
ICANN73 | Prep Week – Policy Update
Thursday, February 24, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:30 AST

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you. Hello, and welcome to ICANN73 Policy Update session. My name is Brenda, and I am 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. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the moderator of this session.

Interpretations for this session will include French, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. Click on the interpretation button on the menu bar in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand using the reactions button on the menu bar in the Zoom room. Once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu.

Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. With that, I will turn the floor over to David Olive. Thank you.

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.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you very much, and welcome everyone. Thank you for taking time out to be part of this policy update for ICANN73. My name is David Olive. I have the honor and privilege of leading this team from Org on the policy and advice development activities. I will be introducing some of our team members from the policy group.

You've heard their voices. You'll soon match those voices with their faces. We are comprised of 34 full-time staff across eight countries. You, I'm sure, know some of us or worked with some of us. We support the policy and advice development efforts across all supporting organizations and advisory committees.

ICANN's policy work is complex and cross-community in nature. Today, we will share with you a bit more about how our policy team meets these challenges to facilitate your policy and advice development work.

In terms of this webinar, we've heard from you a sense of presentation fatigue, Zoom fatigue. Therefore, we are trying to address that. You'll see this with the format of Zoom we're using today to help alleviate some of those issues.

You may have noticed it's a regular Zoom room. That's because we heard you. We want to be connected. I see now we have about 150-plus people in the room. So thank you for that. We are excited to share a new format as part of this effort to address some of the issues of Zoom and COVID fatigue. I'll now ask Melissa Allgood, our moderator, to discuss the structure of today's session. I hope you enjoy it. Thank you very much.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thanks, David. My name is Melissa Allgood. I will be moderating today's session. To build upon David's remarks about what brought us here today, we've also seen an increasing cross-community collaboration in the work that many of you do here at ICANN. We thought it timely to discuss all of this work in a new way. So we ask you bear with us as we do endeavor in this new format.

We will have four panels today focused on different topics relevant to ICANN73 and to the ICANN community more broadly. We will touch upon topics you have likely heard throughout this prep week. Now, our policy team panelists will discuss how the communities that they support are tackling this given topic. We will have a brief Q&A after each panel. In between our panels, there will be an interlude. We're calling these spotlights where additional information relative to ICANN73 will be highlighted.

As David mentioned, we're in a regular Zoom room. So you'll be able to ask the questions two ways. The first is by dropping your question into the chat—I see that Brenda has put that format in there—as well as you may raise your hand. In the event that we do not get to your question, please ensure that it's captured in chat. It will either be answered in the chat, or we'll take it up after the session.

Now, we have one other new feature of today's webinar. We're calling this the resource document. It's been dropped into the chat a few times since the session started. It contains additional links to information that will track along with the content of what will be presented today.

We encourage you to open this document and refer to it as our discussions evolve. This document will also be made available with the recording of today's session.

Now, before we begin, I'd briefly like to touch on how the policy team fits into the broader ICANN structure. At the heart of ICANN's policymaking, we know we have the multi-stakeholder model. This is a decentralized governance model that allows for community-based, consensus-driven policymaking. ICANN's supporting organizations and advisory committees participate in this policymaking work. It's the Org policy team, some of whom you will meet during today's webinar, that support the work of these SOs and ACs. It's through this lens that we will begin our discussion today.

Now, our first conversation will focus on a part of our technical community. We have Andrew McConachie, who supports the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (the SSAC), and the Root Server System Advisory Committee (the RSSAC). Andrew is joined by Bart Boswinkel who supports the Country Code Name Supporting Organization (the ccNSO). I welcome them both to give us a quick history of the DNSSEC and Security Workshop and Tech Day. Over to you, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks, Melissa. So as David and Melissa mentioned, we're trying a new format this time to keep things interesting and dynamic. So Bart Boswinkel and I were asked to give a brief history of the DNSSEC and Security Workshop and Tech Day, respectively. We have about four

minutes each to talk about two events run by the community, which have been going on for over a decade at ICANN meetings.

Both events have been held at roughly every ICANN meeting since they started with maybe only a couple interruptions. We're not going to do their histories justice in the next eight minutes. But I do hope we can communicate a sense of how important these two events are to ICANN meetings and how they've been instrumental in not only bringing technical people together but to also shaping the DNS ecosystem in significant ways.

So I will first talk about the DNSSEC and Security Workshop. After that, Bart will talk about the ccNSO Tech Day. What is now called the DNSSEC and Security Workshop has been meeting since at least ICANN22 in 2005. But even before that, there were groups of people getting together at ICANN meetings to discuss DNSSEC and how best to promote its deployment.

I [inaudible] the archives looking for the very first DNSSEC themed event at an ICANN meeting. It's actually a pretty hard question to answer. There isn't a distinct ICANN meeting or DNS where SSAC was discussed as a topic for the first time. Rather, it was a topic that participants brought to ICANN meetings informally and it gained more formality and structure over time.

There was something called the DNSSEC mini workshop at ICANN22. And at ICANN 32 in Paris, there was a meeting called the DNSSEC Public Meeting. But really starting in ICANN33 in Cairo, we started seeing the DNSSEC workshop appear at every ICANN meeting. This was back in

2008. In 2008, things looked very different for DNSSEC. The root zone wouldn't be signed until 2010, so much of the conversation at the time was about software to support signing the evolving effort to sign the root zone and look-aside validation services that acted as a stand-in for an unsigned root zone. A couple registries had already deployed DNSSEC and re-utilizing the DNSSEC workshop as a venue to share their experiences.

A lot has changed with DNSSEC since 2008. The root zone was signed in 2010. Most gTLDs and ccTLDs are now signed, and look-aside validation services have been retired. Validation has been picked up, as well with APNIC reporting that roughly a quarter of Internet users use a DNSSEC-validating resolver. In 2019, the DNSSEC workshop changed its name to the DNSSEC and Security Workshop in part to emphasize the widening of its remit to cover more than just DNSSEC-related topics.

Recently, the workshop is molding panels to discuss DNSSEC provisioning automation and been exploring topics related to DNSSEC such as secure email transport using DANE. The DNSSEC and Security Workshop still maintains its original mission of bringing operators and developers together to promote cooperation, information sharing, and learning. So that was a short history—a very short history—of the DNSSEC and Security Workshop. Now, over to Bart to tell us about ccNSO Tech Day.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks, Andrew. Let me start by saying one of the nice things if you start looking into the history of such long-standing events like Tech Day. As

you are always surprised—and I think you've come across this as well. As you said, initially, you'd think there was a clear point in the past when the meeting started. But, as you also noted, if you look into the history closely, you note boundaries are blurring.

So focusing on Tech Day, you immediately come across the Tech Working Group. This working group was created in the mid-2006 era and the first session it organized was during ICANN27 in December 2006. So that was the São Paulo meeting. You think I've pinpointed the first meeting of Tech Day. But the goal of that meeting was quite different. It was to start a handbook. A handbook and its contents developed by this group were intended to assist ccTLD managers to share information about safe, secure, and successful operational practices.

So it was clearly one of the threads that, ultimately, became part of Tech Day. But the Tech Day as we know now has also another origin. So I went back even further. I started to look at the first official ccNSO members meeting. That was in Rome in March 2004. That was ICANN19. If you look at the agenda of that meeting, one of the sessions was called "Best Practices for Security in ccTLDs." And fortunately, the set of presentations has survived over time.

If you look at the presentation, there is a presentation by SSAC. There is a presentation on security in .AU, an overview of DNSSEC experiment on the .NL, a presentation on a beta testing phase of measurements of availability of services at the time known as DNS monitoring, and then a presentation on Anycast implementation.

Again, a wide array of topics. And we're talking about the 2004 era. So this shows, I would say, or demonstrates, that the ccNSO, both the council and members, have always been very much into sharing practices and information even when it was created, the information sharing on technical and operational nature. However, the way it was organized varied in the early days. So sometimes it was part of the sessions organized by working group, sometimes part of the ccNSO Members Day, which were organized under the auspices of the ccNSO council.

Now, changing gears again and moving forward in time, these two threads finally merged into what we now know as Tech Day. The first one, which you could say pinpoint on, was, again, ICANN32, which you also mentioned. That was the ICANN meeting in Paris in May 2008. The meeting on Monday, that was a meeting organized by the Tech Working Group. That was Tech Day as we know it now. That was effectively the first time.

Now, what is interesting, the reason why they've organized it on Monday, and ever since those meetings were organized on Monday, was to avoid collision with the ccNSO Members Day, which was also always held on Tuesday Constituency Day as it's known now on Wednesdays.

The announcement of that meeting, I think, is also still valid. So if you would go back and look at the schedule, you will see Technical Workshop. What is it? It's a workshop or it's a session with presentations, discussions, and hands-on demonstrations in an

interactive format. Why is it important? It presents operational or present day, operational issues and challenges, and they will be discussed, and practical solutions as they are in place with ccTLD registries will be demonstrated. Again, this is the format that is still ever since it's been in use. So it's very much operational and technical focused, very practical solutions to resolve some of these technical and operational issues are demonstrated. The meeting itself still follows that format.

So to summarize, since 2008, Tech Day has become a standard and integral part of the ICANN Public Meetings I would say. And as you said, Andrew, ever since that meeting in May 2008, there was a Tech Day, at least at ICANN meetings. Even in these times when we do not meet in person, Tech Day has always been there and it's always been on a Monday. And it provides meeting space for people with an interest in technical and operational side of the DNS in, I would say, as part of the ICANN Public Meetings. Thanks. Back to you, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thank you, Andrew and Bart. I'm going to go over to Brenda to see if we have any hands up.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Melissa. I see no hands at this time.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thanks, Brenda. I have a question I'd like to ask you both. Are there any trends in topics under discussion that you're seeing around these technical events? Either one of you can feel free to answer.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. Well, I'll take a quick shot at that. So I think one of the trends we've seen as the state of DNSSEC deployment has evolved is in a DNSSEC workshop, which changed its name to the DNSSEC and Security Workshop in 2019. their topics have tracked the evolution of DNSSEC in the ecosystem. So if you look back at 2018, you'll see that they're talking about things which are just not interesting anymore like how to sign the root zone, and how do we get the first few TLDs signed.

Whereas now, we're holding panels on more topics that are interesting for today's DNSSEC landscape like using DANE for securing SMTP mail transport or how to automate the signing of domain names at the second level with their registries or registrars. So I'd say the topics that the DNSSEC and Security Workshop have tracked the state of DNSSEC deployments mainly.

BART BOSWELL: And Melissa, let me try to answer it for the Tech Day because I'm not really actively involved being a policy person myself. But it's one of those events that makes you feel proud to support the ccNSO. So that's a good thing. But if you look at what I see as I would say themes, they are DNS-related and technical operational and relevant for TLDs, so not just ccTLDs but also TLDs.

They're around research or DNS-related research, deployment of certain technologies, etc. I think, as Andrew said, with the evolution of the DNS, with the evolution of the Internet, with the evolution of the TLDs themselves and research, the topics themselves have followed these trends, as well. So although the themes are the same at a very high level, the actual presentations and the actual discussions have evolved with the evolution and follow suit the evolution of the Internet and the way it's being used and the role of TLDs in that evolution. I hope that gives you whoever asked it a response. Thanks. Back to you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

My thanks to you both. We're now going to move onto our first spotlight. Now that Bart and Andrew have armed us with this quick history of the DNSSEC and Security Workshop, as well as Tech Day, I'd like to hand the floor to Kathy Schnitt, who will discuss the details of these same events at the upcoming ICANN73 meeting.

KATHY SCHNITT:

Thank you very much, Melissa, and thank you all for joining us today. I just want to highlight a couple of the sessions for both Tech Day and the DNSSEC and Security Workshop. First off, as mentioned, Tech Day is always on Monday. So it will be Monday, the 7th of March. As Bart said, Tech Day has been part of the ICANN meetings since 2006. It provides a forum to present and discuss technical topics.

This Tech Day, as usual, will have a number of very interesting topics. One will include presentations on implementation of TLS client

authenticating using DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities, which is also known as DANE, as we heard Andrew mention. We will also have a domain abuse roundtable where the panelists will share their respective technical and operational activities so they are making progress in reducing domain abuse and some of the challenges associated with the activities.

Moving on to the DNSSEC and Security Workshop, which will be held on Wednesday, the 9th of March, we are actually going to start off with a panel on quantum cryptography, which we will start off with an actual beginner's session on what exactly is quantum cryptography. Then, we're going to move onto a presentation from ICANN Org on a recently published paper talking about how quantum computing affects the security of the DNS.

From there, we're going to finish off with two panel presentations on post quantum DNSSEC. Then later in the day, we will have a presentation on the security implications of email-forwarding mechanisms and policy, which will highlight recent work that studies email-forwarding mechanisms, implementations, and how they interact with existing anti-spoofing protocols.

So as you can see, a range of different interesting topics. So please do come and join us. You can find links on the resource document for further information. Now, I'm happy to hand it back over to my colleague Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thanks, Kathy. So our next discussion will be around IDNs and UA. Internationalized domain names, known as IDNs, enable people around the world to use domain names in local languages and scripts. The introduction of new generic top-level domains, gTLDs, as well as IDNs, into the Internet ecosphere enables significant expansion of the DNS. Universal acceptance (UA) is the concept that all domain names and email addresses should be treated equally and can be used by all Internet-enabled applications, devices, and systems.

Now, IDNs were first introduced at the second level. And in 2009, a fast-track process was created for IDN ccTLDs. During the 2012 round, IDN gTLDs were introduced into the root zone for the first time. For those of you who may have joined other webinars during this prep week, these topics, IDN and UA, have been explored in a few different ways and we're excited to add additional color to these conversations.

On our panel today, we have Ariel Liang who supports the gNSO efforts in this space. We have Joke Braeken who supports CCNSO efforts, Fabien Betremieux who supports the GAC, and Silvia Vivanco supports the At-Large communities. I'm going to hand it off to Ariel to get our conversation going. Over to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks so much, Melissa. This is Ariel Liang supporting the GNSO. So as to what Melissa mentioned at the top level there are already IDN TLDs. So there are 92 IDN TLDs and 61 IDN ccTLDs. However, the variant TLDs

cannot be delegated just yet. So what are variants? You may have heard of the term variants in the pandemic context such as the Omnicom and Delta variants, which are the different strains of the same disease COVID.

But in the domain name context, variant labels mean that alternative labels, they may differ in some forms and respects. But they mean exactly the same thing due to how the language of the label works. In order to enable the future delegation of variants at the top level and broaden the reach of the multi-lingual Internet, the ICANN Org and the community work very hard to address two issues.

First is the definition of variant TLDs. Second is the management mechanisms for variants. So the first issue of definition has been addressed through the root zone label generation rule. The acronym is called RZLGR. It's a rule that determines which subsets of a character in a string can form a valid top-level s and how the variant characters should be calculated. So far, the current RZLGR Version 4 has encompassed 18 scripts ranging from Arabic to Thai. In order to tackle the second issue, the ICANN Org in 2019 adopted a series of ICANN Org developed recommendations for managing variant labels at the top and the second level.

So, for example, one of their recommendations is the same entity requirement, which means at the top level, the variant label should be allocated to the same registry operator would be withheld for possible allocation to the same registry operator. With this background, the GNSO Council launched the IDN Expedited policy development process.

This group started its work in August of 2021. Its remit is to cover two issues. One is the definition of all TLDs and the management mechanism of variants. And the second issue is how should the IDN implementation guidelines be updated in the future?

So these guidelines are for contracted parties to follow the managing of IDNs at the second level. This group has made good progress so far. So they have basically tackled the topic of definition. Now, it's just started its work for the same entity principle at the top level and especially as pertaining to how it can be effectuated legally and operationally.

At the same time that ICANN Org requested both the GNSO and the ccNSO to coordinate for developing consistent solutions for IDN gTLDs, and IDN ccTLDs, some of the same topics are also addressed by the ccNSO. My colleague, Joke, will provide additional details about IDN's efforts in the ccNSO and also explain some of the synergy that both groups are sharing. So over to you, Joke.

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Thank you so much, Ariel. Before I start talking about policy development at the ccNSO, I would like to highlight that IDNs and the promotional universal acceptance is really daily business for many ccTLDs. Bart mentioned previously already that sharing best practices, sharing information is an important aspect of what the ccNSO does.

A good example is the ccTLD News Session, which is scheduled for next week. You can find more information in the resource document. But I

warmly welcome you to attend this session because it really shows what ccTLDs actually are doing on a daily basis and how they deal with certain topics. It's open for all interested to attend.

So regarding the policy development at the ccNSO, you already mentioned that there is ccPDP4 on IDNs on the selection and deselection of IDN ccTLD strings, that that policy development process is ongoing currently. An important difference with what the GNSO is the fact that the ccNSO only deals with the top level. So the second level of out of scope for the ccNSO.

DDPDP4 is doing its work via various subgroups. One of the subgroups recently completed its work. It's the one on the deselection of IDN ccTLDs. The deselection ... Well, this group really defines the trigger event for the deselection of IDN ccTLDs. But the retirement itself is out of scope for the policy.

There are other subgroups such as the one on confusing similarity, which is about to kick off after ICANN73. The variant management subgroup to which Ariel previously already referred to, that subgroup works in close coordination with the GNSO efforts because there needs to be alignment in what the ccNSO and the GNSO do. So they regularly talk to each other.

There is alignment, for instance, in terms of the variant management calculation, the root zone regulation rules being used for that and to also the same entity principles being discussed by the variant management subgroup.

I mentioned that there is close coordination with the GNSO but there is also, of course, interaction with the GAC. The GAC has an important role to play at the very end of the policy development process because one of the elements as specified in the bylaws is that the GAC is being asked to provide advice at the very end of the process. So ccNSO has a joint meeting with GAC at ICANN73 when the recent developments of both CCPDP3 and CCPDP4 will be discussed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: It sounds like we may have lost Joke but which was meant to [inaudible].

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you for that. Apologies for that.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: No worries. Indeed, the GAC as recognized the public policy interests involved in IDN matters and formed a dedicated work group back in November 2019 at the ICANN66 meeting in Montreal. It's called the Universal Acceptance in IDN GAC Working Group. The reason why this group was formed is discussions between the GAC members themselves and we, the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, those conversations are generally reporting the GAC communique, so this is where the formations working group comes from.

In terms of its objective, this working group aims to help the GAC community track and consider matters of interest to governments in

those areas. Generally, the GAC leadership looks to the working group to provide expertise perspective and information on these matters, especially, for instance, currently when there are public comment opportunities that the GAC may be interested in.

So as part of the activities of the GAC related to IDNs, you may be aware that the GAC participates in the PDP on IDNs in the GNSO. There are four GAC appointees to the working group—the GAC chair, a representative from the United Kingdom, India, and Nigeria. And this is part of a wider trend of the GAC's participation, a more formalized participation in GNSO policy development deliberations.

I mentioned that the GAC is attentive to the public comments, and especially those regular outputs we see from the community panels that propose root zone label generation rules. In those occasions, the GAC leadership [systematically] invite GAC members to consider those outputs [for comments].

And as mentioned by Joke, my colleague from the ccNSO support team, we expect that the GAC will increasingly engage with the ccNSO on these matters. This is also part of a renewal of information exchanges and collaboration between the two groups on various matters. as we will see, in particular in this bilateral meeting at ICANN73 between the GAC and the ccNSO.

So while this panel is about IDNs, I've mentioned that the GAC working group is for both universal acceptance and IDNs. That's because the GAC recognizes the very tight connection between the two issues because IDNs along with new gTLDs maybe not be accepted or work

properly in all software applications either as the main name or as part of email addresses. So this is why the GAC works with both issues in the same working group. So the GAC is not the only advisory committee that's concerned with this connection between IDNs and universal acceptance. I believe the ALAC history is too, isn't it, Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes. Thank you very much, Fabien. So I'm going to talk about the At-Large EPDP contributions and user survey and universal acceptance training for RALOs. The At-Large in collaboration with over 250 ALS organizations across the globe expresses the interest of individual Internet end-users within the ICANN community. What is the importance of the EPDP to At-Large?

At-Large believes the work of this EPDP is crucial in producing consensus policies for achieving the security and stability goal of variant labels in a stable manner. From the individual user's perspectives, such security and usability goals are not met simply by allowing variant TLDs to be made available and checked. So what are the At-Large's contributions thus far?

The EPDP on IDNs has a strong At-Large presence and participation record. There is active engagement thus far by the way of advocating, a fact-finding approach, deliberations that factor in end-users' perspectives, as supported by the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group.

I also want to mention the At-Large end-user survey. This is a survey that will allow the ALAC to collect the perspective targeted end-users about IDNs and universal acceptance in the Hindi language in selected regions of India. By surveying specific respondent groups identified by the ALAC, ICANN aims to bolster the data collection efforts of the At-Large and community related to Internet end-users on the topic of IDNs and universal acceptance.

What are the RALOs doing on promoting universal acceptance? The regional universal acceptance training programs are a collaborative effort among the ICANN organization, the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, the community, the regional top-level domain organizations to raise awareness of universal acceptance challenges, and highlight universal acceptance remediation efforts, as well as to allow for engagement with key industry stakeholders.

I want to mention the LACRALO universal acceptance training program, which was designed to increase universal acceptance awareness across the LAC region and engage with technical stakeholders directly.

Over 150 participants from 14 countries volunteer in this training and the NARALO universal acceptance training, which was recently concluded, more than 225 people took this training. In addition to the technical aspects of universal acceptance and email address internationalization, participants learned more about universal acceptance for java software and application developers and the life of universal acceptance ambassadors. So that concludes my remarks and thank you. Over to you, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Well, my thanks to the panel. I'd like to check in with Brenda. Do we have any hands up?

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Melissa. One moment while I do a good thorough check. We have no hands raised. Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Okay. Well, I have a question that I think probably is best directed at Ariel to start. And it is this. There's already an extensive body of research, study, and work in the IDN space. Why are policy development efforts still needed?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks for the question, Melissa. So perhaps there are three points I'd like to mention to answer this question. First, the ICANN Board actually has a directive to ask both the GNSO ccNSO to develop their policy procedures related to IDN subjects by taking into account the existing body of work related to IDN. So the board already foresees that there is a necessity for policy development related to the IDN subject.

Then, secondly, in terms of to make those existing research and body of work into reality to implement some of the recommendations come from this research, the consensus policy development is necessary. Without it, without a multi-stakeholder process to develop the

consensus recommendations, they won't become something enforceable where require a contracted party to follow.

So that consensus development process is absolutely necessary to make these recommendations into a reality and make them implementable. Certainly, some of the studies and research they provide high-level recommendations. But the devils are really in the details.

So, for example, if we can talk about same entity requirements, what does that really mean? Should variants and the main gTLD label be subject to one registry agreement or should they be subject to separate registry agreements? What's the implications to applications for new gTLDs and their variant labels? Can they be applied at the same time, or do they need to be different applications? What's the implications to the objection process, the string similarity review and all these steps?

So these details need to be worked out. So with the policy development involving all different stakeholders that's impacted, it will help reach conclusions and make these recommendations into reality. So I guess with these three points, that's why policy development is so necessary for the IDN subject.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thanks so much, Ariel. I see we did have a question that came up in chat that actually got answered in chat. So seeing no other questions, I'd like to thank our IDN UA panel and we will move onto our second spotlight.

Next up, we will discuss the plenaries schedule for ICANN73. I welcome Ozan Sahin to discuss more.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Melissa, and hello everyone. ICANN73 will feature two plenary sessions. As usual, both sessions were selected by the ICANN community. The first plenary session will be on the global public interest framework to discuss whether it is useful. The session will take place on Monday, the 7th of March, which is the first day of ICANN73. This is an important session because at ICANN global public interest is tied to its mission and central to primary governance documents.

The plenary session will be moderated by Marita Moll from the At-Large committee and it will include a brief review of the global public interest framework by ICANN Org. This session will also include a discussion of a use case, the system for a standardized access disclosure where the global public interest framework has been used as part of ICANN Board deliberations. The lessons will be shared by Avri Doria from the ICANN Bard.

And finally, the session will include a discussion of whether and how this framework can best be used by the ICANN community in its interactions with the ICANN Board.

On day three of ICANN 73, we will have the second plenary session on the topic of evolving the DNS abuse conversation. This plenary session will explore the differentiation between maliciously registered and compromised domains in DNS abuse. This session will be moderated

by Graham Bunton from the Registrars Stakeholder Group. We will have a moderated panel discussion incorporating the audience questions.

Finally, there will be a discussion on the mitigation strategies and the future work. This concludes our overview of the two planner sessions during ICANN73. Thank you for your attention. I will now turn the floor over to my colleague, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thanks so much, Ozan. Our next topic is gTLD registration data. We all know this is a broad topic that has significant reach and interest within the ICANN community. We will only be able to scratch the surface in today's discussion. So according to the EPDP Phase One Implementation Review Team, gTLD registration data means that data element values collected from a natural or legal person or generated by registrar or registry operator in either case in connection with a registered name.

While communities may work on registration data within their respective groups, there are a number of areas where we see community groups collaborating on this topic. With this increased community collaboration, the policy team has increased our effort to facilitate the evolving nature of this work.

So today, our panelists will highlight how the groups they support are engaging on registration data issues. Joining today's conversation, we have Marika Konings, who supports GNSO efforts, Fabian is back from GAC support, Heidi Ullrich who supports the At-Large community joins,

as well as Steve Sheng who supports the SSAC in this space. Over to you, Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thank you very much, Melissa, and hello everyone. Thank you for joining us today. As many of you may already know, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (or GNSO) is responsible within ICANN for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic, top-level domain names.

As part of that work, registration data has been a recurring theme throughout its activities, basically since the inception of ICANN and is part of many different currently ongoing projects. Most recently, as a result of the coming into force of the General Data Protection Regulation (or GDPR) the topic has been at the forefront of a number of initiatives such as the Expedited Policy Development Process (or EPDP) on the temporary specifications for gTLD registration data.

That effort resulted in recommendations for assistance for the standardized access or disclosure of nonpublic registration data. This is also being referred to as SSAD. In addition, there's also the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team. This team has been tasked to further investigate the potential issues with existing accuracy requirements and make recommendations to the GNSO Council on whether or not further policy development is necessary.

This has proven to not be an easy task because following the entering into force GDPR, registration data is no longer publicly accessible, which has made it difficult to measure the current state of accuracy.

Some believe that as a result of registration data no longer being publicly available, accuracy levels have improved. Others believe that the opposite is the case. The scoping team is expected to explore if and how data can be gathered to assess whether or not there are issues with accuracy that require for the policy work. You can expect to hear more about both of these topics during ICANN73 with the Accuracy Scoping Team hosting an open working session on Monday, the 8th of March to make further progress on this assignment.

In relation to the SSAD and the GNSO Council is in consultation with the ICANN Board to consider how to proceed now that further information is available concerning the expected cost and operational aspects of implementing SSAD. Although no final conclusions have been reached at this stage, the GNSO Council is expected to provide the ICANN Board with a status updates during this joint session at ICANN73.

It is important to note though that even though these activities have been initiated and charted by the GNSO Council, other groups that have expressed an interest in this topic have been invited to participate and most of them have accepted those invitations.

This is a relatively new approach that the GNSO has taken. Although previously efforts typically had an anyone interested can participate approach, more recent efforts have followed what we call a representative model. This means that groups are requested to

designate representatives that have the responsibility to consult with their respective groups so that input and proposals made can be expected to reflect the views of that particular group.

The idea is that these different views are heard at an early stage, instead of at the time when proposals go to the ICANN Board. This way, there is hopefully a better chance of developing policy recommendations that reflect the views of the broader ICANN community. In a similar way, recent efforts have seen liaisons from ICANN Org, as well as the ICANN Board, that participate in some of these activities to allow for early input and flagging of potential concerns.

But to be clear, participation from non-GNSO participants does not only happen at an early stage of policy development. The reason small teams at the GNSO Council formed for further review and analyze the SSAD Operational Design Assessment (ODA) and the board concerns related to SSAD also include representatives from interested advisory committees.

Of course, per the bylaws, ultimate decision-making does lie with the GNSO Council. But at the same time, those advisory committees that decide to participate, they do not give up their ability to provide advice directly to the ICANN Board on these topics. Even though there have obviously been some growing pains in implementing this new approach, there have clearly been benefits in ensuring that different views and positions are heard at an early stage, which has, from our perspective, contributed to the better inter-community working relationships.

With the Governmental Advisory Committee (or the GAC) being one of the groups that has adapted very quickly to this new way of working, I'm now going to hand it over to my colleague Fabien, who will talk about the GAC work on registration data in more detail.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Marika. I think it's fair to highlight the significance of the GAC's engagement in all phases of the EPDP. You mentioned a novel nature of the approach. It's not a novelty for GAC representatives to be involved in GNSO PDPs. But what is fairly notable here is over the last few years is a number of representatives that were involved. It's their [inaudible] over the whole duration of the process.

It's also the internal organization of the GAC to support such an engagement and the work in a GNSO PDP. And this is despite some challenges that are specific to the GAC, the fact, for instance, that ICANN is usually on [a] part of the portfolio of government representatives.

It's also that there is a natural cycle of transition between representatives in GAC delegations. So this makes it a very interesting development for us as a support team.

Marika, you noted that the GAC's participation in the GNSO PDPs does not preclude its issuing statements or even advice to the ICANN Board regarding the policy recommendations that are ultimately adopted by GNSO Council at the end of those policy deliberations.

That's because, for instance, advisory committees do not participate in GNSO Council votes. So we've seen in the case of the GAC the issuing of

minority statements on final reports, as was the case for phase two and phase 2A. We've also seen GAC advice to the Board in the ICANN73 communique where the GAC advised the Board to consider the GAC minority statement on EPDP phase two final report and—I'm quoting from the advice—available options to address the public policy concern expressed therein.

We've also seen most recently a similar request to the Board but not in the form of advice this time regarding the EPDP phase 2A policy recommendation.

What we're seeing also in terms of the GAC's participation in GNSO policymaking is it's a continued evolution as we speak, for instance, because you may be aware that the GAC also participates in the scoping team on accuracy. So this is an extension of the GAC's participation to pre-PDP deliberations, which makes sense to GAC participants, given the impact of scoping on policy deliberations downstream.

For instance, there was some feeling for some that some of the issues that the GAC would have liked to be addressed in the EPDP could not be because of scoping. So this is why it makes sense for GAC participants to be involved even earlier than at the beginning of policy development or policy deliberations.

You may also be aware of the GAC's participation in the GNSO small team to review the SSAD ODA. So here, we're seeing an expansion of the GAC's participation to post-PDP deliberations. That was welcomed by GAC participants to be invited into that small team because the operational design that ICANN conducted in its assessment concerned

recommendations that have been negotiated with the GAC in a working group and that have also been subject to minority statement by the GAC at the end of the deliberation.

There's been some concern or there are some concerns, legitimate, that some of these efforts may not be moving as fast as they could. For instance, potentially because some assignments in those groups are not turned over on time by all stakeholders. So I want to share here a bit of what it means for the GAC to be participating and providing views in EPDP on a weekly basis. This requires for the GAC extensive coordination at several levels, within governments and between governments.

This is true among the various GAC representatives that are involved directly in the GNSO PDP working groups. It also may involve a wider circle of GAC experts that are consulting together within the GAC. It may require the consultation of the entire GAC, depending on what input it is. You may recall in addition to minority statements and public comments that the GAC has delivered as part of the phase two of the EPDP some governmental accreditation principles that were eventually integrated into Recommendation 2 of the SSAD recommendations.

So this requires a lot of coordination. This is in the context of I mentioned earlier the natural cycled transitions in GAC delegations. To give you a sense of what that means, that over the three or four years of the EPDP process, a majority of GAC delegations will have seen change in their delegates. That movement of people in the GAC represent about a third of the entire population of participants in the GAC. What it means

for the EPDP is that there was at least a dozen GAC representatives involving all phases, if we count also the accuracy scoping team, which I recognize [inaudible]. It's just a continuation of the process.

So those trends and challenges are certainly something that [inaudible] on our end as a GAC support team. But also in the way we work as a support team with other support teams and how we coordinate the collaborations and the deliveries and all timely contributions that are needed.

So as I will now turn to my colleague Steve from the SSAC support team, I'll just note that there is also a level of collaborations between the advisory committees that are participating in the GNSO amongst themselves exchanging views. That's certainly the case of the GAC and SSAC. I'll hand it over to you, Steve. Thank you.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Fabien. The SSAC has participated in the EPDP process. So 1, 2, 2A under the new representative model. Within the SSAC, there is a dedicated work party that meets on a weekly basis to support the SSAC representative's works. The SSAC also participates in the small team reviewing the operational design assessment and in the accuracy scoping team, as well.

The most recent SSAC input on this is SAC 118, the SSAC comment on the EPDP report. This was also included as a minority statement on the EPDP report.

I think broadly speaking, the SSAC sees the Internet abuse is on the rise and that the inability to gain access to certain elements of the registration data is really detrimental to cybersecurity investigation and research. With that in mind, the SSAC does not believe the SSAD system currently envisioned fit for various security and anti-abuse purposes. As such, SSAC has concerns about the resulting operational design phase, as well.

In SAC 118, SSAC's objective is to lay out requirements from a system point of view that best supports the requirements of security professionals and researchers as SSAC's contribution on this topic. Now, let me hand over to my colleague, Heidi, to provide some perspective from the ALAC. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you so much, Steve. My name is Heidi Ullrich, and I help with the At-Large Advisory Committee, or the ALAC. Their main role is to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN insofar as they relate to the interests and needs of individual Internet end users. The ALAC has been involved in registration data discussions since 2002. It's produced 25 statements on WHOIS and registration data accuracy. It also has been very active in ICANN's post-GDPR activity.

Regarding the current legislation data accuracy scoping team, the ALAC is a very active participant and has been an early participant as you've heard with the GAC and the SSAC as well. In addition, the ALAC has also been actively represented in all phases of the expedited policy development process or the EPDP in all three stages.

So why is registration data access important to the ALAC? While few of the world's 5 billion individual Internet users have a direct interest in consulting registration data, virtually all have an interest in having a safe and secure Internet. The ALAC's main concern here is ensuring that third parties who work to make the Internet a safe and secure place for users such as law enforcement, cybersecurity researchers, those combatting fraud and domain names and others who help protect users from phishing, malware, spam, fraud, DDoS attacks, can access the information that they need. So ALAC supports activities that ensure that registration data is accurate.

With regards to the process, again, similar to what we've heard with the GAC and SSAC, there is a very strong process here within the At-Large, the Consolidated Policy Working Group. They meet weekly. The representatives will speak to the members of the At-Large community in that working group. They'll present the updates of what's been happening in this group but also, very importantly, they'll ask for feedback. So this representative model is getting information from the groups and from the members of the group. So I'm going to hand it back to Melissa. Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thanks, Heidi. So Brenda, do we have any hands up?

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you, Melissa. Nope, we have no hands at this time.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Okay. Well, I would like to throw a question out there, and it is this. What have been the biggest challenges of this increased cross-community collaboration on the registration data topic? I think I'm going to toss it to Marika first to take a stab if she will.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes. Thanks there, Melissa. I'm happy to take a stab at that. I think that the main challenge has probably been for those coming into GNSO projects to have to adapt to the GNSO processes and procedures. Every group within the ICANN community works along the lines of their own rules and processes. These are not all the same.

To give you a very small example, of definition of consensus may be different. There is not a definition of consensus that applies across the whole ICANN community. There are different definitions and different ways in which consensus are measured. So I think that has been one of the adjustments that some may have had to make when joining in a GNSO processes. But fortunately, everyone is a very quick learner. I think everyone has by now fully adapted to the way that the GNSO works in these [efforts.]

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Fabien, I saw your hand.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Right.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Would you like to add to that?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Absolutely, yeah. I'll just mention, I'll quote the definition of consensus for the GAC to illustrate what Marika was saying and the differences that are involved here. So for the GAC per its operating principles, consensus is the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objection, which is definitely not the case. In the case of the GNSO, it's a much more complex decision. There are many more layers to the notion of consensus. So just as an illustration.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Back to you, Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: No, just to bring some context, indeed, Fabien is absolutely right on consensus. There are different layers of consensus in the GNSO but consensus in general is where most agree that a small minority can disagree. So it's not like the GAC one where you need to have everyone onboard. So, again, that's a nuance, but it's an important difference that is important for those that are joining GNSO processes to be aware.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thank you for that. I think we have time for me to ask you guys one more question. It's the other side of the coin. So what do you see as the biggest benefit of this increased cross-community collaboration? Let's start with Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, thanks, Melissa. I think the benefit is you've got viewpoints and opinions from a broader community early on in the process. So I think the provision of names, and, for example, the registration data affects a broader community impact. On those topics, I think it's important to get the viewpoints early on rather than later.

I think consensus process is hard, but this is where I think groups can come together to listen and try to understand the different perspectives. Finding ways to reach consensus, I think that's the core of really the multi-stakeholderism. Those are two of my input. Thanks.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thanks, Steve. Would anyone like to add to that, or are we going to wrap up this panel? I see Heidi's hand. Over to you, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Just very quickly, within At-Large, as I've mentioned, we've seen that there's a much stronger process for both presenting information from the ALAC representative but also getting that from the members. So that bottom-up process is really functioning. The second quick point is that the ALAC representative is part of this informal group that is made up of the members from across the groups and they meet informally. We haven't seen that too much within ICANN. But there is this informal discussion that really helps bring consensus when they do meet into the formal group. Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Interesting evolutions indeed. Thank you so much to the gTLD registration data panel. At this point, we are going to move onto our final spotlight. We'll be discussing Work Stream 2, a topic many of you are likely working on within your community groups. Chantelle Doerksen joins us for this update. Chantelle, over to you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Melissa, and thank you. Hello, everyone. The community continues to make progress related to Work Stream 2 implementation. Our role as the policy team is to support the community on the recommendations that they are responsible for implementing. An overall update on Work Stream 2 implementation will be given by ICANN Org during today's prep session on the reviews and implementation status updates.

Now, as you can see from the slide behind me, the community's work began in 2021 and is expected to continue beyond FY22. The policy development support team works with the community on two types of recommendations. The first type of recommendations relate to the work that each individual ICANN supporting organization and advisory committee needs to consider. These recommendations include Recommendation 2, which have guidelines for standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising the removal of an individual ICANN Board director. It also includes Recommendation 6 on accountability.

Now, in 2021, each community group was provided an initial analysis of their current procedures as related to Recommendation 6 for the review and consideration of next steps. The second type of recommendations are the ones that benefit from community coordination and prioritization. Now, to help coordinate this, the SO/AC chairs agreed to create a lightweight Community Coordination Group, or CCG, for information-sharing purposes. Most groups have selected the representatives to this group. They're expected to meet sometime after ICANN 73.

Now, also, one last part of this update is that in January 2022 a request for proposal, or RFP, was opened by ICANN Org to hire a diversity consultant that will serve as a subject matter expert for Work Stream 2 implementation, Recommendation 1 on diversity. The consultant will be working with the CCG on specific components such as recommendation 1.1 and recommendation 1.7.

In April 2022, the name of the diversity consultant will be announced. Work will be expected to begin later this year. For further information on Work Stream 2 updates, please refer to the resource document for this session. This concludes our update. Staff are available in the chat in case you have any questions. Now, I'd like to turn the floor back over to my colleague, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thanks, Chantelle. It is time for our final discussion. While this new format has allowed us to engage in a few conversations around broad topics, we haven't yet touched on all the topics that will be relevant at

our upcoming ICANN73 meeting. So our final panel will discuss additional community priorities at our upcoming meeting.

Joining us today, Emily Barabas who supports the GNSO, Joke from the ccNSO will be back, Gisella Gruber, who supports the At-Large community is joining, as well as Fabien, GAC support, and finally, Danielle Rutherford who supports both the SSAC and RSSAC communities. I welcome our community priorities panel. I now hand it over to Joke to kick us off.

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Thank you so much, Melissa. Yes, there are two additional topics that I wanted to mention today. One of them is really crossing various groups and various projects. It is DNS abuse. It is being addressed at various sessions, as well, at ICANN73. Out of the ccNSO-related sessions, I would like to highlight Tech Day. My colleague, Kathy, already mentioned that there is indeed a domain abuse panel taking place at Tech Day. So there the topic is being addressed more from a technical and operational point of view.

But there are also other sessions as part of the ccNSO members meeting, for instance. There is a session on the role of the ccNSO when it comes to DNS abuse. This is a follow-up really from ICANN72 when the ccNSO received some suggestions on what to do and what not to do.

Those suggestions were then further discussed in a workshop in November last year and evaluated by a small group under the auspices

of the ccNSO Council. At ICANN73, they will present a roadmap, a proposed roadmap. So if the ccTLD community agrees with this proposed roadmap, it will be adopted at the end of the meeting by the ccNSO Council.

Now, over to one additional topic that I would like to highlight. It's the governance of the ccNSO. It's a topic that has been addressed on various occasions already leading eventually into a new proposed set of internal rules for the ccNSO, which address the relation between the ccNSO members and Council. The ccNSO Council is meeting later today. If they decide to launch a vote, that vote will start after ICANN73. So ccNSO members will need to participate or are invited to participate in that voting process, which has, by the way, challenging quorum requirements.

But the governance is not only focused on this new set of rules, also on conflict of interest procedures. There's a discussion at ICANN73 during the ccNSO members meeting talking about, again, what are the do's, what are the don'ts and how should they be interpreted. So we look forward to that discussion. That concludes the two items that I wanted to highlight. I will now give the floor to Emily. Thank you.

EMILY BARBARAS:

Thanks, Joke. So I'd like to highlight some areas where the GNSO will be leveraging bilateral sessions during ICANN73 to share updates and seek input from the ICANN Board, the GAC, and the ALAC on topics of mutual interest. You've already heard quite a lot during this webinar

about one of the key areas of focus. That's work following publication of the SSAD operational design assessment.

Another ODP that many of you are closely following focuses on the outputs of the GNSO new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process, also known as SubPro. The GNSO Council has been working with ICANN Org through its Council liaison to answer any questions that ICANN Org's ODP team has regarding either the intent of the SubPro recommendations or related issues.

One of the questions that's recently arisen is whether it might be appropriate for the Council to work on additional recommendations or possibly guidance regarding implementation while the ODP takes place. The Council will be seeking the Board's input on this question during ICANN73 and will also be exchanging views about the ODP with the GAC and the ALAC.

So Joke mentioned DNS abuse in her talk. That's a topic I'd like to touch on, as well from the GNSO perspective. There is a GNSO Council small team that's been tasked with analyzing whether there are DNS abuse issues that are best resolved specifically through GNSO policy development work. To inform Council's consideration of this topic, the Council will reach out to community groups for their input. The GNSO will be updating the GAC and ALAC on the small team's work and seeking their input.

Finally, in addition to the bilaterals, the GNSO Council will hold its usual public meeting and wrap-up session during ICANN73. Please see the

resource document for details. Now, I'd like to pass it onto Gisella. Thanks.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Emily. Thank you all for the opportunity to highlight At-Large priority sessions during ICANN73 coming up. At-Large has three priority sessions scheduled. So the first session is on the topic of competition, consumer choice and trust review revisited. This session will explore the CCT recommendations and their value and urgency as we move toward a new round of applications for new generic top-level domains.

The second session is entitled "Prioritization Framework: ALAC Prioritization Assessment Tool Review." So this session provides an update and review of the considerable progress of the ALAC's operations, finance, and budget work group's small team on the designation of the overall priority from At-Large, as well as the end user's perspective of all recommendations listed from the review team and cross-community activities. There will also be a brief update on ICANN's prioritization processes and framework.

The third and last At-Large priority session is on protecting the rights of registrants and end users for secure and stable DNS. The objective of the session is to shed light on the rights of registrants and end users, as well as the importance of those rights to maintain a stable and secure DNS. So those are our three At-Large priority sessions. We very much look forward to welcoming you to these sessions during ICANN73.

As mentioned, all the At-Large sessions are on the main schedule, as well as on our At-Large ICANN73 workspace. With this, I'll hand the floor to Fabien. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Gisella. I think it's fair to say that for the GAC, many of the topics that have been mentioned and are of interest to the other communities will also be on the GAC's agenda, which you're welcome to review. I'll mention maybe a few pieces of information. Regarding DNS abuse, the GAC will have a panelist on that plenary session from its Public Safety Working Group. So the GAC will obviously on its agenda discuss WHOIS and data protection, DNS abuse.

One specific focus at ICANN73 is going to be the global public interest framework that ICANN has been put forward, as put forward, and that will be discussed in the plenary session as well as in the GAC session. In particular, in the context of its application in the SSAD, Operational Design Assessment, the GAC will also discuss subsequent rounds of new gTLDs because this is certainly a priority policy topic for the GAC. So the GAC is closely monitoring developments in this area, in particular the recent initiation of the Operational Design Phase.

Finally, I'll mention IGO protection, which is the protection of names and acronyms of IGOs in new gTLDs which is a continuing topic of interest to the GAC as it prepares for the conclusion of the GNSO EPDP on these matters. That's it for the GAC, I believe. So maybe turning it over to Danielle now.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thanks, Fabien. Hi, everyone. I'd like to just quickly highlight that both the RSSAC and SSAC will be having public sessions at ICANN73. During the RSSAC session, you can expect to hear from various RSSAC members on recent RSSAC publications and also get a deep dive on the RSSAC's various inputs to the ongoing discussions related to the root server system governance evolution.

During the SSAC public session, you can expect to hear about two new SSAC work parties that have recently started this year, updates on ongoing SSAC work parties, and an update on the Name Collision Analysis project. There are actually two draft work products available for public comment right now related to NCAP. So please bring your questions and any curiosities you have about either of these two community groups. We look forward to seeing you at ICANN73. Back over to you, Melissa.

MELISSA GOOD: Thanks, Danielle. So before we move to any questions, I'd like to give a brief update from the address supporting organization, the ASO. Now, as we know, the ASO recommends local policies to the ICANN Board and conducts policy development work in the communities of the Regional Internet Registries. While members of the Internet number community will participate in sessions, the ASO will not convene at ICANN73. So with that, I'd like to ask Brenda, do we have any hands up?

BRENDA BREWER: Melissa, we do not have any hands up at this time. Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: I don't see any questions in the chat. So with that, we made it. My thanks to our final panel and all of you for joining the policy team today. I'll hand it back to David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, everyone, for participating and adding an active chat to the summaries we provided to help prepare people for the actual discussions and further exchanges at ICANN73. So thank you very much. Feel free to reach out to us. If there aren't any further questions, we look forward to seeing all of you virtually at the meeting. With that, I'd like to wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning wherever you may be. Thank you very much for your participation and attention.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, David. This concludes today's policy update during prep week for ICANN73. Enjoy the rest of your morning, afternoon, evening. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]