
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Hello and welcome to the GNSO Policy Update webinar. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat, and I will paste that in the chat in a moment.

Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand and zoom, and once the session facilitator calls on your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record. When speaking, be sure to unmute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace.

On the agenda today, the GNSO Council will have the opportunity to hear from the current Working Group Chairs and hear about their group's progress and accomplishments and what they plan to achieve at ICANN81. Finally, we will hear from Greg DiBiase, the GNSO Chair, with a brief update on the other GNSO ongoing projects. As a reminder, the Council discussed this webinar during the Strategic Planning session, particularly around the topic of being an effective PDP manager. This is a time for Councilors to hear from and ask questions to the Working Group Chairs. John, my co-host, will soon be asking Donna and Roger the list of questions reviewed by the Council, but please feel free to raise your hand during the webinar if you have any additional questions.

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.

You're also welcome to type the questions into chat, but please practice them with question angle letters so that we know it's a question and it's not just part of the chat. This very familiar. Z graphic shows a visual representation of where the current active PDPs fall in the policy development cycle. The PDP on IDNs has a multiple-phase approach to its work, and that's why you can see two boxes on this slide, one on the right and one on the left. As you can see, the Phase 1 Final Report was approved by the Board with 56 of the 58 policies adopted, and work commenced on implementation with two remaining recommendations pending.

For Phase 2, the PDP team submitted its Final Report to the GNSO Council for its review and deliberation. The Transfer Policy Review PDP published for Public Comment its initial report covering all topics in its charter for 60 days, 1st August through 30th September 2024. With the conclusion of the Public Comment forum, the working group is now reviewing 17 Public Comment submissions received and is considering updates to its recommendations.

And this slide represents EPDP Phase 2, which is currently with the Board, and the Board and Council are observing the RDRS pilot before acting on any of those recommendations. SubPro is currently in implementation. So, you all did a really great job with your San Juan and Kigali trivia, so let's see if we can get the tradition going with some questions on Turkey, our conference location, and I'll allow panelists to vote. The question is, while Istanbul was the capital of the Byzantine and Ottoman empires, it's no longer a capital city. Which city is the current capital? Cappadocia, Ankara, Konya, or Izmir?

I'm going to give you a few more seconds. And if you answered B, Ankara, you're correct. Bonus fact, the three empires that use Istanbul are the Roman, the Byzantine, and the Ottoman empires. And with that, I will turn you over to John.

JOHN EMERY:

Thank you so much, Devan. It's great to see that everyone got 100%. It looks like everyone's ready for ICANN81 in Istanbul. So, we're going to have a chat with Donna now. So, huge congratulations to Donna on the Phase 2 Final Report being just submitted to the GNSO Council for review. This past October Council meeting. Just big congratulations. I know it's been a few years slog, but I know you learned a lot throughout the process. But before we get there, is there anything in particular that you'd like to highlight for the Council as they go through and review it?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, John. And congratulations should go to the full team, I was really happy that we had the same, pretty much the same team throughout the three and a half years. So, full congratulations to the team for the commitment and effort to get us to the finalization of our Phase 2 report.

As the Councilors know, I was here last week and provided an overview of the Final Report. And I think just in summary, there's 14 recommendations, which we hope if approved by Council and the Board will be implemented. And there's six implementation guidance suggestions that are related to some of the, excuse me, recommendations so that they don't have the same expectation that

they'll be implemented, but they're intended to provide some guidance to the Implementation Review Team and a little bit of colour and flavor, I suppose, as the team's view about how it could be best implemented.

I won't focus too much on the substance of the recommendations, but there's some other stats here that, just to illustrate, I suppose, the commitment of the working group. So, I think this Phase 2 part, I think it was a 12-month effort on top of the two and a half years that we spent on Phase 1. And overall, that breaks down into 282 calls. Most of our calls were two hours. We had the same time set aside every week, which was Thursday night for me, Wednesday early morning for people on the West Coast, like Steve and Michael Karakash, not so bad on the East Coast, and then Europe, not too bad, a pretty favorable time of day.

So, it's almost 400 meeting hours, so that's a lot to turn up for over the three and a half years. We did have a three-day face-to-face workshop in Kuala Lumpur at the end of December last year, and that was a great help to us being able to get the work done so that we could finalize the Phase 2 report on schedule. And we also took advantage of ICANN public meetings. So, we actually had 18 sessions in total at ICANN meetings, and I think on one occasion we actually had four meetings during one of the ICANN meetings. And I just wanted to make the point to Council that the face-to-face meetings are really important for, well, personally, I found it really important for the working group because I didn't know a lot of the members of the team, so it's a good opportunity to get to meet them.

The other thing that it overcomes too is the time zone problem. So, a lot of our team were from the APAC region, and so the timing of the calls

wasn't optimal for those, but we managed to get through it. But the other thing I'd mentioned that people may not understand is that the APAC region has a number of different time zones within it itself. So, when we were doing Phase 1 and Justine was the Vice Chair, I thought this would be great, we're in the same time zone. We actually had a two-hour difference, which made scheduling meetings a little bit more challenging than I would have thought it necessarily would.

So, I think, certainly from my perspective, using the ICANN face-to-face meetings to progress our work was pretty important. And I thank the team for prioritizing their meeting schedule so that they could attend those sessions during the ICANN meetings.

JOHN EMERY:

Thanks so much, Donna. It's really fascinating to hear how many work hours and all the sacrifice that goes into producing a product like this. So, I want you to be able to highlight really quick, what are you most proud of the work over the past few years of Phase 1 or especially Phase 2?

DONNA AUSTIN:

So, I took over being Chair about six months into this effort because Edmund had been appointed to the Board. And I remember that the chatter around the time was that Roger Carney's effort was going to break all land speed records and be done within 12 months or 18 months. So, I guess I'm proud that we've actually got to the finish line before Roger. The other thing personally is that I did manage to only have to be called to join one of the calls. My MO was that I'd go to sleep

about 8 o'clock, sleep for an hour, and then I'd get up and do the call at 10. I think there was only one occasion that I had the frantic call from Devan, are you joining the call?

So, I was pretty pleased there was only one of those occasions. But honestly, it was an absolute pleasure to chair this effort. It was a really good group and I'm really proud of the work that we've produced. It was undertaken in a spirit of collegiality. The subject matter was new to a lot of us, so we had to spend a lot of time understanding the problem that we were trying to solve. And I think everybody took the time that was needed to make sure that they understood what we were talking about and how to find a solution to the charter question.

I think the other thing, I know the SubPro did have Board liaisons and I think ICANN, all liaisons, we certainly had the same in our PDP. We also had expertise from Samad and Pitman on IDNs. So, we were a little bit of a mixed bag, but nobody was, I guess, treated any differently from any other group. All input was welcomed and input from everybody was encouraged. So, we didn't really delineate between, that's ICANN, so we don't have to put too much emphasis on that. This other stuff in the community is more important.

I think everyone was treated as equals and there was a lot of respect and dare, I say it, love among the group that enabled us to work in a really positive manner. And I have to say that, by the time we moved into phase 2 work, it was becoming a slog. You know, we'd done two and a half years and then we had to turn around and get back up for another 12 months. So, I'm really proud of the effort of the team that supported this effort.

JOHN EMERY:

Thanks so much. You really kind of highlighted how challenging the material itself was and how you were able to overcome that with Samad and other subject matter experts, but really, big props to the working group and the team for really getting into the kind of nitty gritty details of this. What was most challenging for you about this work? Was it the subject matter? Was it the time zones? What really stood out to you as a big challenge?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Personally, it was the subject matter. And I still claim that I don't know much about IDNs. But what did help me was the fact that I understood the GNSO processes and how the Policy, once it's implemented, what that means. So, certainly the subject matter was a bit of a challenge. The time zones were a challenge. And as I said, one of the ways to overcome that is to use those face-to-face opportunities when you have them.

I think it's really important, not only just to progress things, but just to get to know the team that you're working with is really important. And also, the staff support that we had was exceptional. I know that Ariel, working through phase one, took us through a lot of the dense subject matter in a manner that we could understand. She was very good with the graphics and the charts that were really helpful to our understanding of what it was we were discussing. And I know that Ariel, she was educating herself along the way as well. So, while there were challenges, I think that we overcame them in a pretty positive way.

I think the most difficult discussion, and I thank Justine for leading this one, and this is really during phase 1, was the conversation that we had around string similarity. And that was a separate effort that Justine led with Ariel and a small group to try to sort that one out. And it's still probably the most, I think when it comes to implementation, that may be one of the more difficult ones to implement.

JOHN EMERY:

Thanks so much. You alluded to a couple of things that were really important that I wanted to highlight for councilors that kind of face-to-face time to actually get to know each other and to kind of make use of time together, being in the same time zone. You also alluded to a little bit of friendly competition between you and Roger. So, maybe that's something councilors should be aware of, a little challenge and prize between the working group chairs. But what advice would you give to future chairs and some of the lessons learned that you'd like to share with them?

DONNA AUSTIN:

I think every PDP is different. I think when we did our original timeline, we had, it looked like four to five years, which seemed extraordinary. And there's no science to how we came up with that. We did a poll of the working group to try to identify how long do you think it will take to get through 26 charter questions or whatever it is. Everyone had a bit of a different idea, and then we found an average or something like that. So, there's no science to it. I think we'd still be going if we didn't have

that face-to-face meeting. So, I'm really happy that we pushed for that and appreciate council support in doing that.

I would say the timing wasn't great. We did it, I think the first or second week in December, and that's at the back end of a long year and everyone was pretty tired. And perhaps it wasn't as sharp as it could have been. Dan had to do interventions every 20 minutes with trivia questions to keep our brains moving, certainly on the third day. So, while I really appreciated that face-to-face time, I don't think the timing in December was optimal. People are starting to wind down at the end of the year and looking forward to taking some time out.

So, we were pushing pretty hard by the time we got to then, but then I appreciate that maybe we wouldn't have been in the position of meeting the deadline to provide the report to council this time around. I think the support team that you have, certainly that I've had from ICANN has been exceptional. We did have, and I know every chair has this experience, so it's kudos to Steve and the policy department in general for having high quality support. We had a changeover in, I think it was January, February, when Ariel moved off and the wonderful Saewon took over. And I know a little bit like you, John, Saewon was very new to ICANN and it's not an easy organization to understand, but I think Saewon's done a really terrific job and I can only attribute that to the support that she had from Steve and Dan and others from within the policy team.

So, I think I wouldn't say I'm a controlling person, but I do maintain control until I have a level of trust with the people supporting me, and I let go of the reins pretty early. I certainly had a high level of trust in

Ariel and that continued even once she was gone. We did have Emily left us, I think, after about 12 months and Dan stepped in. So, the transition for those have been pretty seamless and I as I said, kudos to Steve for the team that he's been able to pull together in an organization that I know isn't particularly easy to navigate. I think the other thing is just that get as much face-to-face time as you can with your team. I think it's really important.

JOHN EMERY:

Yeah, thanks so much. I was wondering if you could tell us a little bit about how the exchange went with some of the other working groups, like Transfer Policy, PDP or the ccPDP4. Talk a little bit about that kind of exchange between your working group and the others.

DONNA AUSTIN:

So, as most of the councilors will know, there was a requirement that the IDN EPDP and the ccPDP4, which was on IDNs, not worked together, but at least kept in conversation with one another so that we had an idea of where we could end up with recommendations that were inconsistent with one another. So, it wasn't a requirement that we be on the same page on everything and that's understandable because a gTLD Policy effort is different to a CC one, so naturally there's going to be differences. But there is, from, I think, from a security and stability perspective of the DNS, it is important that when you're developing Policy on things like IDN that there is consistency.

So, we had a liaison from our team to ccPDP4 and then we had a ccPDP4 had a liaison back to us. The primary interaction, I think, though, where

information was exchanged was really at the staff level. So, I think Bart and Ariel were in regular communication. We had, and I think this was only for phase one, I think we had three joint meetings with the ccPDP4 and they were just updates and trying to identify where we had areas of difference or where we had commonality that there was consistency in the approach. And I think that was pretty helpful.

On the phase 2, the teams didn't meet formally, but I think where the interaction was happening was at the staff level. So, with the implementation, IDN Implementation Guidelines Recommendations, which I think are 18, 19, 20, and then we've got an Implementation Guidance on 21. The Implementation Guidance that we have on 21 was the result of that liaison with, between staff, because we changed one of the recommendations from the initial report to the Final Report and it affected CC. So, there was a conversation just as a heads-up and then the CCs requested that they at least have an opportunity to be involved in any sign off on future IDN guidelines.

So, I have to say, there was a part of me that thought, well, it's too late bad luck. So, we, but we were so close to the end and I thought it was worth including the request and if we could get agreement from the team to the implementation guidance, it would be worth it to do it, even if it cost us a week or two. So, we did push ahead and did that and the team was accepted the inclusion of Implementation Guidance 21. And on the transfer of PDP, again, that was predominantly done at a staff level and I guess this goes back to that element of trust, John, that I was talking about.

So, long as I was informed about the conversations and what had taken place, I was reasonably comfortable with that interaction happening at a staff level. If I had any concerns about it, then I'd raise it with my team and if I felt it was necessary to have a conversation with other parties, then we would do that. But I think that may have only happened once and that was when we had the request from the Board and it was the point where we split the charter questions into top level and second level and we ended up with the two phases. So, I think that was probably the only time that I kind of broadened the circle and had a conversation.

JOHN EMERY: Yeah, thanks so much. So, I guess the final thoughts to wrap up, do you have any thoughts on implementation that's currently being conducted as a subtrack for SubPro?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, not my problem.

JOHN EMERY: Spoken like a true chair.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, somebody else's problem. I do know that Justine is there on the implementation review team and I think Ariel's following along too. So, I'm confident that whatever the intent was from our recommendations and if there's any concerns from the review team that there are people

on the implementation review team that can sort that out. So, I have not followed that work at all. I did intend to at least get them a mailing list, but that kind of passed me by. And I think that the focus for me was getting phase two done. So, I felt, well, implementations in good hands, I don't need to do anything.

JOHN EMERY: Yeah, I think that's something really important to highlight trust and then focus to be able to get through all this. Well, thank you so much, Donna. I'm going to hand it back over to Devan.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, John.

DEVAN REED: Hi, everyone. I just wanted to share a huge thank you to Donna and all of the Working Group volunteers who have worked extremely hard over the last three plus years. Since Donna does need to drop off the call shortly, we wanted to open up an opportunity to ask any questions of Donna. Councilors, if you do have questions, go ahead and raise your hand or you can type them into chat. We have a few more seconds. All right. Well, thank you so much for joining us, Donna. It's been an amazing opportunity to work with you. And I am going to share some more fun facts.

So, before we hear from Roger, the chair of the Transfer Policy Working Group, it is time for another quiz. Turkey has 21 properties on the UNESCO World Heritage List. One of these sites is featured in a witch

legend, but written by the Greek epic poet Homer. The Iliad, the Chronicles of Narnia, Ulysses, and O-Brother, Where Art Thou? I'll give you a few more seconds to get your answers in. Three, two, one. For those of you that answered Iliad, you are correct. The archaeological site of the city of Troy is located in Turkey. Thank you for playing and back over to John.

JOHN EMERY:

Thanks so much, Devan. You know what, some extra homework in case you were looking for anything. Go ahead and read the Iliad and the Odyssey. It's only about that thick, but I know many of us have a long flight there, so good way to put you to sleep at least. So, now we're going to shift gears a little bit and chat with Roger Carney, the chair of the Transfer Policy PDP. So, hello, Roger. Can you begin by explaining kind of in very simple terms what you've been working on? Public Comment just came in and what you need from council, if anything.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great, thanks, John. First, I'd like to congratulate Donna on finishing her work. We did get started around the same time as each other, and I think we may have had a bet on who would finish first, so we'll have to settle up next time we see each other. But anyway, yeah, so since ICANN80, we've published our first initial draft of our complete package. So, good to our team on that. It was a long three years to get to that.

And since then, as Devan mentioned earlier, we went through our Public Comment, and Public Comment's been completed, and we've started working on those Public Comments. And we've made some updates to

already some of the recommendations based on those. So, that's where we stand now. We're right in the middle of processing the Public Comments. We've got 47 recommendations, and I think we made it through 15 or 16 of them so far with the Public Comments. So, we've got a little way to go yet.

JOHN EMERY:

And so, would you say that the work is kind of on schedule the time being? I know you've got some bets to settle up with Donna, but are you on schedule? And what's the kind of rough estimate of the timeline to finish this?

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, John. Yeah, I would say we're definitely on schedule, maybe just a bit ahead. I think we're supposed to deliver to council sometime first quarter. And we should be looking at by the end of November, getting our first run through the Public Comments completed. And then we'll spend the holiday season and maybe part of January cleaning up the Final Report and getting it ready for council. So, I think probably by February, we should be getting our hand off to council on it.

JOHN EMERY:

Something to look forward to in the new year.

ROGER CARNEY:

Yes.

JOHN EMERY: So, you mentioned that you're going through kind of Public Comment review step by step. I was wondering if you could kind of take us through how the working group is going about that, especially for kind of future chairs here?

ROGER CARNEY: Absolutely, yeah. And staff has done a good job here in providing us, I think most people know the Public Comment tool, but they've also done a really good job of taking us from what our recommendations were in the initial draft and helping along and putting those comments into context of each of those recommendations. And then the working group gets to look at that and say, oh yeah, that doesn't seem to fit. And again, I think it's great, not just the Public Comment tool, but that extra step of saying, this is what our comment, this is what our recommendation was, this is what the comments suggest.

And then the group gets to finish that out with, okay, yeah, we talked about that and that wasn't me and things like that. So, that extra step really is useful and the group has gone through and it's been really efficient the first two weeks of Public Comment review. So, it's gone really well so far.

JOHN EMERY: That's great to hear the two words there are, efficient. It's always good. And the extra step. Are there any recurring challenges that have emerged since the last ICANN?

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah. And it's the continuous challenge that this group has had. The Transfer Policy, transfers affect a lot of registrants, millions a year, but it's very focused on a registrar viewpoint because that's who's dealing with 90% of the transfer. And then the registries do a bit and then everyone else is just kind of ancillary and wants to make sure things are okay. And I think that that's how we see the input throughout the whole time is kind of dominated by those groups.

And I appreciate the other stakeholder groups because they are fairly active, but they're more-quiet. And I think that was just the challenge we've always seen from day one is, the focus here is kind of lopsided. And I do appreciate the other stakeholder groups coming in and providing the input because we get a lot of good ideas from those stakeholder groups, even though they are quieter. So, yeah.

JOHN EMERY:

Fantastic. And so, I wanted to kind of round things off with what do you plan to accomplish during ICANN81 in Istanbul and anything else that you'd kind of like to update the council on?

ROGER CARNEY:

Absolutely, yeah. And our intent with Istanbul was to make sure if there were any tricky comments that came in and we couldn't handle them on a call, we'd do that face-to-face. As Donna mentioned, the face-to-face is so important. It's much more efficient to get things moving along,

especially if there's the sticky issues that come up. We don't have any identified specifically yet.

There's one big, large one, but it's not necessarily something we're going to deal with at 81. But that's the intent was just to make sure we got any of those trickier comments done face-to-face when we could. And as far as council, again, just encouragement from all the stakeholder groups. Through the reviewing of the comments, our other stakeholder groups have been more vocal than they were in sending the recommendations. So, it's been great to get their input. And again, I think that really the encouragement of just getting that done and being prepared. In a few months, 47 recommendations are going to drop on council's lap. So, it will be a big effort.

JOHN EMERY:

Thank you so much, Roger. We really appreciate it. And best of luck to you and your team as you go through the remainder of the Public Comments. We'll go ahead and hand it back over to Devin really quick.

DEVAN REED:

Thanks, John. And thank you, everyone. All the Working Group volunteers who've worked very hard over the last few years. We are going to transition to the conclusion of the webinar and allow councilors any questions and review also other GNSO council work projects. But before we do that, I have one final question as your quiz master. For this question, you can select multiple answers. The question is, which of the seven wonders of the ancient world are located in Turkey? The Pyramids of Giza, the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, the Temple of

Artemis, the Statue of Zeus, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, or the Colossus of Rhodes?

Give you a little bit more time here. See more people are answering. And as a fun fact, while we're waiting, the seven wonders of the ancient world and the seven wonders of the modern world are totally different lists. Go ahead and check them out. And learn lots of things from National Geographic. I am going to end the poll now and share the results. If you selected number three, the Temple of Artemis and number five, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, you are correct. There are so many beautiful sites to see just in Istanbul that I haven't even talked about today. So, go ahead and look them up. I will now turn it over to John and Greg DiBiase for some brief updates on ongoing GNSO projects.

JOHN EMERY:

Thanks, Devan. You really, really challenged us on having the multiple answers there. It seems like we need to brush up on the ancient seven wonders of the world there. But lots of sites to see in Istanbul. And we hope that you can all take a little time to visit some of those sites. So, now we're going to have Greg DiBiase take us through a handful of things, RDRS, Board readiness, and SubPro, just for some brief, brief updates before our conclusion. Greg, over to you.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, John. And thanks, Donna and Roger. I love this idea of chairs making bets. That is great. I will say we haven't adopted this Final Report on IDNs yet. So, I don't know. Don't count your chickens. Just

kidding. Well, I'm not kidding, but I'm optimistic we will be accepting the recommendations. So, a quick update on a couple other items to touch base on going into ICANN81.

First, regarding the RDRS, the Registration Data Request Service. As a reminder, this is a pilot to gather information for pending SSAD recommendations that are before the Board. We had an update from Sebastian, the chair of the standing committee, who will provide recommendations to council in the last meeting. He is going to return to our council meeting in Istanbul to field more questions. So, bring any questions you have about RDRS to Sebastien. The Pilot is a year in, so about halfway through of the scheduled time. So, we'll get an update there and think about what the next steps will be on RDRS and those pending recommendations regarding SSAD that are before the Board.

So, the next thing is Board readiness, just a status update. The Board readiness small team has compiled a set of Board non-adopted recommendations to systematically analyze why they were not adopted and ensure that future recommendations are Board ready. The Small Team has commenced interviews with PDP and EPDP participants and Board members to gain insights from each side as to whether it came as a surprise to the team when the Board or why the Board was unable to adopt recommendations.

So, great work by that team getting these questions together and already starting the interviews. I think that will yield really useful information for council to consider how to improve our processes and make recommendations Board ready. So, be on the lookout for more

updates there. And then just a quick update on SubPro, the Subsequent Procedure Recommendations.

As you'll recall, council adopted a Supplemental Recommendation on singulars and plurals, which represents the conclusion of our hard work to address the pending recommendations that the Board did not initially adopt. And now we're working through the issue of contention sets, starting with the letter that we're drafting to the Board regarding their non-adoption of the recommendation on private auctions, or sorry, of joint ventures related to private resolution.

So, those are the topics to keep top of mind going into ICANN81. There's some more information that leadership sent out on list. So, please feel free to follow up with any questions. And I guess I'll stop there and see if people have questions on those updates.

JOHN EMERY: Thanks so much, Greg. I guess we'll hand it back to Devan now to kind of field any questions for us that we may have for either Greg or Roger.

DEVAN REED: Hey everyone. I'm just going to give maybe a few more seconds to give anybody an opportunity to get their hand up.

MANJU CHEN: I'm sorry. I can't find where to get my hand up in the new Zoom window. This is Manju.

JOHN EMERY: Hi, Manju.

DEVAN REED: Hi, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: So, I have a question. I remember we decided to do this review of action, the decision action was that thing, radar thing, the project list, like twice every year, which is the first ICANN meeting and the last ICANN meeting of the year. We did a very good one with Paul when we were in Puerto Rico, so this year. And I think we kind of agreed that we're going to do a second time by the end of the year, which is the ICANN81. But I'm wondering, because I haven't seen any discussion of who's going to be the next Paul for this thing in Istanbul. So, I'm wondering if we're still doing that. Thank you.

JOHN EMERY: That's a great question, Manju. I have to admit, I don't think we've set plans on doing that, but now that you've raised it, we did commit to doing that and I think it was a really worthwhile exercise. So, let leadership take that back and work with staff. And maybe that's something we can look at in one of the prep meetings or one of the working sessions for the GNSO. But that's a great reminder. Thank you, Manju.

DEVAN REED:

Does anybody else, is anyone else having a hard time finding the raise hand button? Well, I am not hearing anything, but please feel free to interrupt me. I just wanted to also share that to learn more about the ongoing and upcoming policy activities at the GNSO, the implementation statuses of completed PDPs. You can read the GNSO policy briefing at ICANN81. It's going to be published next Monday at this link that I'm going to share in the chat. We always publish it on that first day of prep week.

So, if you go to this link right now, it's going to take you to ICANN80's policy briefing, but we're going to update it shortly. Does anybody else have any questions, anything to add? I'm not seeing anything. I'm not hearing anything. So, thank you all so much for joining us for our webinar today. Have a great rest of your week.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thank you.

JOHN EMERY:

Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]