

---

SINGAPORE - New gTLD Program: Status, Reviews and Next Round

Monday, February 9, 2015 – 15:30 to 16:45

ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Good afternoon. We can start the recording. Hi, this is Christine Willett. Thank you for joining us today. This session is the new gTLD program update. We'll be talking about status as well as program reviews in the next round of the new gTLD program.

I'll start by giving you a brief update on the new gTLD program status and progress, just a few statistics slides. Then we'll move into a contracting update from Trang Nguyen. Russell Weinstein will talk about post contracting activities, and then we'll turn it over to Karen Lentz who will talk about the program review work.

So this map represents the dispersion of new gTLDs which have been delegated. I think we've all seen the statistics this week that we're up over 500 new gTLDs that have been delegated from this round of the program, and the dispersion, less than half of them, I think we're up to 506 now, so just about half of them are based in North America, but we do have a fair amount in Europe as well as Latin America and Asia.

For those of you who have participated in our Webinars or updates, you've seen this pipeline before. Starting at the top, we have our 1930 applications. Over 1200 applicants have gone through all evaluation and contention resolution phases of the program and have been invited to contracting. We've signed nearly 800 contracts to date. 582 of those

---

*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.*

---

applicants have passed predelegation testing. And 506 of those TLDs have been delegated. So we're making significant progress.

We're still estimating that we will have approximately 1300 potential TLDs to be delegated when the program is done, give or take objections, some outstanding objections, GAC advice, et cetera.

This timeline gives you a perspective on the progress of the program. So everyone knows that the application window evaluation work is done. The dispute resolution, we have a handful of objections that are still pending, and we have not made progress to close those objections since ICANN 51 in Los Angeles. However, contention resolution and contracting phases of the program, we made significant progress in both of those areas since ICANN 51.

The contention resolution was up from 52% complete, up 18%. We're now at 70% contention resolved.

Contracting increased from 42% up to 61%, so that's a significant progress in these last three or so months. And we've made steady progress on both predelegation testing and delegation.

The other aspect of this timeline that you can see is how far out the program extends. And we're looking at program activity running into 2017. And as you can see, the stair-step dependencies from contention resolution to contracting, we're estimating quarterly dependencies from each of those phases. So we still have a lot of work to do. We have a number of applicants who have contracting deadlines in the next few



---

months but this is our best estimate of the timeline that reflects the remainder of the program work.

I'll now turn it over to Trang who will give you an update on contracting and then we'll move on to post contracting activities.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you, Christine. Thank you, everyone, for spending your afternoon with us today. As Christine mentioned we made significant progress as it relates to contracting since ICANN 51. Since the close of ICANN 51, we've executed 232 registry agreements. Today what I would like to do is spend a few minutes sharing with you how we were able to make that significant progress and how we can continue to work together.

So when we look at -- when looking at how we were able to achieve that progress, two things comes to mind. Predictability and accountability.

Within the context of contracting, what we're specifically talking about here in terms of predictability is having clarity as to what needs to get done and by when.

As you all know, the Applicant Guidebook provides for a nine-month time frame to sign the Registry Agreement. What we were seeing is that applicants were hitting this nine-month timeline without much corresponding -- without much communications with ICANN, if anything at all. And that leaves us a little bit in the dark.



---

So what we've done is implemented a process for applicants to be able to inform us if they're not going to be able to sign the Registry Agreement within that nine-month time frame and why. And this has been very helpful to us. It helps us understand that although you may be facing some challenges, that you still intend on signing the Registry Agreement. And based on that we can then work with you to provide some clarity as to what you would need to do and by when in order to sign the Registry Agreement.

So how we have been doing that is by setting interim deadlines. Interim deadlines may be set for activities such as, you know, submitting a response to the contracting invitation request or submitting a compliant COI or submitting any pending -- any information for any pending change requests.

Also, if you wish to apply for an exemption to the Code of Conduct or Specification 13, we can provide deadlines for those activities as well. What these interim deadlines do is they help you show that you are making progress towards signing the Registry Agreement, and it's also a great way for you to engage with ICANN and work with any issues towards signing that Registry Agreement. And I'm very happy to share that these interim deadlines have really increased the level of engagement that we've had with you these last few months, and that's great to see.

And also, the majority of applicants have been able to meet these interim deadlines. As you can see on this chart here, we've granted 529



---

extensions to date, and only 14 of those have actually missed an interim deadline or an RA signing deadline.

We definitely don't want to see anyone -- I know 14 is a low number but we definitely don't want to see anyone in that bucket at all. So what we want to do is help you as much as we can understand what needs to get done and by when and help you move towards signing the Registry Agreement as expeditiously as possible.

So what we've done here is created -- we've created sort of a timeline to help you manage your time during the nine months that you have to sign the Registry Agreement.

So these days are shown on here are basically end dates to complete these activities. So, for example, as it relates to the contracting invitation, what we recommend is that you respond to that as soon as you receive it, but if for some reason you can't get to it right away, what we like to see is a response to that contracting invitation be submitted no later than by the end of the fourth month from the date of the contracting information request.

Same thing for COC and Spec 13 applications.

And then for negotiations materials and a compliant COI, we like to have those latest by the end of the sixth month from the date of the CIR.

---

And, really, if you keep to that timeline, then what we have seen is that there should not be any issues with regards to signing the Registry Agreement within the nine-month time frame.

So, as I mentioned before, I think we made great strides since ICANN 51. I'd like to see that engagement continue as we still have a lot of contracts to sign from here until the next meeting. So, as much as you can, please continue that level of engagement. You can contact us through the customer service portal. And you can also contact us here at ICANN 52. We have the GDD booth in the atrium out here. And there are folks that are manning the booth that can answer any questions that you have relating to contracting. So with that I'm going to turn it to Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

All right. Thanks, Trang. I'm going to talk about contention resolution and contention set status. Overall contention set resolution is progressing very well. We're up to 70% resolved now. And I think we'll be at about 85% by the time we meet together in Buenos Aires for ICANN 53. That's based on auction schedule. We have line of sight to getting another 30 or so sets resolved. Most of those won't resolve via ICANN auction most likely. But the way the process works by scheduling the auctions, we then see self-resolution take place. And that's the end goal. So we're happy and pleased with that progress.

We do still have about 13% of the contention sets ineligible for either CPE or auction. And those are largely kind of hung up right now in either some form of an accountability mechanism or GAC category two



---

advice. There's a small population that need to go through -- that are in what we call indirect contention sets. And ICANN is getting ready to release the final rules and auction procedures for indirect contention sets. We had a public comment period open through January 13th. We've been working hard to analyze those comments and incorporate the feedback into the final procedures. And I think we'll be able to produce those this month in February. Shortly after we produce those, we'll go ahead and get the sets that are eligible now scheduled for auction. And we believe that first interdirect contention auction will take place in May. Sometime in -- so details to follow, if you're in one of those.

The next auction we do have scheduled is at the end of this month, February 25th. And right now we have about 10 sets still eligible for that auction. But, like I said, we typically anticipate much fewer sets actually participating in the auction.

This next slide is the financial summary of the auction proceeds. We get asked about this a lot, so we wanted to include it in the update. Despite a lot of the talk about contention resolution and auctions, we actually conduct very few sets through auction. We've only resolved 10 of the over 160 contention sets resolved have been through an ICANN auction. Through those we've collected gross proceeds of almost \$35 million after costs as prescribed in the AGB. The costs are taken from the proceeds. The net proceeds are around almost \$33 million. As we say, the proceeds are being reserved until the board determines a plan for the appropriate use of the funds through consultation with the community. If anyone wants a more detailed view of the auction



---

proceeds by month, that's available on the Web site. And we keep that updated after each auction.

I'm going to switch gears now and move on from contention and start talk about the post contracting processes. Just a refresher on what we're talking about here, after a contract is executed and before delegation is the time frame we're talking about. And that there's kind of three or four main activities in that process. There's getting the registry onboarding completed. So that's account setup with ICANN. That's both your kind of personnel accounts being set up, credentials being issued, as well as system integration. So that, upon delegation, all of the systems that ICANN and the registry coordinate together work properly. Things like CCDS and TMCH and all sorts of things.

In parallel with onboarding, registration would be conducting predelegation testing. And this is where the registry demonstrates their technical capability to execute the critical registry functions.

Next step is transition to delegation where ICANN does a brief review of everything that transpired between application and today making sure everything's cleared for delegation. We go and issue the delegation token. And then the registry redeems that delegation token with the IANA department and issues the delegation process and gets born onto the root zone.

We held a webinar on post contracting processes about January 15th, I believe was the date. And just talking about introducing -- talking about



---

the themes we've seen and trying to introduce some new interim milestones. And I'll talk about those in a second.

But so this slide is pretty similar to one I presented in the webinar. The fiscal year 2014 trend was kind of let's go fast, the registries are ready to go fast. They were excited. It was kind of like a race to the root zone. It was kind of a race to get into the root zone.

The average time from signing a contract to getting delegated was about 80 days during fiscal year '14. As you can see on the bottom of the slide there, it's now almost to 140 days. It's almost doubled this year. So the trend we're trying to talk about here is there's been slowed progress towards delegation. And what we're trying to do is kind of revive that progress and get people moving again.

The first column is the timelines that ICANN would provide when someone asked how long would this process take? You know, how long should onboarding take? It should take 30 days or less and typically less if you're engaged. How long does predelegation take? How long does it take to get delegated after you get a token?

That second column talks about those who completed the process in fiscal year '15, how long has it been taking? You can see some of those are tracking close and some of those are kind of way out of what we expected onboarding in particular.

And then the third column represents, for those who haven't completed the process, how long they've been in that process for. And most of the

---

time this is not that they're actively engaged in the process. It's that their application or their TLDs entered that process but hasn't really made much progress. So you can see we have a high population just kind of queuing in these processes. And that's what we're trying to reengage with the registries and get them moving again towards delegation.

I want to highlight the predelegation one as an example. We have over 100 TLDs right now that have not responded to their PDT invitation. We send that out right after contracting. And almost 75% of those are over a month old. And there's probably about 50% of them that are over 60 days old. So, from an aging perspective, it's starting to give us some pause. And that's why we're trying to -- that's what we're going to introduce the interim milestones to try to reinvigorate the process.

So, as mentioned, for much of the same reasons we implemented the milestones in contracting, we're going to do so post contracting. And it's to ensure this predictability engagement with the registries. And just trying to work together so we can get towards that common goal of delegation.

We recognize with two portals after contracting before delegation sometimes it can be confusing as to what you're supposed to do when. So that is -- these milestones are supposed to kind of help layout a roadmap for here's what to do when to do it where to do it so you can get towards the end point.



---

It's important to remember these aren't actually the milestones themselves aren't new requirements. These are the existing prerequisites to delegation that we've had since we started. What's new is the timeline, the guidance on the timelines as to how you get there and when.

And then there's one other process change that we talked about in the webinar that I wanted to highlight which was, for predelegation testing, in order to help try and reinvigorate that engagement, if we haven't seen a response after a couple weeks, we're going to go ahead and assign an appointment on behalf of the registry. And we'll assign it in the applicant contact. And the registry primary contact will be notified of this. And that's to try to spur a response to kind of get the registries back engaged. You don't have to accept the appointment at that point in time. Respond back to the case. Let us know when you'd prefer to do PDT. And often you'll want to change who's responsible for doing PDT. I don't think many of the registry primary contacts want to be the ones engaged in PDT. Typically, we see that driven by the registry service providers or some technical folks in the registry.

This slide is just a visual of what I talked about on the last slide. Starts with the registry agreement in the top left and works down toward the delegation deadline. Hopefully, everybody knows they're contractually obligated to be delegated within 12 months of signing the registry agreement. And our operating modality is to try to get almost every one of them delegated within that first 12 months. So this provides kind of the pathway to get delegated within the 12 months. It provides slack time to ensure that, if something comes up, if changes need to occur,



---

there's still time and we're not up against a deadline at the end trying to scramble to get you into PDT because you changed something and need to go back through it or some other scenario.

Before I leave this slide, I do just want to mention capacity concerns. As I mentioned, there's over 100 TLDs who haven't gone through PDT yet who need to go through it probably sometime in the next six to eight months or so. Keep in mind we're capacity limited. And, just because you now have come up on your deadline, we may not be able to get you in right away.

So right now we've had a couple week backlog or so. Coming off the holidays, it was a little longer. But now we're back down to just a week or two backlog in PDT. But, if all of a sudden these 100 or so registries want to go through PDT same time you do, there may be some capacity concerns we need to work through. And you need to plan your progress in association with these deadlines.

With that, I think we're done with the program update. And I'll turn it over to Karen to talk about next round overviews.

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you, Russ.

So, with all of the progress we've made in terms of the program and processing of applications, there continues to be interest in what happens next.



---

The answer is a lot is happening. So we're kind of in the process looking toward determining what does the new gTLD program look like two years from now, four years from now, seven years from now. So that's kind of all of our task collectively to do that.

So we're transitioning and starting to initiate a review phase where we're assessing how the program has worked, what the impact has been, looking at it from a few different angles from, you know, how did the application process actually work to looking at the impact of having more TLDs, having all of the new TLDs in the marketplace and what that means.

So I will be talking about the various -- the various reviews that we're undertaking to look at that. I'll highlight the second -- let's see, the third blue bullet on the slide, which is the resource that we have established going forward for tracking all of the review activities. It's new gTLDs.ICANN.org/reviews. So, as we continue to make progress and work through these, this is where you can find all of the latest information.

And, finally, just want to reiterate that this is a community review process. There are -- there were quite a number of people involved in the new gTLD program in various capacities. Whether you are a panelist or an applicant or an objector or a person who submitted comments or an observer, any -- I mean, we really want a kind of diverse set of participation to capture the experience that we have had.

---

So I will go through the various review areas starting with this first one which we call program implementation.

This is very much a staff focused element in terms of looking at the operational -- the actual operation of the program, how it was implemented, starting with the original policy recommendations from the GNSO. And, you know, how we did in terms of actually operating the program. There are -- there are, obviously, a number of elements to the program making this a sort of complex set of reviews. So we've tried to create some structure around it by looking at all of the different parts of the program along these six dimensions, which, unfortunately, you probably can't totally read. But efficiency effectiveness, fairness, predictability, security and stability, and alignment with guidance -- guidance meaning policy implementation discussions that the community had in developing the program.

So we've divided -- tried to structure this review in terms of eight different review areas. And then we'll apply the six dimensions on the previous slide to each of these. These roughly correspond to sections of the applicant guidebook parts of the application process.

So these are underway now.

Trang and a team of people are capturing all of the kind of staff perspective from the experience of having operated and implemented this program.

The target for publication of those reports is second quarter of this year.



---

And those will be -- we expect to get comment on those and to continue to refine and hone those and so that -- this area will continue through 2015.

Next I'll talk about root stability, which is examining what the impact has been of adding many TLDs on the DNS root system. So the review is intended to, first of all, assess what the impact has been and then determine if there are any steps that need to be taken prior to adding more TLDs from future application processes, what those steps would be to identify those, if there are any.

So we're working now on scoping this review. What are the questions that need to be answered? Whether the -- what's the data we need to be able to answer these questions. So that's underway.

One of the components of it that I'll mention is the publication in November of the RSSAC advisory on measurements. And so they recommend a set of parameters for looking at the root server system. And we expect to try to incorporate that in this review process.

So, as I said, we're scoping this now in terms of how you define the review. But we expect to officially kick it off in terms of undertaking the studies in second quarter of this year.

Okay. Next area is rights protection. This relates to a set of new rights protection mechanisms that were built specifically for the new gTLD program. There's a draft report that's open for comment now.

---

The link is -- the link is there. It looks at the trademark clearinghouse, associated processes using the clearinghouse such as sunrise and trademark claims, the URS, the PDRP.

So rights protection, in terms of reviewing it, has a few different elements to it.

This draft report that we've published, we will incorporate the feedback and provide an updated report. And this is on a path to a few different things. One is there's an outstanding request from the GNSO for an issue report relating to rights protection mechanisms, which is now scheduled to be produced later this year. We think this review process will help inform that in terms of identifying what the experience has been and what -- you know, what are the comments in terms of issues that seem to be most important, what worked well, what might we want to consider for future -- for the future.

And then, secondly, there is a recommendation or some previous advice from the GAC to conduct an independent review of the trademark clearinghouse. That is something that we're also involved in scoping right now hoping to be able to start executing -- excuse me -- start executing that still in March. So first quarter of this year. But we think that will feed into the GNSO issue report as well in terms of looking at what policy considerations or policy work might be undertaken. As well as, as I'll talk about in the next slide, rights protection does feature in one of the other reviews.

So this next area is competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.





---

This is a review that has been articulated in ICANN's Affirmation of Commitments.

And it's intended to look at the extent to which the program has helped promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.

Also expected to look at the effectiveness of the application evaluation processes which the work on program implementation will help inform. And also intended to look at the safeguards that were put in place in the program to mitigate issues, which would include the rights protection mechanisms that were developed for the program.

So this review is expected to kick off later this year around the third quarter. And I'll note that this is a recurring review like the accountability and transparency review and the security and stability and WHOIS that we won't just look at competition and trust and choice once. We will continue to do that for a period of time.

So, if you notice from the previous slide, we haven't actually started this CCT review yet. However, we have been engaged in quite a bit of preparation for it.

The first area that I'll talk about is a set of metrics that has been proposed through community processes. Most recently the implementation advisory group on CCT looked at a set of metrics that was -- that -- a set of metrics that was recommended by the GNSO and ALAC.

They made an interim recommendation in -- I think that should be actually March 2014 -- but they made an interim recommendation to take some metrics and look at them in the form of a consumer study -- or sorry, consumer survey and a second set of metrics to look at as an economic study.

When you try to look at a trust and what things like trust and what the impact has been, it's something that's very difficult to measure. So one of the ways that was proposed to look at that was to do a consumer survey and to look at areas such as, you know, consumer perception and their attitudes towards the DNS.

The final report from that group which followed the interim recommendation recommends a larger set of metrics where they propose that ICANN collect data in these particular areas that would be available then to the CCT review team to consider.

And so the final report from the IAG-CCT is actually up on the board's agenda for this meeting.

So, to update you on the elements that I mentioned relating to the consumer survey -- so this has -- is already underway. We spent time selecting a provider and designing the survey. That survey is actually being fielded right now in a number of countries.

And so we should have a set of baseline data available by the time we meet again in June.

And I'll note on the consumer survey that the recommendation here was to do, one, to capture a baseline and then to do a follow-on survey and capture what has changed in that period of time.

In terms of the economic study, this was relating to some metrics that were proposed around pricing and innovation and services in the market.

And so we've published an RFP, have gone through the procurement process, we're close, I think, to contracting with a provider to be able to begin that.

So we are still hoping to begin that -- the actual study still in this calendar quarter.

And, like the consumer survey, this is a baseline. And there will be a follow-up phase which we'll look at any changes that have occurred.

So those are the review activities that we're doing. I wanted to also mention some of the other activities that are occurring within the supporting organizations and advisory committees many of whom are doing, as part of their work, sort of retrospective look at the new gTLD program or some aspect of it and are discussing potential input to future procedures.

So the GNSO has formed a discussion group who is working on identifying issues. This is a precursor to potentially doing additional

---

policy development work that would relate to future application rounds.

So there's a link there, if you'd like to get involved in the policy aspects.

So there's a link there if you want to get involved in the policy aspects.

The GAC has also formed a working group where they so far have identified three areas of interest, one being geographic names, including applicant support and community priority evaluation. And also the Security and Stability Advisory Committee has convened a work party to look at the previous SSAC that's been given throughout the new gTLD program, looking at the impact of that and considering any -- any technical issues that are identified through that process.

Okay. So this timeline slide shows all of what I just talked about in terms of the reviews all in one place. If you see where we are, we are in first quarter of 2015, so we have several paths under way. And we've got the activity continuing for quite a while.

I'll close this -- this section. There is not a -- This is a timeline depicting the review activities that I've described. There's not a timeline on here - - there's not a next round on here. And this, I think, is what you'll continue to see in terms of timelines as we move through the review phases. We'll continue to update, you know, where they are and how long we think they'll take.

---

I think that, you know, looking forward a little bit, when you -- when we're through some of these review processes, they will most likely end up with recommendations. And so when you -- when we have actual recommendations, I think we can provide timelines that look at the status of those and the different paths that they take. For example, many of -- some of the recommendations may relate to policy processes. A recommendation could be, you know, the GNSO should do policy on X. And so that there's a procedure for the GNSO to determine whether they want to do policy work on that.

Some of the recommendations may relate to areas that are not relevant to a policy recommendation, necessarily, but are kind of a project size area that would be the subject of community discussion and trying to arrive at some sort of element to the program and how it could work. An example of something like that might be if there's -- you know, if there's a lot of comment around the continuing operations instrument that was required for all registry operators, which was not a policy recommendation but was part of the evaluation process. And so, you know, an outcome of some of the reviews and comment and feedback could be, you know, we should look into whether there are alternative ways that we could provide for continuity in looking at new gTLDs. And then I think there's probably a third bucket of recommendations that would be -- that would be neither of those, that would be something that's fairly straightforward to implement, like an improvement or a service level recommendation, like you should create a page that has all of this -- list all of this type of information, you should update this form to include this field, or, you know, procedural things like that.



---

So I think, you know, in terms of looking -- looking in the longer term, once we are through some of these review processes, we'll be better able to capture and articulate what the specific work tracks are and how long we think they'll take, as well as including the, you know, processes that are occurring within the -- within the SOs and ACs that we want to continue to coordinate with as well.

Okay.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Thank you. Thanks, Karen, Russ, Trang.

We have just almost 25 minutes left to the session. If we have questions and answers, the microphone here is up at the front. Questions pertaining to program operations or the reviews activity. We'll entertain questions now.

We have one question from the Adobe room, and then we'll come back to the room.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

So this question comes from Maxim Alzoba. With regard to page 19 of the presentation, is self-assessment of the new gTLD program in line with accountability principles?

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you, Maxim. So I would say that it is. I would say it is part of running a responsible program for the staff to look at the various



---

elements of how we performed, how we spent money, how we used the resources that we had.

I think it's also -- you know, this is not, you know, secret information. These reports will be published for comment and feedback, and we very much hope to get feedback on the actual implementation from the perspective of the applicants and others in the community. So thanks.

SIMON COUSINS:

Hi, I'm Simon Cousins from Allegravita. I'm very interested in they study. I wonder which countries have been surveyed.

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you, Simon. There are -- I'd have to look them up. I think there are around 20. We made sure to cover all of the ICANN regions and looked at, you know, what size of a sample within each region and distribution across the countries would be statistically significant. So that will be published in the report once we have it, and if you want to touch base with me afterward, I can point you to that.

Thanks.

NEPAL:

Hello, my name is (saying name) from Nepal, and I am first time fellow of ICANN Fellowship.

I'm just talking about developing country prospect. You just mentioned that developing country has different certain policy as well. So from



---

cost perspective, our economy cannot cover that much of cost if we go for that. So what type of consideration is there for developing countries?

Thank you.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

So for this round there was an Applicant Support Program, technically SARP. Karen, help me. What was S-A-R-P?

Sorry, the acronym explanation eludes me. So we called it our Applicant Support Program. It was a mechanism by which applicants from developing countries and other areas could apply for financial support and other operational support during the application phase.

That program, that aspect of the program will be evaluated as part of the program implementation reviews. We would expect that something similar, type of program, will be considered.

Karen, I believe you said the GAC is also looking at that program as part of their evaluation.

JORGE CANCIO:

Hello. Good afternoon. This is Jorge Cancio (phonetic) from the GAC, from Switzerland.





---

I would like to ask you the specific timeline on when all these parts of the evaluation will be assembled and if there will be a common report on that evaluation in order to know what is the procedure after that.

And, secondly, if, in that evaluation, I've seen that there's a part on consumer trust and things like that. If there's a specific reference to the impact on human rights and related aspects.

Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you, Jorge. So your first question on the timing, I think you were asking whether -- you know, whether all of these reviews would eventually be one final -- one final product, and that's not currently what we expect because they're all kind of looking at different things and they're all, you know, sort of a little bit unique in terms of the process and how it occurs, as well as being, you know, kind of -- we expect that they'll be finishing at different times. You know, but I think that there's -- you know, there's no reason that we couldn't, once the review phase is finished, right, once all of this work is done, we couldn't compile everything and have a holistic product available.

Your second question on competition, consumer choice and consumer trust, you asked whether there was an element relating to impact on human rights in that. I don't believe there is. The scope of this review is taken from the text of the Affirmation of Commitments which is a document from 2009, and it listed specific things. So I'm not aware of an element that relates to human rights.



---

Thanks.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: I think we have one more question coming in via chat. If there's anyone else in the room, please join us at the mic at the front.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So we have another question coming in from the chat room. This is from, pardon me, Rishi. The reviews are framed at taking four quarters a year each. Within each review, are specific milestones set so a realistic sunset can be achieved for each review? The question centers around tracking and ensuring a start and end date for each review.

Thanks.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you. Rishi, was it? So the question was about whether -- these are sort of broad timelines and quarters and whether we can publish more granular milestones. I think that's actually a very good suggestion. I'll note that two -- two of the reviews haven't actually started yet, so we don't have that sort of start date and, you know, set of target dates. But for the others we do, so I think we can look at augmenting that on the -- on the Web site.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: If we don't have any other questions in the room or online, we'll wrap it up early, then. So much has changed in two years.

[ Laughter ]

Thank you all for joining us this afternoon. Have a good week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

