ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team

Tuesday, 09 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/lwJACQ

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

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Meeting being held on Tuesday, the 9th of February, 2021 at 18:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now. Thank you.

Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Please note, the raise hand option has been adjusted to the bottom toolbar reactions section. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN

multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to our chair, Dennis Tan. Please begin.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone. With that, let's jump right into our agenda today. So we are going to continue reviewing our draft charter. I think we begin at section D. Then we'll jump into the post-meeting homework preview and any other business at the end. So any AOB that we want to pin for later? Okay. Seeing none, let's focus on now the draft charter, so section D. So Jeff, as a way of background, section D deals with the same entity principle at the second level. So we already discussed the same entity principle at the top level. Now we're moving on to the next level in the root.

All right. So this is a situation where there is no gap between staff paper and the SubPro recommendations as far as which entity needs to be considered as the entity for second-level domain name variants. And that is the registrant. So here, I want you to see D1, D2, D3 as different flavors of the same thing.

And when I say different flavors, it's because we're treating variant domain names in the different instances, in which D1 deals with the exact same second-level domain name in two variant TLDs. Because it's one second-level label in two TLDs, then its two domain names are variants of each other, right? TLD is different, second level the same.

D2 is the multiplication, if you will—so variants at the second level and variants at the top level. So now, you have a permutation of these two labels at each level.

And D3 was added just for completeness and that's the one where you have second-level variant labels in a single TLD—a TLD that has no variants. And I would put out that's the case for the majority of variants that are managed today. And that's the status quo today, as far as I know, in TLDs that offer variants at the second level. So it was added for completeness because that was, neither in the staff paper or the SubPro was explicitly discussed here. So with that background, context, any questions on background? I see Maxim's hand. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you hear me?

DENNIS TAN: Loud and clear, Maxim. Go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: As I understand, it's a situation where a TLD has few IDNs. For example, they have policy not allowing any variants. And there is a desire to force them to have variants. Am I right?

DENNIS TAN: I don't think there is a force here. We're not discussing whether you activate variants or not, or whether you activate them automatically or on behalf of the registrant, or you allow a process

by which the registrant or the registrar request a variant activation. This just pertains to the question of if we need to … Well, the SubPro already discussed it, right, that for variant domain names, they need to be allocated or reserved for allocation to the same entity. And that same entity is the registrant. That's the discussion at-hand here, not whether a registry policy—actually how implements that.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just short notice. For the clarity, the registry itself can be a registrant because in the current round, and potentially in the next round, the registries have a right to register up 100 domain names for purposes of development of TLD, etc.

DENNIS TAN: I'm sorry, Maxim. I think I did not follow. Could you repeat or paraphrase? Thank you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Currently, in a TLD, registry itself can register up to 100 domain names. So the registrant will be the registry itself. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. So I think you're talking about the promotional and operational domain names that they are allowed to self-allocate for promotional purposes. Is that the one clause that you are referring to?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you for that. So first, the staff paper and the SubPro recommendations align each other so there is no questions. So we are not questioning whether for future TLDs, that's going to be the case. So we apply our principle throughout the framework and we extend the question as to does the recommendation extend to existing TLDs?

And this is where I want to bring a piece of information. The existing TLDs, today there is a legal basis or provision by which variant domain names need to be allocated, as pertain to the same entity. And that same entity today is the sponsoring registrar. And that's stated in some registry agreements as well and the standard language for IDN table services in the RSEP process.

And then, I want to address Jeff's comment about the single TLD. That's my fault there. I was trying to make clear distinction between both cases of both. And I couldn't figure out a different term than "singleton." So we can address that or find another term, strike it out and just explain what that use case means.

So again, I think that's the approach here that we need to take, is to apply our principle two. We assume SubPro recommendation. That's the presumptive policy that's going to be adopted for future new TLDs. And the question that this working group needs to ask to the next working group is does that make sense? Is it advisable to extend the same policy to the existing TLDs? And second part,

be mindful that there is existing legal procedures today that would need to be changed or updated.

So I see Maxim's hand. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: If we mean that in the case of existence of a particular TLD, all potential variants should be allocated only to that very entity, we might need to change wording slightly, saying that it has no other allocated variants. Because if you have variants, it's the case. If you don't have variants, you don't go to this item because in absence of variants, we have nothing to speak about. So I suggest changing it to "allocated" or "existing TLDs which are variants of the string." Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah. I think the discussion is valid in terms of … Yeah. We're talking about variants. There is no allocation of any other form of domain names that some people might think as a different way, or translation or transliterations. I think you were referring to that. But yeah. It's a variant based on, at the top level, the root zone and at the second level, the IDN table per registry policy.

Okay. Any observations on D1, D2, and D3? So same entity for second level and that same entity is the registrant of record. Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to D4. I'm sorry. No. I see Maxim's hand. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'm slightly confused here. Which item here reflects the current state where you have a TLD or few TLDs which are variants of each other and which is going to regulate how the domains have to change hands—I mean how they should be rearranged between the current owners?

DENNIS TAN: So that seems to me, Maxim, that's going to be the substance of the next working group to take into account and discuss at length. But we are capturing all of the implications that this new policy on variants have to existing procedures and potentially grandfathering certain TLDs and whatnot. I think what is going to be a new form of C4 and E6, I think. That's when we are capturing all of the implications for existing TLDs. Does anybody have a different point of view there, as far as how to treat all the potential exceptions or how to account for the reality of today's landscape of variants?

Okay. Seeing none, let's continue. So again, D1, D2, D3, the different flavors of second-level domain names. D4, the actual question is that the same entity is the same registrant. So that's the question that's going to be captured here. And again, D1, D2, D3 capture the use cases and D4 is the actual question whether we extend SubPro recommendation to have same registrant as the same entity extended to existing TLDs and what are the implications to existing processes and procedures as we know they exist. Yes, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we might need to mention grandfathering potential in D4 because in situation where, in some TLD, two domains which are variants to each other exist and currently belong to different registrants, there should be a way of resolving that or freezing the situation. So it should be investigated, I think.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Do you think there is a different way to articulate that idea, as in understand the implications of today's procedures and processes? And we can point to the current language in the RSEP and the registry agreements as far as same entity for second-level domain names. Okay.

And Jeff, yeah. I think I agree with that. That's the substance. I think we leave it as a headline. They need to discuss whether the SubPro recommendation extends to existing TLDs and all the implications. And we can point that out, right? Because there is provisions in today's registrar agreements and there is a process in which that's something will need to be changed, grandfathered, or something. Yeah.

Okay. So moving on. So that's before. We now look at D5 and the rest, which are … No. I'm sorry. D5. So that deals with implementation questions. And I think this is an opportunity for us to go back to our proposed frameworks because if my recollection is—keep me honest—we did not discuss what way we're going to deal with implementation questions. We discussed implementation. SubPro can deal with that as far as future TLDs. But there was a remaining question as well. So how do we deal

with implementation question when it pertains to existing TLDs? So I'm not sure. Jeff, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. These questions are interesting because it's going to come down to timing, I think, because I doubt there's going to want to be a separate process for future TLDs and existing TLDs. So the SubPro work track or whatever that's working on this issue really needs to coordinate with this PDP to make sure we come up with one solution that works for both future and existing.

So that doesn't give great guidance, I know. But I'm kind of thinking that you wait on this one. You have these questions here but then put a note in, saying that this must be done in coordination with the SubPro group so that one solution can, in theory, be implemented for both because this is going to require, I would assume, changes to registry and registrar systems. And I don't think you'd want different … Maybe there is a legitimate reason. I don't know.

But to me, it seems like this one is one where you would say, "The groups must work together." Whichever one's first on this issue should be working on it and make sure it gets the input of … So if it's SubPro, it needs to makes sure that this PDP working group has input to make sure it works for existing. I'm not sure of another way to do it. It shouldn't be both groups working on it independently, I guess is my point.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Valid point and I think I tend to agree with you. Coordination is going to be key because I don't think there is an appetite for two distinct paths. That ought to be coordinated and consistent. Maxim, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: If we are speaking about D5, I think there is a document requiring ROAs to be formed a particular way. I think it was a clearly label and display policy or something. And it might need to be changed, potentially, if we see that there is suggestion to dig into technical part of thing such as ROAs because they're quite deep inside of the registry systems. And potentially, there might be some conflict between documents, which should be avoided.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah. You mentioned the clear label and display consensus policy. I'm not sure it quite fits in here. But if you have something more precise to refer to the document, please feel free to include it in the document as a comment.

So going back to the implementation question framework. How do we deal with that? I and I think Jeff gave us a good explanation as to how we should deal with this, especially when there is going to be convergence between existing and future TLDs. And one is the operational implementation. I think Jeff has put it clearly here. The operation should be standardized. So SubPro will need to coordinate with this group. I'm just thinking of needing expertise, or additional insights, or what have you.

So to that effect, how do we capture that here? Or we don't need to capture it at all? What does the team say on this instance? The default would be, as far as implementation questions, that there is an intersection between future and existing, that we defer to the future SubPro IRT, but this IDN EPDP remains open to be invited to discuss such issues as well. Jeff, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I think that's right. But it really is whichever group is first in time to get to the issue should be the one that works on it. But the reason why I'm leaning towards the SubPro is that it's already in the implementation phase, whereas this group will be in the policy phase, which means that the policies need to get approved by the GNSO and then start an IRT.

So I think you're right, the way you initially formed it, that the SubPro IRT should work on it but should coordinate with this PDP to make sure that we can come up with a standardized operation. So in other words, give jurisdiction to the SubPro but make sure that this PDP working group is involved.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Any other observations, comments to that effect? I think we're getting there. So it's coordination. Is that language that we want to convey here in this charter? I see agreement there. Any other? I don't see. Maxim, I'm sorry. Jeff, is that an old hand.

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's a new hand.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry.

DENNIS TAN: I know, Maxim. Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: We have text about cryptographic probe, which doesn't exist now and I don't even know what do we mean here. We either need to mention what do we mean or to use some other words.

JEFF NEUMAN: Maxim, can you repeat that? I didn't follow that. Sorry. Maxim, can you repeat that?

MAXIM ALZOBA: In D5, item four, we have text about requirements of a cryptographic probe, which we don't have now. We either need to use clear language describing what do we mean or to have some reference somewhere because it's not clear. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. Thank you. So we noted that, Maxim, so we will take care of that in the draft. Any maybe, based on our conversation, how to deal with implementation questions, this whole explanation detail may be removed from this paper. All right. So D5, I think we took

care of it. And I think we have a clear path as far as future implementation questions. How do we deal with that, especially in the context of existing and future TLDs?

Now, question added from Edmon. "Should variant domains be considered different registrations?" So is this a policy question or an implementation question? The policy question is whether they need to be assigned—so not going to use a new term—allocated to a same entity and that same entity is a registrant. So should they be considered different or same registration for ICANN purposes—fees, EPP connections, what have you. So I have a few hands here. Maxim and then Jeff.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the current logic of all processes, including billing … ICANN sends invoices to registries, taking into account number of domains. And also, ICANN doesn't have, I'd say, the full map of domains with marks which should not be billed, other than IANA IDs like 9998, 9999, which are used for the registry itself—registrant-owned domains. Another thing is in EPP, different comments, different items. We will have to build the whole structure up for sake of saving a few cents here and there. I'm not sure that it's financially feasible. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Jeff, then Edmon.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I think it's a great question from Edmon. And I think it is policy because, as Maxim was saying, for financial aspects, ICANN charges fees for each domain name registration, both to registries and registrars. If they're considered different registrations, then presumably a separate fee would attach to both, regardless of whether they're bundled or however it's handled. So I actually think that this is … And Ariel's saying it's covered in F. Okay. If that's covered in F, that's great. But it is a good question. Thanks, Edmon.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. So that's precisely the question. I know we're going into a little bit of substance here. But the main point is to ask. And to Maxim's, point, it depends on the registry, even for now. I think on various occasions, I've argued the same. If it's one domain create then it's one billable transaction. And then, you have domain updates for activation of variants. If it's multiple domain creates then it's multiple registrations and it's multiple billable transactions. And that's different.

But what we should probably cover … And if it's covered later, I probably put it in because as I was reading, this was prompted out. We should note that this is discussed further. But the point is, we should discuss about this and say whether it's okay that different registries do it differently and therefore will have different billable transactions. Or it should be unified. I think it makes sense

to cover that particular discussion. I don't have an answer which way we should go but I think we should cover that question.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you. Yeah. It think the team agrees that this question needs to be asked and discussed in the future working group. So let's work with this wording. Let's introduce this question into the charter.

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, I don't think we need to … I think we can just delete Edmon's comment here and just make sure it's covered in F. Like everything that Edmon was just talking about and Maxim, and some of the comments on the chat, let's just do it all in F. Let's not put it here.

DENNIS TAN: Right. Just so you know, because I'm looking at F7, F7 is labeled as implementation question. So I just wanted to note that since we're discussing this as more of a policy, what I see on the chat, not implementation, just note that nuance on F7. So if we want to capture this as a policy question, perhaps we need t put it in front of F7 and then discuss what implications lead to operational aspects of it. But the question is captured here so we will not miss it. It's just the placement of it. Okay. So we'll add this. And the direction is here. It's more of a policy question, not an implementation question. So let's capture that as well. And let's keep moving.

So now, we'll move on to E4 and E5. So these need to be looked it in tandem, as they deal with the IDN table calculations. And now we already crossed the frontier from top-level to second-level. And now we're still in the realm of second-level domain name. So we're talking about IDN tables at the second level with a purpose to produce a consistent set of variant labels. So E4 and E5 do this. So E4 states that … And let me know that E4, we have a gap, meaning that the SubPro did not discuss this explicitly but they did discuss E5. And now I'll just explain a little bit about the difference between the two.

So E4 states that IDN tables … And let me just set the context. Single-TLD registry, different IDN tables of a same script. So think of it as a script that we all are familiar with. I'm going to pick on Latin. And you can have different IDN tables for languages that operate in the Latin script domain—so Spanish, French, German, you name it. So you have different language tables using the same script.

The intent of the question here is do they need to create consistent set of variants across all these tables? It should not be the case that because you have a Spanish-language table and you have a set of labels that are variants of each other and you apply the same level using the French table for instance. And suddenly those labels are not variants of each other anymore.

So if you are using the same code point, you're using the same label as the starting point and you have all these IDN tables, they all need to share the same variant set of labels, if you will. I hope that that's not too technical and the point came across. Jeff [says],

"That sounds right." And before I continue, Maxim, I see your hand.

MAXIM ALZOBA: New hand. I have a question. In the first sentence, we reference to different scripts and languages. As I understand, variants could happen inside of a language. There are no variants between different languages because it's translation. So the text might be more clear, I'd say, that the variants are to be found in the same script or in the same language. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Well, it happens, Maxim, that there may be variants, as we're talking IDN variants, across the script. Those variants are visually identical. Think of Latin and Cyrillic, in which certain code points look identical and you can create visual variants, if you will. So they are different scripts and different languages but they are going to be variants of each other. At least that's how the Root Zone LGR operates and defines. Maxim, is that a new hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes. It's a follow-up question. So we mean that a single TLD with different, graphically-identical items, I'd say, is what we mean here?

DENNIS TAN: What we're referring here is those variants that are defined in the IDN tables. So in the definition of variants, we're not talking about

translations or transliterations. It might be that some registry operator might offer that kind of service and that's up to them. But that's outside the variant topic or concept as we deal with IDNs.

So IDN variant's one where an IDN table—a registry operator, in this case, because the registry operator defines those tables for their registered TLD. They define what code points they allow in each table and whether a code point has a variant of it, such that when you use that letter, character, you create variant labels.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Okay. Just a small note. ASCII is not IDN, as I understand, yet. So we have the consistent terminology. And if you're speaking about variants between ASCII, I mean like a script English, and IDNs like Cyrillic, one of those is not an IDN.

DENNIS TAN: That's correct. I think we colloquially refer to IDN variants because one label creates a variant of the other. And at least one of those labels is going to be an IDN. But yeah. I take your point because sometimes I, myself, need to clarify that. ASCII labels can create a variant and vice versa. An IDN can create a variant that is not an IDN per se. It's going to be an ASCII label. But yeah. Your point is well-taken. Be we are referring, in the greater scheme, in the Root Zone LGR world. That's what we have at hand.

So I see some activity in the chat. Hopefully I'm not missing out there. I see, "What this is being discussed?" So you are in E5. E4 again, right? We're talking about the setup. The IDN tables need to create a consistent, mutually coherent, variant set of labels.

And E5 is with the actual usage of those variant labels. They do not need to behave the same. Or they do not need to behave exactly … They do not have to have identical behaviors, that is.

And when we say "behavior," we mean whether you can activate or not that label because it could be a market need that certain variants can be activated in one market and they do not have to be in other markets. I think the example that I always use, or it's familiar to me, is the difference between traditional and simplified Chinese. When you have Chinese labels in a simplified Chinese TLD, you will activate those second-level domain names that are a simplified Chinese variant but choose to drop those traditional Chinese.

On the other hand, on the traditional Chinese top-level domain names, you will activate the second-level domain names that are in the traditional Chinese variant and not the simplified one. So across those tables, you will create the same set of variants but they will not behave—they don't need to behave exactly the same. That's up to the registry operator to decide. Basically, that's what E5 is saying.

So the question here is … So first, we need to fill the gap because since SubPro did not explicitly address the actual … How do you create the variants—the actual recommendation of you need to create. Or is it advisable or is it recommendable to create a consistent set of variant labels across same-script IDN tables? Because you can have E5 without E4 but you are not addressing the issue here. I think the issue here is to have a consistent set of variant labels across the one single TLD space, such that there are no issues in there.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, Dennis. I understand E5 because that's what we worked on. But I don't understand how you could have variants in different languages and scripts and why you're saying there's a hole. I'm trying to figure out what's not covered—like a specific example. And I'm not … You're saying … Sorry.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. No. Thank you, Jeff. With E5, it basically says that a set of variant labels, they don't need to behave the same. And that's perfectly fine. But the real intent here … So you can have that and have tables where, for example, you have a language table that creates a set of variants. And then, the same TLD has another language table, using the same script. But for some reason, they do not create the same set of variants.

And each of those, they can behave differently. They are independent registry tables. But you are not addressing the main concern which is if you have the same-script, using the same script for two language tables, why are you not having a consistent, coherent set of variant sets so that you're not creating confusion across domain names in your own TLD?

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So you're still talking about creating in your own TLDs as opposed to … What you're not saying is you can have a character within the Japanese language that is a variant of a character within the Chinese language but one or the other may not consider them variants. And you're saying that they both should

be, which I think would be kind of a nightmare for existing registries. Much easier to do going forward. But for existing registries, getting them to agree …

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. I think Sarmad is coming to the rescue. So, Sarmad, please go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Dennis. I think one of the motivations behind this was that consider two registrations or two labels under a TLD. If it is possible that you go and register, for example, to one language, those two strings and those two strings are declared as variants of each other under a TLD, but under the same TLD, if you go and register those two strings through a different IDN table, then certainly those two strings are declared as not variants of each other. So in one case, they get allocated to the same person but in another case, they can actually get allocated to two different people. It can potentially create, obviously, an issue.

So mutually coherent means that if those two strings are created by any of the IDN tables under that TLD, then their status should be consistent across all those options. So if they're variants through one IDN table, they should be variants through the other IDN tables as well. And if they're in independent strings, then they should be coherently independent strings so that the confusion doesn't … Otherwise, one cannot predict whether those two strings are actually variants of each other or not because it would

really depend on which table you are using to register them. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Sarmad. You put it more eloquently than I did. Jeff, is that a new hand or old hand waiting for your turn?

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. I should lower it. Yeah. I think I get it. I think I'm just trying to grasp with the fact of how that operates within variant top-level domains if you have those two scripts. It just expands exponentially. Wow. Yeah.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. It does. But yeah. So that's the issue at hand. And then, E5 is … I see it as a [relief], if you will, that says that, "Yeah. You create those consistent labels but they don't need to behave the same." In certain cases, you activate one set and you can block others. And in other cases, other languages, you can activate the opposite. You can activate in the opposite way because market behaves different. But E4 and E5 basically go one-in-one.

So in this case, because we have a gap, then we need to ask a question. And I think the key here is going to be coordination, as far as the coordination with the SubPro IRT, if that's the case. Don't see any … Yep. I see, "Agree with Jeff." I don't see any objections here. So yep. That's what we capture, then.

Okay. Jeff's doing a time check. So we have 10 minutes and I do have a hard stop at a minute before the top of the hour. Ariel, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. Just for clarity for staff, are we changing any proposed language for E4 and E5 as shown on the screen or this current language is okay? I just want to make sure we get the notes right.

DENNIS TAN: No immediate answer but I tend to think that there may be opportunity to streamline it a bit. But that's just about that.

JEFF NEUMAN: If there's a way to describe it a little bit more like Sarmad described it because that was really complicated to understand.

DENNIS TAN: It is. Yeah.

JEFF NEUMAN: So I think the question's right. It's just if there's a way to make it more easily understandable, that would be beneficial.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. Sarmad has cool graphics. We can borrow those. We'll make sure we'll make the best to explain the issue at hand. Yep. Agree.

All right. So moving on to E6. Okay. So E6 is the implementation question here. And same with E7. Let me just make sure it's the same thing. Yeah. So E4 is the definition or the concept that the staff paper is using in harmonization of IDN tables. So, "What's the difference between E6 …?" Okay. So I think they could be merged with each other. Yeah. One is to say same set of tables and the other one is to use RFC 7940 to represent those tables in XML format.

So those are implementation question. So we, here, as far as implementation, if there is a partial overlap with SubPro IRT, then we will use our framework. So the key here is to be coordination between the two efforts to make sure that the operational solution is consistent across the board. Any other opinion on that? Okay. Thank you. I think we can save a lot of real estate space here on the charter, just by minimizing or streamlining the implementation questions. And that ought to be coordinated with SubPro IRT.

Okay. Let's continue, then. Oh. Look at that. We went through all section D. And that's good. So two times in a row, we make our target. So with six minutes left in our meeting ... Exactly right. Read my mind. Let's go into our timetable here. So next meeting, we're going to be reviewing section F, which deals with … Let me see here, my notes. Yeah. So adjustment to Registry Agreement and registry services.

And just want to bring up a comment that Jeff put in on the chat, that we may want to do some work online. So if you can read this on your own time before the meeting and pose your questions, comments, on the mailing list, we can get those in advance and then we can jump into the discussion and go quickly. I think we are now at a good pace. At least we are hitting our targets as far as what content we want to cover in each session. So let's see how that goes in the next meeting.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Hey.

DENNIS TAN: Yes, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: I think we should have a goal of doing both F and G next time because they're not as technical. So it takes us longer to go through the technical-related questions. But these questions on the agreement and on the other things like that—agreement and the guidebook—I think we should be able to get through F and G next time. I would love to see. So can you add G to the homework? And if we get to it, great. If we don't get to it, then that's fine, too. But if we put F and G in the homework …

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. That's a good idea, Jeff. Thank you. Yeah. Sounds good. So this the homework for next meeting, sections F and G. So let's

try to get that. And then now, we move on to any other business. Okay. So hearing none, I think we came to the end of our meeting. Thank you very much for attending today. We'll speak again next week, same time. Thank you very much.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's meeting. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]