, planning, application. We want that sensitive time as new businesses are being formed and new nonprofits are being formed to be able to get that kind of expertise input into it was really, really important to the community. That was almost universally a theme and also to the Small Team Plus, and I think it will be to Council as well. So, Nigel, great job. Thank you.

I think we are moving on to Justine. Yes, Justine gets all the fun stuff. String Similarity.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I seriously doubt you can call it fun, Paul. It's the most challenging one, I think. Okay. Anyway, good evening, good morning, good afternoon, wherever you may be. It's very early in the morning for me. My name is Justin Chew, and I am the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council. So kind of technically a member of Council, I guess. I have been a member of the Small Team, as well as the Small Team Plus. I'd like just to echo what Nigel said earlier about being happy that we had this mechanism to increase participation from other communities or additional community persons, resource persons into the Small Team Plus. Many times I kind of feel lonely, although I really enjoy the company or my GNSO colleagues, I do kind of feel lonely as the only ALAC person, At-Large person on some of the small teams. So I'm very happy to have some of my colleagues join me on the Small Team Plus. Anyway, as with Nigel, enough babble, let's get on to the fun stuff, as Paul says.

Okay, so, Topic 24. There were actually two recommendations under topic 24, which the Board did not adopt. It's 24.3 and 24.5. But we'll take them together because they are sort of connected anyway. Essentially, if you see the language in the next slide, but we won't go there yet, the original Recommendations 24.3 and 24.5—oops. Thank you, Steve. Stop moving that thing. So Recommendations 24.3 and 24.5, the original language kind of extended the string similarity review process to include certain things. For example, extending it

beyond visual similarity check to include what we call a singular/plural check. So this topic is about string similarity, but the two recommendations pertain to singular/plural strings. So, second element that the recommendations try to include was a mechanism for a singular/plural check, and then also an intended use element as a way of identifying exemptions or exceptions to the singular/plural check.

But the Board had concerns about this. They had concerns about all the three elements that the recommendations had tried to put in, which is things like in terms of a singular/plural check, there is no universal way of determining whether something is a plural of a singular term. The way they put it is that not all applied-for strings will be lexical words. So the example that they gave was, if you think about strings in English, .mouse and .mice wouldn't be permitted under this recommendation, which is a problem because they are singular and plural of each other. That is a case where the recommendation wouldn't allow such things but it would allow other more common plural strings where it's just an addition of s. So .tld and .tlds with s would be allowed under this recommendation. So there is an even treatment of strings.

So, I mentioned an example in English, right? But we all hear in Internet world, right? It's supposed to be multilingual. So if you move away from English, there isn't a universal way of determining whether as I say something is a plural of a singular word. Across languages, you can't predict it consistently. And it's also about what the reader sees in terms of the URL and the string or the domain name. So the example

that was given was that bats, B-A-T-S, could be said to be plural for bat in English. But it's also a word in French, which is the declined form of the French word battle, to fight or battle. So that gives you an indication there is no universal way of determining whether something is plural or singular, a plural word of a singular word, and across languages.

There is also things about, like I mentioned that at the end of the day, sometimes it's about what the reader sees or what the end user sees in terms of the domain name or the TLD, whatever. So in the case of .auto, that could mean automatic. It could also mean vehicle, a short form for it. Cat could be the animal cat, but it's also the short form of Cathleen. So again, it's subject to the interpretation of the person that's actually reading the string or the word.

So just moving on to how the Small Team Plus proposed to fix or address all those concerns is that we have essentially removed all the intended use elements that appear in 24.3 part. It is actually the first bullet and the third bullet where it refers to the intended use mechanism, as well as the intended use mechanism that was in 24.5. Also, the Small Team still tried to have a way to include the ability to account for singular and plural words or strings in the case where an applicant is dotBrand. This is one of the things that the SubPro PDP actually identified as lacking, this ability to recognize strings, whether it's plural or singular of each other in the case of trademarks and dotBrands. So essentially, the revised recommendations try to retain this ability for the use of or the allowance for singular and plural strings in the case where there is a dotBrand applicant involved. Okay.

The last point about the language kind of thing, in 24.3 also, there's mention about the use of dictionary to help identify whether something is a plural of a singular string. The Small Team Plus suggested that we would substitute the reliance of a dictionary to recognize linguistic resources. So just expanding the resources that we could probably rely on to help with this notion of identifying singular and plural words. If we go to the next slide—yeah, okay.

We were discussing this in an earlier call, and I think we came to a conclusion that we were going to highlight the fact that these particular two recommendations on the topic 24, even with the revisions that you see on the screen now, may not receive the support of the ICANN Board because of the fact that the Board basically has issues about the use of intended use as an element, which would still apply when it comes to allowance for singular and plural in the case of a dotBrand. The Board also said that in terms of the string similarity review, the standard should be maintained at visual similarity. So, you will only be caught if the two strings or multiple strings would be confusingly similar. So the standard is visual similarity. And if by introducing intended use, you're going beyond just visual similarity. Of course, this notion of intended use is a hot topic that's being discussed now via the Board consultation on PICs and RVCs. That's all about whether the use of a commitment to monitor and to enforce intended use might be problematic in the light of the ICANN Bylaws prohibiting touching content. So moving on to the next topic.

Topic 18: Terms and Conditions. There are two recommendations under this topic as well. So I'm going to deal with just one of them and

Paul is going to deal with the other. Recommendation 18.1. The context of this is in the SubPro Policy Development Process. There were incidences in the last round where the application of an applicant was rejected, and possibly on grounds outside of what was provided for in the Applicant Guidebook, and insufficient rationale for the rejection was given.

So the SubPro PDP recommended that in terms of an application being rejected, it must only be rejected if done so in accordance with the provisions of the AGB, the Applicant Guidebook or if it's required under specific law. If it's caught under ICANN Board fiduciary duties or it's actually referenced in the ICANN Bylaws, those would be the only kind of circumstances by which a rejection should be maintained, and then rationale should be given.

The SubPro Small Team has now revised the language to shift the emphasis away from those grounds that I mentioned specifically, that will require ICANN to reject an application to the more positive side, to allowable grounds under which ICANN may reject an application. But again, I don't know whether this is going to receive the Board's approval at the end of the day. Because they have raised concerns that by specifying the circumstances by which whether you reject or whether you'd allow an application is somehow limiting the Board's authority to act as they see fit, including acting in unforeseen circumstances. So the Board is concerned about being bound by having to meet one of the specific conditions in either rejecting an application and so forth.

The rationale for the original recommendation was that it's to guard against arbitrary rejection of an application and to ensure that there is transparency when rejections occur. And the Board took the opinion that all these requirements already provided for and safeguarded by virtue of certain articles in the Bylaw. So the committee shouldn't be concerned or too concerned that the Board is acting willy-nilly, I suppose. I think I'll just stop there and give Paul a chance to speak.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Justine. I really appreciate it. Like I said, you got the fun ones. You got the ones with all the detail. I really appreciate that, and especially calling out the remaining issues that are here that the Council will have to tackle and I think specifically of what's going on in the chat and relationship to the singular and plural issues. There's community work ahead and there's Council work ahead for sure. I agree with Greg, great summary, Justine. We really appreciate it.

So I'm going to take these last few topics with the big thank you to Nigel and Justine. There'll be back for question and answer time, though. So don't worry. The next one is Topic 18 Recommendation 18.3. This has to do with the covenant not to sue that is baked into the Applicant Guidebook. The Board had a concern that dissatisfied applicants or objectors might argue based upon this particular policy recommendation that the covenant not to sue isn't valid because they don't like the way the appeals or challenge mechanism was built or the way that it was being operated by ICANN. The Board's concern, they gave it to us straight. They were concerned that anything that would weaken the covenant not to sue might actually preclude the

ability to offer the program due to unreasonable risks of lawsuits. That was a good splash of cold water.

So, the Small Team Plus took a look at this and we did a couple of things. One, we removed the dependent language between the covenant not to sue and a specific reference to the challenge and appeals mechanism that's described under Topic 32, which we're going to get to. So decoupling those, I think, sort of deals with one of the major concerns.

The second part of the concern was that we simplified it. We made it clear that there simply must be a challenge and appeals mechanism, and to make it clear that just because somebody doesn't like the outcome of a challenge or an appeal, that won't create additional causes of action for the Board's concern.

So that takes us to the actual text here. The strikers are hard to read. And as I mentioned in the chat, they're available in that link. But you'll see that where we've added and where we've subtracted. So there must be mechanisms in place for the applicant to have the ability to evaluate decisions and objections substantially reviewed. We've got here a reference to Topic 32, that it may be satisfied by Topic 32, but it's not prescriptive and that ICANN will continue to have terms and conditions that contain a covenant not to sue.

So we hope this does it. We got some good feedback from our Board members working on this one. So we're reasonably confident on this one that if we send it to the Council that it's going to have the traction that it needs.

Then we'll go on to Topic number 32, which is the limited challenge and appeals mechanism. The Board's concern was that it wasn't clear that a challenging appeal mechanism applicable to initial or extended evaluation decisions made by ICANN or third party providers or challenges concerning conflicts of interest of panelists could be designed in a way that does not cause excessive, unnecessary cost or delays in the application process. There are always concerns about folks who will overuse these kinds of mechanisms in an attempt to grind us all down, and the Board didn't want that to happen here. Very reasonable concerns. In the early days, Becky and Avri spent a lot of time with us explaining that concern.

So in the Small Team Plus work with Becky and Avri for a bit, and Alan, we removed references to specific evaluation and objection elements and instead made the specific areas dependent on being feasible and implementable. In other words, we don't want the Board to build something or feel pressured to build something that's not feasible and is not implementable, and that, I think, hopefully will create some creative freedom for the Board.

We emphasized that the challenge and appeals are limited only to these topics and are on a one-time basis. In other words, you can't keep filing and keep filing and keep filing until you get the answer that you liked. We've specifically removed evaluation elements for being challengeable where extended evaluation is available. Because extended evaluation is already of a sort a kind of appeals mechanism or an escalation path to have something looked at more closely if you think an evaluator just missed something or didn't get something

right. So again, that narrowed the scope of the things that fall in the limited challenge and appeals mechanism.

Then we soften the linkage between the recommendation and the underlying Implementation Guidance. You'll see some text on the next screen that talks about generally aligned with the principles. In other words, we didn't want to be so prescriptive in that Implementation Guidance that the Board felt we were doing the IRT's job or the Board's job, but we did want to give some good Implementation Guidance that came out of the SubPro Working Group Small Team. Generally, Implementation Guidance aren't policy recommendations anyways. So I think the softening of that linkage was just bowing to the reality of what Implementation Guidance is. We, again, are reasonably sure that we've addressed the concerns raised by the Board members who have been rowing this boat along with us as we made progress.

So let's go to the actual strikethroughs. This looks... I'm so sorry. But remember, there's a link to this in the chat. So, everybody, make sure you take a look at this before the community consultation in San Juan. But as you can see, we've added some things here about feasibility and being implementable, that they're limited, that we carved out those things for extended evaluation. Essentially, that we have then gone on and—I think there's a second screen here—we've taken some of the detail out of 32.1. Some of that ended up very much in what's called Annex F, which is a listing of the things that can be challenged.

That takes us then to 32.2, a little easier to read, where we talked about the generally aligned with principle as opposed to be as described in language. Again, it's not that we think Implementation

Guidance needs to bind the Board, we're just trying to convey what it is the community collectively worked on for a long time and that we're looking for from the Board.

Then we have the same language at 32.10, the limited challenge and appeals process must be designed in a manner that does not cause excessive, unnecessary costs or delays. Again, generally aligned with the principles in the Implementation Guidance.

So that is where we landed here. I see Julie's put the link again in chat. I think that may be the third or fourth time we've done it, but I think that's great. As someone who's attended a whole lot of these calls, I think to myself, "Oh, I wish I had grabbed that link." So it's there. I encourage everybody to take a look at it.

So that takes us through the last topic, Topic 32. I apologize to the translators. I know I'm a fast talker. I'm trying really, really hard, but it's really, really hard to talk slow. So we have about nine minutes left. And I don't know if there are any questions in the Q&A pod. But if there are, maybe Julie Hedlund can read them for us. If they're not, then Julie can let us know that as well, and we'll figure out what to do with the next nine minutes. No open questions. Okay.

Well, we know we've thrown a lot of information at you today. But we didn't want to just have a Prep Week webinar, give everybody nine minutes to ask every question they can think of after just being exposed to the information for the first time. That's why we're taking a pause. And in a week or so, we're going to have 90 minutes. And this takes us back to the slide that I promised you would see again. So this

is a reminder, these are the upcoming milestones. So today, we've done the Community Update Prep Week webinar. Next, on Wednesday, March 6, which is not next Wednesday but the other one, I think. So we've got quite a bit, a good chunk, for everybody to go through and read the slides and get comfortable again. Thank you for your questions. We'll have 90 minutes there. We may do some light re-presentation to the material. But I certainly hope that we save a good amount of time for questions and answers and feedback. Because the feedback we get, we're going to be scribing, we're going to be capturing. It's real important to get that real-time feedback from the community. We're about to land a jumbo jet. Are we on the right runway? That's what that session is for.

Then, as I said, the next day, there'll be a Small Team Plus working session. Nothing we're doing is private. So if you want to bring a baggie of your favorite potato chips and sit in the room and listen to us work, come on down. So we'll be doing that, working then on amendments through the week of April 1, and getting hopefully our final recommendation, supplemental recommendations to the GNSO Council. Nothing's final until they look through it and vote, do whatever they're going to do. They could adopt some, they could reject some, they could adopt all or reject all. That's up to the Council. But I really think we have a good set of working supplemental recommendations. But we do want to hear from you in San Juan. So if you can't be physically in San Juan, I encourage you to participate remotely. If you can be in San Juan, I encourage you to ignore all the other less exciting sessions than ours and come on down and spend 90 minutes with us while we hopefully finish up this work.

Julie Bisland says that a policy briefing—it's a reminder—that it's now available for download, and she gives us in the chat. So that is good information, Julie.

We have six minutes left and I think we're going to give you six minutes back to your life. Special thank you again to Nigel and Justine. Nigel is joining us at an hour that is personal hour in the UK, and I appreciate that, it's not work hours. And Justine is joining us at some unfortunately early time in Kuala Lumpur, 4am or 5am or some such. We've all been there but nobody has been there as much as Justine. You're a trooper, you both are. Thank you so much. Thank you, staff. We look forward to hearing everybody's questions in San Juan.

JULIE BISLAND:

Thank you so much, Paul. Thank you, everyone, for joining. This concludes our session. You may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]