
BEIJING – IDN Variant TLD Program
Wednesday, April 11, 2013 – 13:30 to 15:00
ICANN – Beijing, People’s Republic of China

DENISE MICHEL: If you take your seats, please, it's 1:30, and we'll be starting our IDN variant TLD program session. And you're welcome to move up to the front or join us at the table. There's not too many people here.

So welcome to the IDN variant TLD program session.

Kim, if you would like to start, we will introduce the front table. I will with give you a quick overview and run through the agenda and we'll get started.

KIM DAVIES: My name is Kim Davies. I am on the staff project team.

NAELA SARRAS: Naela Sarras also on the staff project team.

STEVE SHENG: Steve Sheng, also on the staff project team.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Also on staff project.

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.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel, vice president, strategic initiatives.

ASMUS FREYTAG: Asmus Freytag, consultant to the IDN project.

SARMAD HUSSEIN: Sarmad Hussein, consultant to the user experience study.

MARC BLANCHETT: Marc Blanchett, consultant for the same project.

DENISE MICHEL: So significant progress has been made and very important work remains to support the secure and stable delegation of IDN variant TLDs. One is the IDN variant TLD program has finished its work which is scheduled for June 2014.

As we show on the slide, which is also available online on this session slide deck, the IDN variant table was established by the Board resolution in 2010 to identify issues that are related to the delegation handling of IDN variant TLDs, and that work evolved to include work with the community to develop solutions and define the necessary processes that must be in place to establish IDN variant TLD delegations.

Phase 1 was script case studies that occurred in April 2011 through October of that year, in which ICANN conducted six script case studies: Arabic, Chinese Han, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Greek, and Latin.

The purpose was to investigate the issues relevant to individual scripts that need to be resolved to facilitate a good and safe user experience for IDN variant TLDs.

The case study teams were composed of volunteers from each of the communities and was assisted by ICANN staff and expert consultants.

We then moved into phase two in November of 2011 through about February 2012. Phase two involved the integrated issue reports. Experts from the six case-study teams and expert consultants advised ICANN in completing the integrated issue reports.

A common framework that summarizes and categorizes the various issues in identifying and managing IDN variant TLDs in the DNS root zone and offered recommendations to identify potential solutions.

Neither the whole string variants nor mirroring variants were considered as feasible options within the team conclusions. That was also overseen by the Board variant working group, and this was one of the findings of the integrated issues report.

Phase 3 which is the current phase, running from February 2012 through April of 2013, includes three separate projects. The first is a label generation rules, LGR, tool project which is developing a standard tool listing allowed and variant code points for a domain name registry.

The next project is the root LGR procedure which is expected in March. It's developing a procedure to be used to populate and maintain the set of allowed Unicode characters or codepoints in the root and related character variants regarding IDN TLDs. It also defines the target

dispositions for derived variant strings, the allocatable and blocked -- or blocked.

The third project is the user experience study on IDN variant TLDs. It's the study that's focused on understanding the implications, examining potential challenges and proposing recommendations for satisfactory, reliable, and predictable user experience when dealing with IDN variant TLDs.

One of the most important outputs would be the set of recommendations that would translate into contract provisions.

Phase 4, which is the upcoming phase consists of ICANN working on -- in which we're accelerating, focuses on providing solutions in key areas.

The first project in phase 4 is to set up the integration panel and materials for the generation panels in preparation for a fought population of the root LGR.

The next project is the update -- update the new gTLD and IDN ccTLD programs. This is to account for variants in general, and particularly the root LGR and user experience study recommendations.

Third aspect is the update of ICANN-IANA processes and systems to implement the changes specified in the new gTLD and the IDN ccTLD programs to support the IDN variant TLDs.

So IDN variant TLDs could be delegated only after phase 4 work has finalized, and the first version of the root LGR has been published.

So again, we're targeting June, July 2014 for the completion of that work.

So that's a quick broad overview of the work completed in the IDN variant program and the work to come.

Today, we'll focus on providing you a presentation of the projects that were completed in phase 3. We'll then cover the procedure to develop and maintain the label generation rules for the DNS root zone regarding the IDNA label project.

Then we'll discuss examining the user experience implications of active TLD variant project. Also outline the next steps for you, and of course invite discussions and questions about these topics.

With that I'd like to turn it over to Francisco Arias, first agenda item.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, Denise.

So I'm going to update on one of the (indiscernible) that finalizing this phase and I'm not going to read that long title. I prefer the short version, the IDN root LGR procedure.

So why are we doing this? As most people know, we intend to use this in the DNS or, I shall say, on top of the DNS since it's IDNA. DNS labels are usually considered useful mnemonics, so we usually would like to have people use something that they can recognize so they can use their own writing system.

But we should clarify that not every word may be available to use in a TLD, for example.

So IDNA requires some rules to be defined in order to identify what it's allowed in a registry. And in this case we're talking about the roots, the root probably we are not used to see it but it's just another registry.

And another thing important to say is the existing root labels of course need to be grandfathered and will not be affected.

So variant labels, what are they? It's very difficult to give a specific definition in the integrated issue report which was the output of the second phase of this program. We have some working definitions, let's say. And basically some different codepoints that can be considered (indiscernible) by users of that writing system and the best example so far is probably Chinese. Equivalents between simplified and traditional Chinese characters.

So what's the use of variant labels. We probably want to avoid the allocation of IDN variant TLDs to competing applicants. Why do we want to do this? For security reasons. We probably don't want to of competing different entities to have allocated strings that are considered as variants for users of that writing system.

On the other hand, we want to allow the allocation of some of those IDN variant TLDs to the applicants so they can better serve their user population.

So the IDN root LGR will define the variants if any of the codepoints that are allowed in the root and their possible disposition, meaning where the resulting string can be allocated or it has to be blocked, so no one can have it.

So with that in mind in this project, we develop this procedure to populate and maintain the IDN root LGR.

As I said, the root LGR will contain all the codepoints that will be allowed for IDN TLDs in the root -- well, for IDN TLDs.

The idea is to provide as much coverage as possible for inclusion of all the possible writing systems, but of course also keep in mind we need to minimize the risk to the root zone since it's a shared resource that is shared between everyone in the Internet.

And also, as an objective here is to automate as much as possible the process by which an application for a variant can be managed.

In developing the procedure, we follow a set of principles that were followed by the IAB. IAB is the Internet Architecture Board. How can I put it? The elders of the Internet. Well, the wise men in the Internet on the technical side. And they give us guidance on what should be considered when adding codepoints to the root. And there is this set of principles that are defined there. I don't intend to go into all these principles here in detail. Perhaps only one of those, which is the overarching principle that we consider, which is the conservatism.

We want to err on the side of not including something if we have doubts about the security of that codepoint for example.

So we're considering all the different principles in the IAB principles. Conservatism takes place over the rest.

So talking now about the procedure, the procedure considers two different types of panels. Generation panels on the top of this diagram,

and one integration panel. The interaction between these different panels is what eventually produce a unified root LGR for the -- to be used in applications dot IDN TLDs.

The variant panels is not just one. It's one per writing system. So, for example, you have a generation panel for perhaps the Arabic script and another for the CJK or perhaps there will be one for Japanese. It's still to be defined and it will depend on the guidance on the integration panel.

I will explain later on the integration of all these different panels. Here I just tried to depict the idea of how the process works. The generation panels will propose specific (indiscernible) from the writing system to the root LGR. And the integration panel will look at those proposals and take into consideration the IDN principles, and then the mandate from ICANN to main the security and stability of the Internet, particularly the DNS; will decide where to reject or accept that proposal from the panel.

The interesting point here is that there has to be a consensus between the panels that something must be added before it can be added. So that's in line with the conservatism principle as mentioned before.

Perhaps one other thing to mention is that the membership of the panels is independent. It is someone that has participated in our generation panel cannot participate in an integration panel and vice versa.

So generation panels. These panels, we are expecting them to be driven by volunteers from the respective communities that are interested on having variants in the root. So they will develop the rules that constrain

to their writing system only. They will not look at the whole of Unicode. Just the particular writing system that they're interested. And they will output, let's say, a subset of the root LGR from their perspective.

Those proposals will go to the integration panel.

Besides having volunteers in these generation panels, I should say that ICANN will also provide experts, if needed -- for example, if there is the needed generation panel that's lacking some specific expertise, say Unicode or IDNA, DNS or some other, then ICANN will provide that expertise so that the generation panel proposal can be as strong as possible.

Moving to the integration panel, this will be just one panel, and this panel will consist of independent experts on the following expertise: DNS, IDNA, Unicode, and linguistics.

They will be in charge of accepting or rejecting the proposal from the generation panels. And as I said before, there has to be an agreement between the generation panel and the integration panel before something can be accepted.

The integration panel will also take care of integrating the proposals from the different generation panels into unified IDN root LGR.

And of course they need to take into account the mandate for ICANN for a secure and stable and reliable DNS root zone.

Another thing that is important is that decisions within the panel have also -- they have to be by unanimity. All of the members of the panel have to be in agreement before something can be accepted or rejected.

So the output of this procedure is the root LGR. It's the repertoire for the roots. So the list of codepoints that would be allowed for IDNs.

Another component of this is that there will be subrepertoires inside this big repertoire for the root. This is managed by syntax. So, for example, you can have codepoints that have more than one tag.

You can have, for example, a Han character, a Chinese character, that can have the tag for the CJK, for example, but also from a Japanese language should the need be.

Each of the applications, when they do an application for a TLD, they will have to select the subrepertoire that applies to them. So if it's Japanese applicant, for example, they will have to select, "I am applying this TLD as a Japanese -- from the Japanese subrepertoire."

So the labels that are being applied for, all the codepoints in that label will have to be contained within the codepoint in that subrepertoire.

And another important thing to mention is that the whole label will have to be well formed. This is particularly important for those writing systems that, let's say, are more complex, like Devanagari, that is used in Hindi, where there are specific rules about what can be there and in what order.

The IDN root LGR has support for some form of these whole level evaluation rules, as they are called.

So I mentioned the subrepertoires, but I should clarify that the variants will be exactly the same. Doesn't matter what the subrepertoire tag that you are in your application.

However, this position that is allowed for your variants can be different depending on the subrepertoire that you are applying for. And I have an example there that shows what I am referring to.

So the disposition, it can be two. It can be either blocked, meaning the resulting string cannot be active in the DNS, cannot be allocated to anyone; or it can be allocatable, meaning pending some other procedures that need to be defined, the variant could be activated -- allocated and activated in the DNS according to those other rules that are not part of the root LGR procedure.

And the output is, of course, machine readable for automatic processing.

This is example that we have here. I will not claim that -- I'm not, of course, versed on the writing system. Someone else provided that example for me. But the idea here is you have a string to Han characters there that compose that string, and those two codepoints have -- sorry, one of those, the one to the right, and I don't think I have a pointer here, the one to the right, 767C, has variants. And if you are applying the first -- the first part on the top -- let me see if I can use -- no. I don't have the pointer here. Sorry.

The first example of application which has the tag ZH, which is Chinese, has one variant that is allocatable, the one that is shown in blue, while the other three variants are blocked.

However, if you apply the same string with the tag Japanese, all the four variants will be blocked.

The reason for that is perhaps those variants do not make sense to be used in Japanese. And like I said, I don't claim this to be a real example, so please don't kill me for this.

Moving on, so when we can have the first version of the IDN root LGR, know that I'm saying the first version, first release, this is going to be a dynamic process and there will be more than one version. This is going to be updated from time to time as we have more writing systems come and express their interest on being in the root.

So the initial version of the root LGR we think can be provided once. And this depends on the integration panel. Once they feel comfortable that what they have from the generation panels, that input from the generation panels is enough to consider that there will be no conflicts later when there are more writing systems added to the root LGR.

Of course this has a dependency on the committee. It means it depends on when the generation panels -- the sooner they are formed, the sooner that the initial version of the IDN root LGR can be formed.

And with that, I'm turning the microphone to Steve.

Thank you.

STEVE SHENG:

Two questions.

Are we taking questions at the end? Probably.

Yeah, okay.

So I'm going to give a brief update on the report that we did examining the user experience implications of active variants.

So the scope of this study is we focus on TLD label issues. So if you look at the -- the graph on the right, you know, the largest circle on the right is the IDN labels. And within that, you know some of those labels have variants; right? And the circle on the left is the TLD label, it's really the intersection of those three that we are focusing on.

But also recognizing that, as an end user, you don't make -- usually make that distinctions. Users see domains as fully qualified domains, so we considered those implications as well.

Variants has been deployed at the second level in a couple of registries. So in the study we want to document, you know, what their practice is and what they have learned.

So that's documented in the report.

And finally this, report wants to try to strike a pragmatic balance between user expectations as well as with consistent and secure implementations. So sometimes those are at extremes to one another.

Regarding the variant experience at the second level, we surveyed some ccTLDs, and we're grateful for these TLDs that provide answers to us.

The high-level take-away of this slide is some of these practices do converge, and some of these practices exhibit differences, probably because the nature of the script.

So for example, where they converge is, you know, they treat variants as an atomic unit for operation and registration data. So they all

allocate it to the same registrant, and if status changes for one, it also changes for the others.

So that's the place where it converges.

Where it differs, for example, you know, in the Chinese community the choice of active variants is perhaps an old simplified one, an old traditional one plus user choice, whereas in the Arabic community that distinction of preferred variant is not as strong as in the Chinese community.

So on and so forth with member of the variant set, the registration software and registrant support.

Oop, sorry.

As Francisco mentioned, the P2N1 starts with the set of IP principles. I think in this study we also tried to articulate as a set of starting point principles for active variant TLDs, and these principles are generated from the current best practices as well as user guidelines. And there are seven of these: Minimality, security, equivalency, predictability, consistency, manageability, and ease of use.

In the interest of time, I'm not going to go into each of these principles in detail.

I want to highlight there are some principles, you know, that are termed as "must." So these are used more or less as, you know, requirements for it.

And other principles are termed as "should." This means that we recognize there exists some circumstances where, you know, some of

these principles may not work, but we want this to be the best practice. And someone who tried to apply this should also use this as a first -- try this first. So that's kind of where we are with these principles.

To examine the impact, we categorized user into three categories. So these are end users, those who use variants; the registration users and managers. These are more traditional in the ICANN sphere, registrants, registrars, and registries.

And, finally, I think one of the contributions of this report is it talks about the community, technical community, you know, in market to those who deal with usability, configuration, and diagnostics of variants. These activating variants at the top level and the second level have implications for various parts of the community. And we try to be proactive in identifying these issues, recognizing that not all of these issues, you know, are for ICANN to solve. And we really invite the community interested parties to work on these together.

So the issues are identified into three categories -- the use of variants, registration management, and configuration and diagnostics.

I think there are a total of 28 or 29 added together.

Finally, I'm going to quickly, you know, focus a bit more on the recommendations. These recommendations are based on the user experience principles that the report articulated and is informed by the current IDN variant practices. These are really directed into four audiences -- ICANN, registries, registrars, and the technical community.

I'm going to highlight a few of the recommendations. But, in noting that in each of the recommendations we articulate what the

recommendation is and provide some more details of that recommendation. So I invite you to take a look at the report for the full list of recommendations.

So the first recommendation to ICANN is to recommend ICANN to implement a well-defined and conservative variant TLD allocation process, recognizing that activating variants brings impacts to various parts of the community and the current -- you know, there's no -- not a very satisfactory technical solution.

So what we recommend is a principle of conservatism. The approval of variant TLDs should not be automatic, must not be automatic. The application must clearly demonstrate the necessity, not just the desirability, not just I want my variant and give it to me. But demonstrate the necessity.

The variant -- TLD variants must be allocated to the same entity. And also all requirements for TLD application, the variant applications must also match. So those are some examples of what in the report we articulate as conservative.

The second recommendation to ICANN is to -- because the -- as Francisco just gave a presentation about the LGR -- and I think that's really an important and central piece here. And we want to add to that to make sure, that when the LGR is created, it's maintained the repository. And it's available to users and programmatically processable.

Knowing that, you know, the LGRs submitted not only used to determine what variants they are; but they also have other uses. For

example, it could be used by application developers and others. So having it in a programmatically processable format is really important.

The third recommendation is -- also about LGR is to develop a minimal, simple, and consistent IDN LGR for the root zone. The LGR really have what is -- when it's developed, it has a character repertoire as well as, you know, variant set. So I think what -- so what do we mean by minimal, simple, and consistent? So here are some examples. Minimal needed by a given script community do not include scripts and -- you know, there are so many of those in the unicode. Minimally used by a given script community.

By default, if there's no consensus is reached on a given code point, the default decision is to leave out that code point. And the code point should be added at a script level.

For the variants, you know, the report recommends the variants be added based on security consideration and/or significant community need. I think Francisco mentioned this adequately in the procedure before, so I will not belabor this.

At the root level, the variants should be based on the script. And, finally, simpler variant rules should be preferred than the more complex ones.

So that's some examples of minimal and simple and consistent. There are more of those in the report that I invite you to read.

Something's not working. I'll try here.

Is there a way to advance the slide manually? Sorry. Okay.

I guess they want the audience to stop on this slide and take a look while we wait for a -- there we go. Okay. All right.

So the next set of recommendations is directed to registries that offers IDNs for those scripts that does have variants, right? It's very similar. What we try to do here is to have, you know, these kind of practices at the root. Kind of the best practices at the root is more or less like a must.

But, going down at the registry level, these are, you know, kind of the best practice recommendations. So, for example, registration of variants not automatic, must be initiated by the registrant, and the variants are withheld by default. So it's also in applying the same conservatism principle. Variants registered to the same registrant, all requirements for label also applies to the variants and may be treated as an automic unit.

Next, slide, please. Okay, thanks. So let's jump to -- there are other recommendations for our registries. But I'm going to, in the interest of time, not cover that. I'm going to jump to recommendations for registrants. So, for example, one recommendation for registrar is to extend the linguistic and technical support of IDN variants for registrants. Because, you know, registrars is really the interface with the customers. And they need to support registrants to understand, prioritize, select, and update variants for registration. You know, that's from the end user experience perspective, right? Because that's the entity that directly deals with end users. You also need to support variants to understand pricing and service level implications.

We also, you know, the last category of the recommendation is for the technical community. And this is an area where you know, it's really outside, you know, even outside probably ICANN's influence. But we want to call these issues out to be proactive and really invite the community to work together to find solutions.

So one recommendation is to, based on the requirements articulated earlier is for developers to consider enhancing software for administration and management of variants. And we gave some examples of what those are.

Another recommendation is, you know, software intended for Internet end users, for example, web browsers, e-mail clients, and operating systems should support variants to the extent necessary to ensure a positive user experience.

You know, I want to stop here a bit and say, in general, you know, with the IDNs, the user experience, with IDNs itself needs to be -- there's a big, long way to improve, right? So the expectations, you know, shouldn't be really that high. But there's a long way to go. And the community should work together, you know, in order to -- for the adoption of IDNs. And in variants as part of that, this is what we recommend.

So those are, you know, the recommendations. The full list of recommendations is in the report that we published in March. We have done consultations through public comments, through webinars, at ICANN meetings. We interview operators.

But, as always, we are willing to hear more feedback on this report and any additional input we have. But, for now, I'm going to leave -- let me colleague Naela talk about next steps with regard to the project. Naela.

NAELA SARRAS:

Thank you, Steve.

Okay. So, coming out of these two reports that were just posted in March, we, again, looked at the projects that were identified. This is looking back to those of you who are with us after we did what we called the integrated issues report, which was phase 2 of the program. We came up with a number of projects. And there were at least, I think, eight of them, of things that we still need to implement or work on before we have the LGR together.

So our next steps will be to focus on pretty much implementing what Steve and Francisco talked about, the root LGR and the user experience study. That's why -- the reason why I mentioned the numbers of the projects is we're going into now project 2.2. The numbers haven't been updated to be sequential to match the time in which we're executing them. We're sticking with the original project numbers from the -- from when we established those projects at the end of phase 2.

So this project 2.2 will be to implement the process that Francisco talked about. And I'll go into a little bit of detail of what that means. And also to look at the user expectations, the user experience study that Francisco just briefly discussed.

So in 2, what do we need to do? Francisco explained that we're going to have the model of integration panel and generation panels. So we need

to start right away on recruiting the integration panel. It's going to follow -- it's going to need expertise on it, of course. It's going to be a very small group. When you read the report, it will be -- you'll see it's a very small group of highly skilled people who are looking for -- of course, it will be the areas of DNS, IDN, dealing with linguistics and unicode. And this is also what's listed for the pool of advisors.

Now, the pool of advisors, according to the process, are the advisors that are on hand to advise the generation panels. So you have integration panel as the panel that is the final arbiter of the LGR. Then we have the advisors that are on hand and available to advise the generation panel.

The generation -- the integration panel also needs to do its setup work, initial setup work. And that's all outlined in the project 2.1. This is what Francisco discussed.

And then a big part of our work here is going to be reaching out to communities to form their generation panels.

For those of you who have been following this project for a while, we think it will be a little similar -- actually, probably a lot similar from what we did in the beginning of the program where we had case studies working on those scripts. But in this case we need to do a good outreach and make it known out there that the generation panels are now -- need to be forming themselves. And there's interaction between generation panel and integration panel. And one important piece here is that the rest of the work that we're talking about down the road really depends on these generation panels being in place and producing work.

So all of this is great, but it's all interrelated and depends on each other.

And then, in order for ICANN staff to support the generation panels, we need to put some supplementary work and guidelines, make that available through the Web site and other infrastructure that we need to provide to support the work of the generation panels.

This really jumps very quickly. I think Francisco did talk about what the integration and generation panels will do. So I'm concerned we didn't cover much what's happening in generation panels.

So that was project 2.2.

Project 7 we'll talk -- I think Denise touched on this a little bit. We're going to -- coming out of what Steve described, which was the user experience study, there have been -- the recommendations that he talked about. What we need to do, because these recommendations, as you saw, touch on registries, registrars, ICANN itself, and the technical community, we need to go and ask the sponsoring organizations and advisory committees on which of these can be immediately implemented or which of them are ones that possibly need more policy work.

So that's -- that step needs to happen before we just start implementing what's in the user experience study.

Then, along with that, we need to update the applicant guidebook and the IDNs ccTLD documentation implementation plans to implement the changes that are in that user experience study. And, at the same time, also update the applicant guidebook and the ccTLD implementation plan. This applies to both.

I think this morning we were discussing what we foresee here as really defining in the applicant guidebook the business process of how we're going to handle variants, whether it's a new application coming in or whether the applications that have been already submitted that have named variants, how we take those applicants through the process going forward. So that's project 7.

Project 8 is, once the applicant guidebook and the user experiences are reflected in the relevant guidebooks, we now actually need to implement them in the ICANN systems and processes to be able to -- in order to be able to process the requests, delegate variants. So that work, in addition -- it says implement changes identified and that's correct. I think there will still be a step behind that where we need to identify all the places where all these changes need to happen.

And one piece of work that continues from the third phase that we just wrapped up is the LGR tool, the label generation rules tool. This is the tool that defines a specification for listing those codepoints. We do have -- this work has been going on for at least six months now. There's a draft out that I included the link for here. And then we put the mailing list of vip@icann.org, the mailing list as the place to send input, because it wasn't a clear place to send input. That's what's coming, Kim. Kim is the one working on that tool. I have a non-working clicker now, yeah. I think I have only from here the timeline.

You have timeline?

So I can start talking about timeline while it's loading.

Hello? Can someone advance the slide, please? Ah, he's working on it.
Okay.

There we go.

Okay. So the timeline -- this is similar to what we showed at the beginning. This is going forward. About April 2013 here we need to get going on the implementation of project 2.2. This is the generation panels. This is the -- the actual implementation of the process defined in 2.1. So we'll be setting up integration panels, doing outreach for generation panels, et cetera.

At the same time, we need to start defining what's happening in project 7, which is the updating the gTLD and ccTLD programs. And then from there actually implementing those changes.

What we project or what we see happening between now is that this work will take us a good -- little over a year, as you can tell from here. So around mid next year we expect to have the process for IDN variant TLDs for delegation in place.

And this is also -- there's a note here that isn't very -- it's not -- it's not coming through very good. But, really, this is subject to all this work falling in place. As you can see, it's all interdependent. There's a lot of projects that depend on previous steps, so this is a good optimistic timeline that we can work towards right now. And I think that's it, right? Yeah.

So that's it. What we wanted to talk about next steps. And from here we'll take questions.

KIM DAVIES: Thank you. Wendy, can you help us with questions, please.

WENDY PROFIT: Two questions from a remote participant, Ms. Williams. "Question: How many active applications for IDN TLDs are affected by the current program of work?" And the second question is: "Taking into account the prioritization numbers for IDN applicants in practical terms, does the IDN variant project delay the evaluation and implementation of any applicant's plans?"

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So the first question how many applications are affected by this current program, I will say all the IDN applications in the sense that -- not in terms of the evaluation of the string, because that has already passed. But, in terms of the variants, the potential to identify variants, the way that is worded in the applicant guidebook is that the variants that are listed in the application are an informative note in the application. They are not recognized until the appropriate work, which is this program, finalized. And so this program is the one. Once we have the IDN root LGR, that will be the mechanics to identify the variants related to all the strings. I think that was the first one.

The second one, let me see. So we don't expect any delay on the evaluation. As you can see, the results for, I believe, all the IDN TLD applications that are out there. I'm looking at Trang, my colleague. And maybe she will correct me if I'm saying something wrong. Will the IDN TLD applications results are already there, right? Or most of them? IDN TLD applications?

TRANG NGUYEN: So, Francisco, are you asking whether or not all of the IDN applications have had results published?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes.

TRANG NGUYEN: No. Only the ones that are prioritized, which means the first 108 applications. There are some IDN applications that were not been prioritized, and those have not been evaluated yet.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Okay. Thank you. In any case, the work here does not have an impact in terms of the delay and evaluation. Thank you. Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Francisco. Rinalia Abdul Rahim, for the transcript record. I am from the At-Large advisory committee.

I have a few questions all related to the implementation of the label generation rules for the root zone.

Assuming that the board approves the recommendations for the procedure tomorrow, how soon or how quickly do you think the integration panel can be formed? And related to that is: Are you still concerned about the supply and availability of experts that would constitute that integration panel?

And the next question is, when you say that the first version of the IDN LGR would be released after you have a comprehensive set of writing systems, do you mean a set of the family of languages that share a script? Or do you need multiple sets, for example, CJK in the root and then Greek, Cyrillic, and Latin in the root? Thank you.

NAELA SARRAS:

Okay, Rinalia. Thank you.

I'll take the question about how soon, how soon for the integration panel. We do have a program plan or project plan that we initially started putting together for this project. For the integration panel itself, this work is happening as soon as we come back from Beijing. We -- I looked at the plan earlier this morning. I think we were projecting to have the panel in place within the next couple months. So we understand the urgency. And we're actually -- we've been asked to expedite the program as quickly -- as much as possible. So in the next -- in my colleagues here should correct me, if I'm saying anything wrong. So, in the next couple months, we expect to have the integration panel up and running. There's some setup work that they need to do. And that's still within that about two to three months.

In terms of you said the pool of experts to fill the integration panel, you're absolutely right. The world isn't full of these people that are just ready to serve on integration panels. It's not a large population out there that can serve on this panel. But I think this program has shown up to date that we have been able to use the best of the best consultants that we could get our hands on out there. So, in terms of expertise for that integration panel, I don't believe we have concerns

that we can't get the right expertise to serve on the panel. I think we're pretty comfortable there.

ASMUS FREYTAG:

Maybe to attempt to answer the question of comprehensiveness, the label generation rule -- is that better? The label generation rules want to be not, ideally, would develop them all at once for now for all future. Because that way you can guarantee that you never have to update them in any way, shape, or form that risks any form of incompatibility. That's clearly not feasible.

But what you must aim for is to have a set of label generation rules that are very unlikely to be challenged by future updates. You do not want to introduce any incompatibility. The risk of that has to be very clearly limited. And the only way to do that is to examine enough scripts that you are sure that you have all the wrinkles that can occur present in at least one example. Again, that's an ideal case. We will have to see how close to that we can get to that in practice, but we must try. We cannot, under any circumstances, I think, be justified in taking a single script family, no matter how prominent or interesting, and just go with that one. That is -- that is, essentially, the repeat of, you know, the ASCII-only DNS in a different guise in the next level. We do not want to have the risk of disruptive upgrade.

It's not just what's in the repertoire. It's not just what's in the variables. It's in the data formats that we want to publish. It's in the tools that we want to publish. There was in the presentation a very clear mention of - - that there's interest in being able to run the LGR evaluation based on published information outside ICANN. If it was just run inside ICANN, it

would be maybe not as critical. But it is supposed to be available in -- for people to evaluate strings as being possible variants of existing IDNs. And, for all of those reasons, it's really important that we can have enough scripts in the initial path that we stress these various specifications correctly so that we don't unwittingly put constraints that, when we get a final -- finally get a proposal for an LGR update for a particular script, that we'd have to backtrack in any way. Backtracking is just not an option.

>>

Ching?

CHING CHIAO:

Thank you, Francisco, Steve and Naela and everyone here. This is Ching Chiao speaking in a personal capacity.

I would like to bring the subject for people in the room with the less technical not knowledge but more from the business and policy sides about the timeline.

My question is very simple and straightforward. Why June next year? Please help us understand that. During this week, we've heard kind of this new gTLD program needs to be moved forward. We are looking at the new amended contract, which the registries are working night and day on trying to reach a consensus towards a new registry agreement. We're seeing new TMCH contracts. But we understand or a misunderstanding is that this working group has been set up quite some time ago. And we know that -- or I personally fully understand how

much work has been done by this working group. And I really applaud for that outcome. But why June?

We understand the pressure that you have and we have from the business and policy side. You have seen the strings 106 applications or 108 that's been published. You know the variants. You know who are the people to talk to, aka, the ccTLD communities. They have implemented whatever it's called. synchronized ccTLD, or we call it actually the same, actually, the variant program.

So I'm just throwing this kind of open question here, but I don't want to make anyone here to look bad. But my big question mark here is why June next year. So that's one question that I have. Also I have a follow-up suggestion on this one. So anyone. Thanks.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, Ching.

I certainly appreciate the interests of people and particularly applicants who have their variants as soon as possible. However, we must remember that what started this program was a board resolution in 2010 that -- where the board said there will be no delegation of variants until the appropriate solutions are implemented. And that's what we are working on.

Why June? I think that's a simple answer. We look at the work that is -- that we think is needed in order to finalize what we need to do. And that's the date that we came up with. We are positive about that date.

But I shall add a word of caution here. There are two parallel tracks here. One is the work that we need to do internally at ICANN. That's the part that we're saying we think can be done mid next year.

And there is the other part which involves community participation, the integration panels and interaction with the integration panel to have a conservative IDN LGR. That is -- of course, there's no timing on that. Obviously, depends on the involved communities.

But so the main message here is we hear you; we understand you. You need -- however, we need to do our due diligence and make sure we have a secure and stable DNS root. And we believe that we need to do this work before delegation of variant TLDs can happen.

CHING CHIAO:

So, actually, thank you, Francisco.

I know you've been working also night and day on this. So a practical suggestion is actually -- and this is my two cents here. I would really love to see, for example, actually, the recommendation 6.1.1 to be placed or to be made into an advisory at the TAS system. So the applicants -- most of the applicants will receive at least this first 100 IDN TLDs, knows what to do, say, from August this year when we see the first -- potential first delegation and then to next June, next year. So we know what to do in the next 8-10 months. How do we sell that? How, in terms of policy, we should comply with the ICANN guideline or this type of advisories? Because it's not in our contract. So, basically, you're putting us into a business risk. We're going to tell them, hey, there will be a variant coming up. You will be seeing registry telling registrar to

pay us advance, pay us the pre-- you know, deposit first. We will sell the variant to you, but we'll only delegate it to you when ICANN delegates the variant tool to the registries.

So you'll be seeing market activities like that, and there's no restriction or regulations. So just my two cents here. Maybe a advisory -- a time advisory would be helpful in this case. Thank you.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Edmon Chung here.

I have a few questions as well on user experience and on LGR and on the next steps.

Before I say that, actually I -- standing here in Beijing, I remember probably it was 14 years ago that this first came into being. 14 years I have been working on IDNs, and it was actually Beijing also that I first visited when I first started working on IDNs.

So I actually want to say that I'm very excited about the work that has been done. I'm very -- I want to really congratulate the team on the two reports, the LGR and the user experience, especially the user experience actually. And it is certainly a culmination of the ideas, the work from the community for the many -- the 14 -- actually 14 years of IDN but 12 years of variants.

And I wanted to really congratulate the team.

Not only that, but also the integrated -- the IP study team and also the language study team reports before that.

So what it does is that it really now sets the very strong foundation for our work forward. And I do see the light at the end of the tunnel.

So if you want to, I'd like to get everyone to join me in a round of applause for the team.

[Applause]

Truly appreciate it. Now for the questions.

I guess top of my list is the user experience study, 6.2.1. I don't know why I remember that, but....

So I think it's very important and I want to make sure you understand what I'm trying to ask.

I'm hoping, and I'm guessing it doesn't but I want to make sure that it is not incompliant with the CDNC policies and RFC 3743 in terms of preferred variants and, in fact, the implementation that you're seeing today in pretty much all of the registries that provide IDNs, including IDN ccTLDs.

I want to make sure that 6.2.1, bullet one is not noncompliant with what is out there right now.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Edmon. The recommendation for you're saying 6.2.1 --

EDMON CHUNG: Bullet one.

STEVE SHENG: -- registration of variant not automatic, are initiated by the registrants,
and variants withheld by default.

So that's the -- The background of the recommendation is to adopt a
conservative approach, you know, that, from the top level to the second
level with regard to the activation of variants.

So you're saying that it's in conflict with CDNC guidelines?

EDMON CHUNG: That's what I wanted to clarify.

So I understand the top level. I'm not asking about that.

In terms of the second-level registrations, right now dot China, dot
Taiwan, dot Asia, most of the IDN implementations that I know of in
terms especially for Chinese, you register a domain in the Chinese, and
you have a preferred variant --

STEVE SHENG: Okay.

EDMON CHUNG: -- which is either your traditional Chinese and then its preferred variant
is kind of automatically included. And that's a fundamental part of the
CDNC policy.

And so I want it make sure that you're not throwing that ten years of experience away.

STEVE SHENG:

And I think it's certainly not our intent to do that. So I think this is useful feedback for us to consider, you know, when we're embarking on the next phase of the project.

But I want to see if, Sarmad and Marc, if you have any thoughts you would like to share.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

So I would like to make two comments here. First of all as far as the recommendations for registries are concerned for second level, they're not a "must." They're a "should" which we clarify in our document is a preferred practice, but not a required practice, of course.

And the second is that this recommendation is generically for all scripts. And Chinese, CJK context may have a different policy in that context, but that policy is not applicable across all scripts.

So those are two comments.

And of course your observations are welcome, and I think there can be - - as I said, it's not a requirement. It's a "should." And in the context of CJK, if there is a very strong community, in a way, agreement coming through the LGR process, of course that can be included in the -- that can be included in the implementation.

EDMON CHUNG:

Understood.

It's very encouraging to hear that, and I have just a simple suggestion is when we worked on the ICANN IDN guidelines, we touch on this issue with mixing script as well. And we specifically talk about the Japanese language. This is a situation that's soft similar where there certain objections that may need to be there.

You talk about this as sort of a recommendation, but I guess in the ICANN realm, I would be much more comfortable if you included that wording in the report, because I would guess that is going to be used for other purposes as well. And looking at the next steps, part of it is to implement the two reports into the different processes.

And actually, I think barring that particular adjustment that probably needs to be there, I think they are very good recommendations, and I'd like to see them perhaps even in the contract of registry contracts for those who are running IDN registries. Because they should know about these kind of things, and, you know, they sudden be carrying out those practices.

So that's important.

I'll put myself back at the end of the line every time because I'll switch to another question.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, Edmon. Wendy, I believe we have some remote participant questions.

WENDY PROFIT: Yes, this is Wendy on behalf of remote participant Liz Williams question. Question: Referring to Steve's slide about best industry practice, how will that commitment be integrated into specifications for technical service providers? Will the ICANN contract be amended to take account of the new standards?

Do you want me to ask the second one now, too, or just wait?

STEVE SHENG: So I guess it depends on how we define "technical service providers." So from these best practices, you know, together with the principles that was articulated, some of these made into the recommendations.

So project 7 through sort of a consultative process will implement some of these recommendations into contracts or best practices.

So, Liz, if your question is about whether they will be in contracts or best practices, my answer is, yes, some of them are.

I have to confess I don't fully understand your question about technical service. Do you mean the back-end provider? Other operator?

But others, feel free to chime in if you have something to add.

WENDY PROFIT: Last question from Liz as well. Could the panelists provide some feedback on the actual user experience impacts registrants can expect whilst waiting for the IDN variant work takes place? Do they expect negative effects which will

harm new IDN applicant's businesses, noting that they are due to go live very early in the process of delegation?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So I'm not sure I understand the question.

WENDY PROFIT: She said, yes, back-end providers to the previous one.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So maybe I should start with the other one because I think I could answer that one first.

The requirements for back-end providers, ICANN has contracts with the registry operators. They contract to ICANN, not the back end. So we cannot have a requirement on the back ends. We have requirements with the registry operators which, in turn, they may need to or decide to put in the contracts with their back ends.

So I think that will be the answer to the first one.

Regarding the second question, negative impact on registrants given the lack of variants, I guess?

MARC BLANCHETT: That's my understanding of the question.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Okay.

MARC BLANCHETT: In the variants are not deployed, then what's the impact of the registrants.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: So probably there will be some impact; right? And the impact could anniversary depending on which community you are.

So at the moment, I think there are no variants. So, you know, for the blocked variants, I think probably there will be not so much security concerns; right? Because, I mean, there's no -- hasn't been considered. It's almost, like, blocked.

So I think there may be a negative experience for some of the active variants. I think that applicants need to acknowledge that.

What we're trying to do here on the other side is to balancing that with defining a robust and consistent process to generate labels for the root; right? Because we only have one root, root zone. It's a shared resource.

And in terms of policy-making and procedures, decisions at the root should be much more conservative than decisions at the second level.

So I think with that regard, I think we're balancing the two.

There will be impacts, but balancing that, we felt that it's necessary to complete the work, the necessary LGR work, in order to -- you know, if the work is not done, you know, maybe in the future the negative

impact to the users will be even greater, you know. And potentially even more security problems.

So that's kind of a short answer to that. Not so sort answer. Sorry.

MARC BLANCHETT: May I add something? Marc Blanchett.

One thing that was -- the scope of the study of the user experience study was given that IDN variants were activated, what are the user -- you know, the issues or the expectation of the users.

So we didn't really work on what happens if the variants are not activated, because the actual scope of the work was given that they are activated, what happens.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. Mike.

MIKEY O'CONNOR: My name is Mikey O'Connor, and I confess to being a full fledged clueless newbie on this one. I sort of became aware of this this week. So I'm going to sort of represent my ISPs because just listening to this conversation and reading, I just literally just now read section 5, so I've got a long way to come up the learning curve. But I'd be curious to hear from you all whether you think this thing is ready to go out into the world. Because I'm representing the organizations that are going to take the calls when this unbelievable array of horrors happens, and I'm just curious if I should be, like, buying ad space in major newspapers

and saying, "Heads up, colleagues. We've got search problems, inconsistent this and that. People aren't going to be able to log on to Facebook." Because you guys aren't going to get the call and Facebook isn't going to get the call. I'm going to get the call.

Is this thing getting ready to go out in the world? I'm sorry to ask such a stupid question, but this is hair-raising.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, Mike. So the answer is no. Precisely that's what we are saying. We need to do more work before this can be ready.

But I feel like I need to clarify what is meant by variants, perhaps.

So the term is overloaded, and it means different things to different people.

So usually when people talk about variants, probably what they are thinking is what we call in the reports mid (indiscernible) variants meaning you have two names and the provider implements a mechanism that tries to make the two DNS strings and whatever is used in that DNS string to behave as if the two names were the same, something like that.

So that's not what we are trying to implement here.

We specifically discard that as part of the integrated issues report as something that is not workable precisely because of the kind of things you are mentioning.

What we are talking about to implement is things like, for example, something that is very straightforward, having blocked variants. You have a name that no one should have because otherwise it will have security implications because maybe will think -- will be confused, think it is related to some other name that is out there.

So blocked variants. Something that -- we don't call them that but it's something we already have. We have some TLDs that are basically blocked, not allowed, because of those type of considerations.

And there is a consideration to have active variants that's what the user experience is mostly about, and that relates to have two names that will be allocated to the same entity. But there is no full expectation that they will try to do something to mirror the two spaces.

So basically we will be only taking care that those two names are managed in some sort of automatic form so that if you transfer this registry to someone else, it will be the two strings, for example, so there is no possibility to have one string to be with one party and another string to be with another party.

But in terms of the expectation for those two names or everything that is using those two names to behave in a mid (indiscernible), we are pretty pessimistic about that being a possibility. We are basically saying no, that's not what can be expected.

Go ahead.

MARC BLANCHETT:

I will encourage you to read the whole report.

14 years ago when we started the IDN working group or IDN work, in fact, right? Because as soon as you input languages into domain name, then you will get support calls, whatever you do.

So -- And I -- I have been the co-chair of the working group, co-author of the specs, so blame me. Don't send the support calls to me, however (laughing).

Having said that, so I think my take is on the support calls, the large group of issues are related about IDN in general, not specifically about this, what we're talking about specifically about this; right?

Now, more specifically, you have some ccTLDs that have been deploying IDNs; right? And then some of them already have variants at the second level; right?

So what we're -- it's already deployed. It's there; right? And it's simpler for those TLDs because it's usually language specific or community specific. Therefore, they can manage their, you know, scope.

Here we're talking about the root, the TLDs. So the impacts are larger. And from the user experience report that I encourage you to read is the fact that we tend -- no, I'm not trying to....

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

Perfectly fair.

MARC BLANCHETT:

But we're trying to say from the user point of view, and users being different kinds of users, it is difficult to envision that a rule can apply to

the second level differently than the first level and differently on the third level; right? It doesn't make any sense.

A codepoint or all the rules related to what is valid at one level should be at the same level. I think we can agree; right?

So I think this whole work is to actually try to make as uniform or the best we can to make all these work together; right?

So it's not simple. Just there will be some support calls.

Then the question is more about we started 14 years ago about saying do we introduce languages into domain names; right? And I think that's most of the problems.

And if we don't do variants, then -- I'm French speaking so I have kind of less of a problem, but I understand that some languages, they have different ways to write the same strings. So if one way doesn't work and the other way works, then it adopt seem to be right. So....

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Asmus, you wanted to add something?

ASMUS FREYTAG:

Yeah, I wanted to -- we've gone back to talking about the active variants again, and I want to reiterate the usefulness I see in the LGR procedure, and that's why it's so important to get it right, also, in the ability to block large amounts of variants.

You can think of variants as kind of being indirect collisions between labels. If two labels have the same variant, then they can't exist at the

same time because they will be treated -- the idea is they will be treated by the user as somehow identical when in fact they aren't identical point level. And that gives all sorts of opening to abuse. So you want to filter those out.

And we want to get that work right that we can take care of in that LGR part, which is something that can be automated. And we can take care of filtering stuff that can be, with knowledge of scripts or languages, defined as being automatable of detecting potential collisions between things. So that the next part in the system, which we haven't talked here at all about, which will be the string similarity review, which is a case-by-case evaluation using humans, that that evaluation doesn't have to, you know -- deals with all the obvious cases.

So blocked variants behave very, very different from the allocatable ones.

Among the allocatable ones you have that subset that can potentially be activated.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you. We are running out of time. We have only five minutes and we have Edmon and we have a remote question.

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

Let me do one last sentence which is this was extremely helpful. I really appreciate the dumbing down to my level.

I will read this.

But one of the things to stick in the work plan would be some sort of extracting this report to sort of a policy level.

This is a tough read for me, and I sort of thought I kind of understood this stuff. So for the typical ISP out there in the world, it would be really helpful to have sort of a basic introduction to the terminology and the issues in sort of one layer less technical language so that people could start understanding what's coming at them. Because this is hard.

Thanks.

MARC BLANCHETT: There is a recommendation in the report about this.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon Chung again. I guess what Mikey meant in terms of policy is a small "P" policy, not the big "P" policy. And if you look at those lists of issues, you're probably going to find a similar long list when you talk about new gTLDs and universal acceptance of them. But we won't go there.

So back to the couple of more questions. We're running out of time, I know. One is the label generation rule sets in terms of comprehensiveness.

I wanted to follow up with what Rinalia said. And Asmus, I actually do know what you mean, and we've talked about this. We may disagree,

but I want to make sure that my Chinese colleagues understood what you're saying.

All through the process, the Chinese community has -- you know, this is an urgent item for the Chinese community, and we've always thought that through the process this could go parallel. And if the Chinese community is ready, it won't be held back by other script communities.

What you just said is probably different from what understanding, so I want it make sure that my Chinese colleagues understand this.

Or maybe I understood you wrong.

ASMUS FREYTAG:

No. I think you understand me quite fine.

I think the best thing that -- I understand your interest and the interest of the Chinese community in getting this to work. Everybody has had high expectations and a long lead time and wants to finally see that thing come to fruition. I think the best thing that everybody can do is in -- I'm thinking of the Chinese language and the Han script community, I'm including Japanese here, as very sophisticated experts in this area. And having looked at the problem, already having defined what the variant could be, having defined which language environments are allocatable and which are not, they have basically really deep experience on this stuff.

Now, the best way to make this go forward as expeditiously as possible is in speeding up the slowest part of this process. And the slowest part of this process would be perhaps important generation panels.

Important in the sense that they're script touches important issues, that may not have the expertise, may not have the background, may not have the facilities, because scripts can be complicated even if the countries are not very rich or sophisticated or highly computerized. And any help that Chinese script community, including Japan and that one as well, could do in facilitating certain of these potentially not-so-quick-off-the-mark other generation panels would be highly useful.

Having said that, of course it's very useful if the integration panel can start with a very well put together, quickly delivered LGR submission from Chinese generation panel. That would -- The integration panel process is not necessarily one where nothing will happen until everything has come in, you know, in the mailbox. What will happen is that the people on the integration panel will sift through stuff as it comes in. It is just that the delivery date for an LGR is dependent on it being comprehensive.

So work will not just cease. It will just go quietly behind the background. And it's absolutely essential that the Chinese generation panel be formed immediately and supply proposal the minute the integration panel is ready to receive input.

EDMON CHUNG:

Sure. I understand that and I just want to make sure that my colleagues from the Chinese community understand what is being said right now.

Our understanding was that we won't be held back by other scripts in this process, but that is no longer true, I guess if Asmus gets his way, in a way.

So if those of you who are concerned about it, you need to speak up. That's the suggestion of mine.

ASMUS FREYTAG:

Edmon, if I may jump in on this one. It's not if I get my way or not. It's, as Steve has pointed out, it hinges on the fact that the root is a shared resource; right? So that's where all of this is coming from.

And, you know, you were part of the group when we put together the document that basically that these are the requirement for successful --

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

So if I may interject, we are running out of time so I will answer that, and that's what I'm going to do now.

I think we cannot be speculating here what is -- what should be or should not be. I think this is a matter for the integration panel once it is established. And so I really think we should not be speculating about this.

I cannot say this should be one way or the other. This is really not the place to decide that.

And we have just one last question. I would like to go to that very quickly.

WENDY PROFIT:

Remote participant Liz Williams asks from a registry operations perspective, new operators need to provide name registration policies for registrants to abide by. Do the panelists recommend that new IDN

registry operators say, quote, "The registration of variants' names at the second level are not allowed until X date. If you wish to reserve your variant, click here and we will be able to offer you variants." Unquote.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Liz, for that question. I think what you are asking is about second level; right?

I think the procedures in the report and our focus for this project is really -- really for the root zone. So I think that's point number one.

At the second level, it's really a registry's determination, so....

But having said that, I do think your conservative approach is a good idea.

One of the recommendations from the user experience report is trying to see to -- to promote consistency across different levels. The second-level registries should considering the LGRs for the root zone and use part of that and document instances where you deviate.

So just want to emphasize that.

Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG:

Just one very quick question if I may.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Very quick. Common.

EDMON CHUNG: Chung again. On the next steps, there was one part where you should go -- you were going to go back to the ccNSO and GNSO. I just want to get a sense of how that would happen and, you know, what is in that scope.

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, very quickly.

So to be clear not just GNSO, ccNSO. It's all the SOs, ACs. You should watch for the resolution tomorrow. What we're asking for is to actually -- I think the resolution will have a definite date of when we expect -- it will call on the SOs and ACs to provide input and advice to the staff about which of the recommendations can immediately proceed to implementation, and which need further policy work. And we expect that to come in with a certain amount of time. It has a deadline for when that input needs to come in.

So that's the mechanism that we're using.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Okay. With this, we close the session.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]