
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group

Tuesday, 02 February 2021 at 18:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/8lUmCQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

All right. Well good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDN EPDP Charter Drafting Team call on Tuesday, the 2nd of February, 2021. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room.

And I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the recording and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it over to Dennis Tan. You can begin, Dennis.

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.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Julie. And welcome, everyone. It's our fifth working group session. So let's jump into the agenda, which we have in front of us on the screen. So item one, review of the agenda. Item two, discuss the draft charter questions under subsections A and B. That's basically a continuation from where we left last week. Then, we'll review our post-meeting homework review. And then, we'll discuss any other business. At this point, I would like to open any suggestions for AOB at the end so that we don't forget.

All right. Seeing, none, let's just right into item number two of our agenda, discuss the charter. So we left at A12. Thank you, Ariel. Just a bit of recap, last week we discussed the framework as to how the principle and assumptions—how we are going to approach each of the items from the staff papers, vis-à-vis the SubPro recommendations, right?

And just to recap quickly, when there is consistence across SubPro recommendations, and the staff paper, and the TSG paper, meaning there is no gap amongst all of those recommendations, we say, "Okay. SubPro prevails for future TLDs." But we need to discuss the question about existing TLDs because we know SubPro is about the future, not existing. So we'll see how we develop the questions pertaining to existing TLDs. So that's basically the principle we are [voting].

There is one case in which there is a gap, one case in which SubPro recommendation and the TSG paper not quite align 100%. And therefore, that's one exception that we have to decided to leave at the end, just to see how we craft the questions and the rationale and see how we can agree to a final wording of the question. So that's the one item that this group is not fully in

agreement as to how to handle that. But since it's just one case, we are going to park it at the end so that we can progress with the rest of the document. So that being said, any comments, observations?

Okay. Seeing none. So let's jump right into A12. And you will see a few notes here because one of the things that we hear from the working group is that we want to streamline the document. So try to find efficiencies, where things can be merged or remove things that don't need so much introduction. We agree.

From a context standpoint, we don't want the extremes. We don't want any context, meaning introducing the issue and the question. And we don't want to go to the extreme and copy-paste everything that is on the staff paper and SubPro recommendations and repeat it here on the charter document. So we are in the middle. We want a summary of the context, just the gist of the issue at hand, and then pose the questions. Of course, the referral links so that the reader, the next working group, can directly go to the source of the materials and read the whole detail.

And that's why you will see some notes here. The way we are approaching that, we have not yet made the corrections because we want to leave that at the end. But here, for example, we are noting that on the first paragraph, we want to shorten that. There is nothing wrong with the information, the substance of that paragraph. We will just need to find ways to streamline it—to keep the essence but save some words, if you will.

So again, that will help us. We want to avoid the worst, meaning during our session we want to be more efficient with our time, with

your time. So we go to discuss the actual question that is before us.

So with that, A12. That maps to row 18 of the gap. And I believe Ariel put that link on the chatroom. But easier because we're now able to click on this document. So in this case, there is a gap, meaning that SubPro did not take into account the thesis from the TSG paper, as far as subsequent updates for revisions of the Root Zone LGR. So the question is ... Again, the introduction is, "Root Zone LGR is going to be subject to changes, updates."

And just so you know, Root Zone LGR is now in its fourth iteration, version four. And we certainly expect more to come because some of the scripts are still in development, namely Latin, Cyrillic, Armenian, and others. So in the future, there may be a fifth or sixth version of the Root Zone LGR and maybe more, as more scripts, again, are integrating the Root Zone LGR or revisions need to be made for supporting scripts.

So this has to deal with that case. As the Root Zone LGR is updated, how does that impact the already delegated approved and active TLDs in the zone? Hopefully, ideally, the Root Zone LGR remains consistent with what has already been delegated, meaning there is no—a new version of the Root Zone LGR says that already TLD now is, the label is invalid or their variants, for that matter.

Ideally, that's not the case. But if it happens ... Because it could happen. The Root Zone LGR is based on Unicode. Unicode is ... For the most part, they strive for consistency and conservatism. But there's always the possibility that something can happen in

the opposite direction. So if that's the case, what are the right approach to deal with those cases?

So that's making the gist of the issue here. So what does the working group need to discuss and recommend to handle those cases that, for the sake of this conversation, I'm going to call exceptions, where the Root Zone LGR finds exceptions to the rule because of reality, because of delegated TLDs. Now, how does the policy ICANN community deal with those? So I'm going to stop there, pause there to hear any reactions, observations, as far as the issue at hand and the relevant questions for the next working group to discuss. I see Edmon's hand. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG:

Hi. Just something came to mind, in terms of the question. I guess it's not just existing TLDs but also their variants. If a new LGR comes along and it affects the variants, that should be handled as well. Do we cover it in this question or is there another question that covers that already?

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Edmon. That's a good point. No. Both cases. The TLD and the variants need to be accounted for. So yeah. Ideally, right. Ideally, the Root Zone LGR is adopted as the sole source to validate TLDs and calculated variants. And that process is carried on onwards to the variants. Thank you for that clarification. All right. Any other items on this, A12?

Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to A13. And this has to do with single-character TLDs. As you know, single character TLDs, thus

far, have been prohibited to be applied for. Nonetheless, there has been always the eagerness of the community to allow for single-character TLDs, especially in some scripts, such as Chinese and Japanese, where a single ideogram—a single Unicode character—can really have full meaning of a term, of a word.

So SubPro recommended to allow certain scripts or languages to be allowed to be used as single-character TLDs. SSAC recommends certain precautions in that regard. And I think the staff paper points to the same and the TSG points to the same SSAC paper. So basically, here, all agree at a high level that they agree to allow single-character TLDs in certain scripts.

So the question for the working group here ... Well, I don't think we are going to revisit because this is old language. They're revisiting SubPro recommendations. Based on our principles, we are not asking about revisiting. We are just taking the assumption that SubPro recommendation, that's the recommendation. And how do we manage now, based on that principle?

So I'm looking at the chat. Maxim, "Grandfathering is important." Yeah. I think you were meaning on A12, right, about the grandfathering? So I think I agree on that regard. And yes, single character is emoji. But since we're talking about Root Zone LGR, Root Zone LGR prohibits emojis because they are not IDNA2008 valid so that's out of the question. So Root Zone LGR agrees with you.

Yeah. So Ariel is pointing out, do we actually need A15 since SubPro already decided that they're going to allow? Let's see. So

we need to look at A13, A14, and A15 as a bundle of things. Yes, Sarmad. I see your hand. Please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN:

Thank you, Dennis. So for the single-character, I guess the question is about next steps. So SSAC, for example, in its report, suggests that since single characters come by themselves so they don't really have a larger context. Therefore, they may not actually have that context for disambiguation. And therefore, there is a chance of, for example, higher confusability when characters come by themselves.

Therefore, one of the ways they suggest some of this additional risk can be addressed is, for example for, the case of Han script or Chinese, review the list of characters allowed and, for example, shortlist those characters which could be okay to be used as single-character TLDs—so maybe developing a short list.

I guess the question is, is that a reasonable expectation or mechanism to handle this or it's not a reasonable mechanism to handle it? Do we need to do anything else or more? And is that something that should be decided in this EPDP or is that implementation detail for a SubPro recommendation. So I guess that's a question we need to answer.

And from an ICANN Org perspective, obviously, we will need to get some guidance to see whether we need to go back to the Generation Panel to request them to do more work in this context or not. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Sarmad. Yes. So that's useful. And I think Ariel is thinking the same thing. That's basically the next step. So the policy recommendation has been made. It is now the next step because we know, according to SSAC, that not every single character is eligible to be a TLD because of the risk that Sarmad just discussed.

So the next steps are how do we identify those scripts and even go farther than that? How do you select certain characters from those scripts to be eligible for TLD labels? Sarmad, is that a new hand?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sorry. It's an old hand.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. So along those lines, A13 through 15 are on the subject of single-character TLDs. So A13 was meant to introduce the recommendation from SubPro. Now that we are agreed on principle one, SubPro is the assumption. So we assume that SubPro recommendation will become policy. Therefore, we allow single-character TLDs.

Now, the implementation question is how do you identify those that are consistent with SSAC recommendations? And that's basically the gist of what this working group can propose for the next working group to look at. So in that sense, what you see highlighted there, under 14 on the second paragraph, that's where we are proposing as the wording for the question for this charter. And Edmon, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: I think since Dennis, as you said, 13, 14, 15 is actually one unit and there's really just one overall question, I guess it might be clearer if it's consolidated into one section. Or it would be something, A, B, C, just so that it reads—for the working group to consider it as one big question unit.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Yeah. I agree with you. As we take note, again, this was the original draft. So much of the structure and flow was kept as is, as we go through, so to find these types of observations because you see above, there's several comments about merging two or three items. So this is the case where some merging will be necessary in order to help the reader in the next working group to understand the flow. And they need to treat this as unit, not piecemeal. But yeah. Thank you. That's helpful.

So any comments on the questions? And just to note, the question is second paragraph of A14. I think the first paragraph is going to be removed because that's already introduced in A13. So the relevant question here is what mechanism should be used to identify the script languages appropriate for single-character TLDs? And you can continue reading there.

Ariel, can you scroll down a little bit to see if there's more on page 15? There is a little bit more, right? Yeah. So A14 and A15 is more implementation. So A14 is about identifying the scripts and eligible characters within those scripts and A15 is on how can we quickly

identify those using the Root Zone LGR tool. So it's a two-part implementation there.

Going quickly through the chat because I see some activity here. Hold on for a minute. Yeah. Thank you. So Steve is copy-pasting the SubPro relevant language, in which it stated that, "It's appropriate to limit single-character gTLDs to only certain scripts and languages." So it's not the whole Unicode universe. It's certain scripts and languages, recognizing that they lack the expertise so a future working group will need to look at that problem. So I believe that working group is this one—or not this one but the future IDN EPDP full working group. Okay.

All right. So I think we've got that worked out. Ariel, of course. Yes, Ariel. Go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dennis. Just to clarify the direction, how we're going to consolidate A13, A14, A15, what we're going to do is to delete the question A13 because based on principle number one, there's no real gap, based on what SubPro recommended. So the first paragraph is basically the context for A14 and A15. And A14 and A15, these two questions are the implementation aspects of the single-character TLDs. So the questions themselves will stay. But we can consolidate these three parts into one question. So just to clarify, that's the way we're going to consolidate these three.

DENNIS TAN:

That's correct, Ariel. Okay. Can we scroll down. So, we've got our work out. Very good. We are making good progress. That's what

we had hoped, once we finalized and agreed upon a framework. So we will work much faster. And I think that we're fulfilling that promise. Knock on wood, we'll keep on that promise.

Okay. So A6. And you see, the number is not working in sequence here because this A6 and the next A3 were moved around a little bit, depending on the conversations we have had. So yeah. Okay. Need to recollect what was discussed on this about the ... Oh yeah.

So there are a few use cases. Again, Root Zone LGR will become the sole source to validate and calculate variance. The one that's implemented, that means that existing TLDs will be subject to some processing or to find out what the variants are and also to revalidate whether the labels are validated or not and whether setting obsessions or grandfathering, as Maxim pointed out, [inaudible] will be needed.

So this is one of those use cases. In the ccTLD world, for example, the cases of [speaking Chinese], .China in simplified and traditional Chinese were delegated not using the variant terminology but synchronized TLDs. So because of that, there are going to be ... That's up to the ccNSO of course. But that's one case.

So A6, I put on the notes there that may be something that we want to merge with C4, if we can, Ariel, quickly see what C4 is. This is another use case in where ... Again, another case is which delegated TLDs are found to be variants of each other. So another exception case that needs to be looked at.

So what I'm proposing here is all these exceptions or all these use cases that could find exceptions to the Root Zone LGR need to be bundled together as use cases so that the working group can look at, at once, all these potential exception cases that they need to think about. And that's why I was suggesting let's put them together as use cases in one single item here.

Yeah. Thank you, Ariel. That was what was in C4. So I have a few hands here. So, Maxim and then Edmon.

MAXIM ALZOBA: If we speak about same entities on the second level or do we speak about it later?

DENNIS TAN: Second level? No. Not yet, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Okay. Speaking about TLD level, the same entity requirement cannot be met because the current Registry Agreements, they do not involve process of handing in TLD to another entity for no reason. Because the thing is, nothing in policy can, I'd say, regulate financial things because of so-called picket fence. And taking TLD out of hands of an entity is definitely a financial item.

So I am not sure how it should be resolved. It definitely should be investigated, different options. And potentially, there might be a class of TLDs which are, I'd say inherited, where the strange status, where, for example two different TLDs which are variants

of each other are in different hands. But it's historically happened and it will not be allowed again or something. But also, we need to write there that the various options should be investigated. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I think you are confirming that there are situations here that ought to be discussed and resolved, if those exceptions become material or become reality. So it does confirm that this working group needs to develop the questions so that the next working group looks at these cases. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Agree with combining A6 and A4. And also, I think it should either move up to be immediately after A12 or A12 should be moved down to immediately before A6 plus A4 because I think they're similar stuff.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Yes. Good suggestion. We need to put them together and find the right placement, as to keep certain flow of the ideas and the issues that need to be dealt with.

All right. So that will take care of A6 and C4. Again, these are the cases where Root Zone LGR is going to be processed for the existing TLDs and potential exceptions cases need to be handled. So what are those potential cases? Some of these are discussed in the staff paper and the TSG paper. But the next working group

will need to discuss in substance how to resolve those issues and what is the right procedure to be implemented.

So moving on to A3. A3 is meant as a catch-all. What additional aspects of gTLD policies and procedures need to be considered in order to apply the Root Zone LGR for existing TLDs and all what is meant. Again, it's a catch-all of things that need to be thought of. So I don't think there's comments there. But I'm looking at the chat or hands, if any. Okay. Yep. I agree, Maxim. I think that would not be needed. But yeah. That's for the next working group to discuss.

All right. So let's move on to section B. And we are getting out of the source or definition of valid labels and variants. And now, it's ... Sorry. Oh. A3 was an implementation question? Can we go up a little bit, Ariel, please, to A3 again? "Why is that an implementation question," Edmon asks. Right. You are meaning that's not something for the IRT to do but the actual PDP working group needs to look at the additional aspects and gTLD policies and procedures. So it's not really an IRT question but a PDP question. I think that's what you meant.

EDMON CHUNG:

Jumping in. Sorry. I just wonder why we state it as an implementation question. I guess we can just strike out "implementation question." It's just a catch-all for any other thing that we may have missed, right?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Yeah. I think I agree with that. Okay. So let's take note of that. Maxim is noting RPMs. Edmon, is that a new hand?

EDMON CHUNG: Yes. I think Ariel wanted to speak.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Edmon.

DENNIS TAN: Oh, yes. Sorry.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Edmon, for raising a hand for me. Yeah. I just want to provide context why we have this bracket implementation question before. It's that before we discuss the principles and framework for dealing with the charter questions, we still had questions to confirm the, basically, policy principles that are already recommended by SubPro. So we have these policy questions to begin with and then we have these implementation questions that mainly address some of the gaps that SubPro didn't address.

Now, because the group has agreed on some of these principles such as if the SubPro had no gap with the staff paper or the TSG recommendations, then we don't ask these policy questions at all in the charter, so that we will largely reduce the number of these questions. So perhaps implementation question that's tagged is no longer necessary. So I just want to provide some context to why we had it to being with.

Thank you, Ariel, for that qualification. Okay. So moving on to section B, IDN variant TLD management. So now we move, again, leaving the Root Zone LGR definition and the tool itself to validate and calculate variance to actually what are the implications, as far as legal entities that need to manage this?

So at the top level, SubPro, the staff paper, and the TSG paper did not look at legal entities. The staff paper and SubPro agree that the variant TLDs need to be allocated or reserved for allocation to the same entity and that same entity be the registry operator. So B1 basically deals with that SubPro for future TLDs.

So the question here is do we apply the same policy recommendations to existing TLDs? So based on our principles, that the question that we ask. We have the assumption that the SubPro will become policy for future TLDs. Now we need to extend the same principle, the same policy to existing TLDs, meaning that for existing TLDs, if they want to apply for variant labels, that needs to be applied by the same registry operator, of course.

So here is also an opportunity to merge, B1 and B2. And I think we already noted that. Okay. And Maxim is noting ... Oh. Maxim, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I think the current TLDs which are variants of each other should be exempt from this rule because I don't see the way, without TLDs bringing ICANN into court, for doing that—for taking Registry contract out of hands of one entity and granting it to

another. So it might bring security risks for ICANN. So it's a bad idea. But yeah. That's it.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Maxim. Yeah. I think that's the essence. There might be a problem. If existing TLDs are found to be variants of each other and they are within different registry operators, that relates to what we discussed in A6 and C4. Those exceptions need to be captured and dealt with. So we need to find the flow of those use cases, how you deal with exceptions.

All right. So let's get moving. So B1 and B2. I'm sorry, Ariel. We're going to deal with B1. This is the assumption where we need to reword these questions so that this applies to existing TLDs. And because B1 is basically talking about the same entity, B2 is saying that that same entity is a Registry Operator. So this is a two-part that can be collapsed to one item here, since SubPro didn't make that distinction so obvious.

Any other comment? Maxim, is that a new hand? Okay. All right. So let's keep moving. So Ariel, I think it's clear what we need to do here in B1 and B2. Okay.

All right. So in C2. So this is a question about how do you apply for a variant label? Any questions? I think that's a straight-forward question. Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Just a terminology suggestion to not use “subsequent procedure” because it ... I don’t know whether we can find better terminology. But it seems to sound to me like SubPro. Maybe it’s just me.

DENNIS TAN: The future procedure. Yeah. Sure. Thank you for that. All right. But yeah. That’s the essence of that question, right? Once you allow for variant TLDs and for the existing ones, what’s the process to apply? And that’s a discussion that the future IDN EPDP will need to discuss, whether it opens the stand-alone process, or do they need to wait for a window, or what have you. So that’s all to be discussed there.

This is a two-part question. I think we need to separate these two because one is about the process to allocate the variant label and the other one is the future process to change the label status from allocated to activated, delegated [inaudible]. I don’t know. Maybe it’s too ... We’ll leave it there and see how that fits in the overall charter.

So moving on to C3. I’m happy we’re making good progress here. Hopefully we close all of section B as we had expected. So C3, this maps to [vote] seven on the mapping document. So same as registry operator, requirement is that both or all of the variant labels, at the top level, are managed by the same back-end service provider. Again, in this case, we’re assuming this is the case for future TLDs. So the question here is does it make sense to extend the same policy for existing TLDs. And Maxim, your hand’s up. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

First, I'd like to speak about the previous item. I wonder if, in SubPro, there is a reason for objection, which is someone is trying to apply for the variant of my existing TLD. Is it a valid reason for objection? We need to at least check because if we try to apply these as a policy for future TLDs, it should be. So the party can complain that someone is trying to take, effectively, the variant of their TLD, potentially, out of their hands.

The second thing is about backends. Also, these cannot be applied to the current existing TLDs because it's a material change. When someone is forcing you to go to another backend, I don't see the way to do it because the contract doesn't have any provision saying that ICANN regulates. ICANN procedures, they just ensure that the backend is, I'd say, up to the current standards. It's about the ... I forgot the three-letter term for evaluation of the backend but that's it. So it's definitely a material change and cannot be applied to the current TLDs. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Maxim. Yeah. There definitely is some implications, in this case asking whether there is [native] backend. But that is something that is going to be discussed in the next working group. So you confirmed there is a need to have a discussion. And if there are certain sections to the policy recommendations that need to be taken into account, those need to be discussed and laid out in the actual policy recommendations.

So thank you. So I think we have the question here, whether it makes sense and think about the rationale and motivations for apply, extending the policy of SubPro to existing TLDs, and whether there are going to be exceptions that need to be taken care of.

All right. So that takes care of these three, then. Yes, Ariel. Please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dennis. So I think there are some commonalities between B1, B2, and C3. And I'm just wondering whether it makes sense to consolidate all three questions and then ask whether the SubPro recommendations should extend to existing TLDs so that it seems more consolidated than just consolidating B1 and B2 and then have a separate question for C3. So just wondering whether consolidating all three questions would be more efficient.

DENNIS TAN:

Yeah. I would not be opposed because it basically is the same. There is no gap in their recommendations and the IDN EPDP can either decouple the discussion for sure and then come up with a single recommendation. So yeah. I would not object to merging same entity as a registry operator and some backend service provider.

However, Edmon likes the current flow. [Separate] those from C2. So we have different preferences. So maybe, let's keep it as is and try and efficiency and streamline the content for now. And

then, we will revisit how we merge those. But he's not against consolidating. I agree.

So let's keep it separate for now but streamline the wording so that it's more efficient. But then, at the end, we can decide whether registry operator and backend service provider, we want them to be presented as a bundle, as opposed to two different layers, which in reality, they actually are. The registry agreement is with ICANN and the MSA is with the registry operator and the service provider.

Okay. Let's keep moving. So C3, C4. Oh yeah. So C4 is merged with B6 so we already captured that, those exceptions of the current situation for Root Zone LGR vis-à-vis the existing. So we already took care of that.

C5, then. So is there any additional constraints for the same entity requirement for top-level [inaudible]? So this is a catch-all question again. Are there any additional requirement beyond requiring same registry operator, same backend to manage TLDs? So this is okay, in my opinion. It's a catch-all question that the IDN EPDP will need to discuss and consider, if there are any other requirements.

And I want to stop here because section D is a whole new section on second levels and I'm not sure we're going to go through that. And it will also give us time to review our next week's homework. And I think we accomplished today's expected items. So yep. We went through subsections, completed A through B. So good job, team.

And we'll check next week's homework. So where are we here? Is that what we're seeing, Ariel, on screen?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. That's correct. Basically, what staff and Dennis are going to do after the call is, based on the comments and input we received, we will make revisions to the charter questions in subsections A to B. and the drafting team an review them. And then, next week, we'll start with the next subsection, which is subsection D. And you can already see the draft charter questions for that.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. Thank you for that. So a sneak peek of subsection D. Now deals with second-level domain names under those TLDs. So just to note a few items. We are going to talk about the same entity principle as well. Now that applies to second-level domain names.

And just to note that today, registry operators are subject to certain provisions as far as the same entity on variant domain names. So you can find those in the RSEP process. There is a standard language for registry operators when they want to apply for IDN tables, or IDN services, that is. And they can choose and select what type of activation for variant labels they want to offer. And if they want to offer, they can activate those coming from the same registrar.

So there is some same entity notion today, as far as variant domain names. So we'll discuss that as well as how to manage IDN tables so that there is consistency across tables within the registry operator, within the same script. But that's for next week.

So any comments, observations from today's items or next week's homework? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to AOB. Any business? Okay. I see none. So I think we can stop here and I could give you back five minutes on your day today. I thank you very much for your participation today. We accomplished what we had expected to accomplish there. So congrats to us all. Let's keep that moving so that hopefully we can catch up on our targeted end date and we don't have to extend the meeting or find extraordinary sessions.

So thank you very much for today and have a good rest of the day and good rest of the week. And see you all next week, same channel, same time. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]