

---

ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - NCSG Open Meeting  
Wednesday, March 24, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 EST

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much. Hello, and welcome to the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group meeting (NCSG).

My name is Maryam Bakoshi and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standard of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat, with questions and comments allowed during the time set by the chair of this session. If you'd like to ask your questions or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I'll hand over the floor to the chair of NCSG, Bruna Martins dos Santos. Bruna, please.

---

***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.***

---

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much, Maryam. Welcome, everyone, and hello. My name is Bruna Santos. I'm the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group chair. You have just joined the NCSG Open Meeting at ICANN70. We have an interesting agenda for today's meeting with updates from our GNSO councilors and EPDP members, as well as the Cross-Community Working Party in Human Rights.

But before starting this meeting, I would also like to thank you all, our community, for your continued engagement with NCSG. I guess that this month we all completed one year since this pandemic started, and I understand this might have affected a lot of us in many different ways and resulted in new forms of organization, also civil society organizations. But before starting this, I would also like to thank our Policy Committee members, Executive Committee members, Constituency Leadership teams, representatives at working parties in other efforts, working groups as well, and also the broader NCSG membership for all the hard work. So everything is very valuable here and I'm happy to see a lot of friends here.

So moving on to our agenda, as it is on the screen right now, we will start with some updates from both chairs or leadership teams of NPOC and NCUC. The two constituencies are part of the NCSG. After that, we will have Policy and Council updates. Shortly after this meeting, we will have the GNSO Council meeting, so this can also be an opportunity for you to ask questions or start a discussion around the topics that will be discussed at the Council meeting.

---

After that, we are also inviting our EPDP members for a continuation of the debates we held at the Policy meeting. So this is also an opportunity for the membership to ask questions and propose topics here.

After that, we will have CCWP, the Cross-Community Working Party in Human Rights update with Ephraim. Last but not least, we will have ICANN staff presenting on the Information Transparency Initiative. And last but not least, I would like to try to at least have a short discussion on our governance and participation, just as an opportunity for us to hear how hard it has been for everybody, and also what we can improve in terms of participation and outreach and everything else.

So without further ado, I'm going to start the discussion on the Consistency updates and I'm also going to hand the floor to Raphael. Raphael is the NCUC chair.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: Hi, everyone. Thank you, Bruna. Raphael Beauregard-Lacroix for the record, NCUC chair since the last ICANN meeting. For those of you who were there at the NCUC Open Meeting yesterday, this might be things that you know already, but even then I think it's good to provide this information as a summary form.

Since the fall, the EC, we've been mostly working on the ABRs votes, the previous one, so the one for the current financial year and the one that was requested as well in December. So for the current one, for this year, yesterday we announced that NCUC is going to have a

---

webinar with civil society participation, a webinar which will take place at the end of April, early May. The dates will be determined. It's a webinar that will be open to all civil society members—everyone who is from civil society within ICANN, so not only members of NCSG but also potentially members from ALAC who identified as civil society. We've been basically designing the schedule or the agenda for that webinar, reaching out to speakers and other participants, and also we have been preparing the materials for an ICANN Learn course that will come along that webinar, ICANN Learn course that will focus more in the history of civil society at ICANN in general, so not only NCUC itself but also NCSG NPOC and also ALAC. And so we've reached out to the different parts of the community to get their input. Most of them had already some materials written about their history, but it did require some work to gather all of that and put that together.

So that's mostly what we've been up to for the current ABR for the current year. So everyone who is a NCSG member will receive an invitation for that webinar in the coming days or weeks with the date and the participation details as well.

Also for the coming Financial Year 2022 at NCUC, we also requested the webinar to try to get in kind support from ICANN Org to improve our online presence and general device, more coherent online strategy. So in the previous years, there were a lot of parts of the community that requested something similar and Org generally refuses [inaudible] saying that they were themselves working on an overall strategy, so we might not get anything there, but the point would be to also indicate to Org at least our will and our intention to

---

have something a little bit more coherent when it comes to online presence and online reach out, and given that a lot of things now happen online and that despite the fact that we can all hope that ICANN meetings will resume in person soon. I think for all of us, a lot of things will have transitioned online in a more or less irreversible way. This brought us to make that request for an ABR.

So yeah, we've been mostly working on those two things. Nothing as much at the level of the EC. So yes, that is all for me. Thank you, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much, Raphael. I have also invited NPOC leadership. I don't see Raoul on the list. Do we have anyone from the NPOC leadership who would like to present on recent developments from the constituency? I guess the floor is open in case we have a representative here. Okay. Juan, let me just ask you. Would you be able to provide a short update on the constituency work? I'm sorry for putting you on the spot, but in case you're not, we can maybe wait for Raoul.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS:

I know a few things about what are they doing. I know they are doing webinars. They are making webinars for NPOC members, they have been doing this year. I know that they have good reception about these webinars, several topics in each session. I don't know how many webinars are scheduled, but I know that they have done that.

---

I know that they are still working on the famous charter because I know they've received a few comments from the staff so they are working on that. And they are working also in create something legal outside from ICANN but I don't know how it goes. I don't remember what else for now.

Of course, they are concerned about the lack of participation, diminution of participation of the members in these online meetings and they are trying to discuss how to solve this. I think that's I can share with you of NPOC because I have no many more information right now.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much, Juan. Thanks for the short update. Just one point about the webinars—Maryam has written on the chat—this is a series of webinars on increasing know-how and knowledge on DNS operational concerns. So it's a series of seven webinars and, as Maryam has cited on the chat, there has been four webinars and there's still three to go. So in case if any of you has interest on that, please reach out to Joanna or Raoul or Juan or anyone that's part of the NPOC current or past leadership. I'm sure they will help you on that.

Thanks again, Juan and Raphael, for these short discussions. Do we have any questions for our constituency representatives or any topics you would like to present to them? I guess we can have one or two questions if there's any. Okay. I'm hearing none and seeing none.

---

I am just going to note that Maryam just posted on the chat the link to the NPOC webinars. And it's also a good reminder for us to talk about the NCUC webinars about civil society engagement and also NCSG's webinars as well on policy contributions and our policy work here at ICANN. So this is something we're also working at and hopefully we'll be able to announce to the broader community soon. So thanks again to the two of you for the updates.

I'm going to move on to agenda item number two right now, and then this is also a short update on Policy and Council. I have invited both Tomslin and Tatiana to help me with these discussions. We had a very extensive Policy Committee call this Monday, but then the idea here was to just provide a more general overview on what will be today's GNSO Council agenda and also what can be other many relevant opportunities for you in terms of policy development processes and anything else.

So, Tatiana and Tomslin, I don't know which of you would like to take the floor first, but it is open so feel free to take the mic.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Hello, everyone. Bruna, I think that Tomslin as the chair of the Policy Committee might want to go first. So, Tomslin, over to you, and then perhaps I can just recap again the agenda of the Council. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Tatiana. Thanks, Bruna, for letting us speak today as another opportunity to give Policy updates to the members. Today, since it's a

---

very short one, I'll just focus it on the public comments because I think this is where we have significant opportunity for members to participate.

On Monday's meeting, I did mention some of the active public comments. Since there are more members here today, I'll just repeat those then go to ones that are coming up. The EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendation, we're currently working on that. I'd like to note to members that the second Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team Final Report comment has no volunteer again, so I'm still hoping membership will volunteer for this. Then there was the Initial Report on the third ccNSO Policy Development Process which is an opportunity to comment as well. And the final one that is currently running is a proposal for Korean Root Zone Label Generation Rules, and it is the second public comment.

The one that was just due—and that was the IANA naming function review recommendation for an IANA naming function contract amendment—there was a volunteer for this, but unfortunately the draft came in on the due date itself. Therefore, it left no opportunity for the Policy Committee to review this before submission so this wasn't submitted. So, just a reminder again that we'd appreciate it if those drafts come much earlier so that it can be reviewed. I do send reminders but, yeah, just a general reminder again for everyone who volunteers.

For upcoming public comment proceedings that we might see, where there is opportunity again for us to comment and if there are members



---

interested in any of these topics, please, it's a call to start getting ready for those. I think there is one planned. The estimated timeframe for this one was March 2021 but it hasn't come out yet. That's the Domain Abuse Activity Report, I think, that hasn't up yet, but I think that's something that is in the works as well. There is the proposal for Root Server System governance that is also the public comment proceeding is also being planned. The other one is the renewal of [.error] Registry Agreement, and then there is also the proposal renewal for .name Registry Agreement. That is planned for April 2021. That's the plan for this date. Another is a proposal for Latin Script Label Generation Rules starting May planned again. And then there is the proposal for the Myanmar script Label Generation Rules. And then the final one that is planned in the short term is the North American Engagement Plan.

So these are all opportunities for members to participate in the public comment, especially our new members or members without experience in policy work. This is opportunity for any of these topics that you have interest in. Please volunteer to draft comments and you could work with more experienced members. That's it for my update today on the Policy work. Thanks, Bruna. I'll let Tatiana talk about the Council.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much, Tomslin. Tatiana, you have the floor.

---

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Bruna. Thanks to Tomslin. We had quite an extensive discussion on various agenda items for the GNSO during our Policy Committee meeting just a couple of days ago. I don't know how many of you managed to attend the GNSO meeting with the GAC. Just a short recap, from the GAC had quite a few questions to GNSO and they did ask about EPDP Phase 2A, again, the topic of our extensive discussion on Monday this week.

Also, about DNS abuse that was the issue I covered, as you might well imagine, the GNSO Council, as a Council, it is quite hard to agree on DNS abuse because various stakeholders groups and constituencies have their own views on these. So I had to provide a very generic recap and the general position was that the GNSO will not favor anything, any policy development process before we actually define abuse and scope it, and then look at the mitigation, what is going on now, and identify the gaps. It was also pointed out that with all the current efforts—they called them something like, I don't remember exactly, ad hoc efforts—short-term frameworks. We as a Council highlighted that anything that is going on but is not related to the policy development process is outside of the Council remit. However, I do believe that here we will have a big push from GAC, from ALAC, and from some of the constituencies in the GNSO. So apparently, the GNSO Council will have this topic on its plate from now and for quite some time.

As to the GNSO Council meeting, I don't want to rehearse all the agenda points here. I just want to highlight perhaps some of the contentious issues we might get from here. Of course, the EPDP 2A phase, while previously there was some costs, so perhaps to put a stop

---

on it if it doesn't achieve any progress, but it does seem that it has moved on somehow, and I saw during the Policy Committee meeting that our membership also favors continuation of this work. So basically I think that there is no contentious issue for us right now as to how to approve the continuation of the EPDP 2A.

Another item is voting for the charter on the Transfer Policy. Again, there were some general discussions about the composition of this working group of this PDP with Registries having 10 participants and us having 2 members and 2 alternates. The same number of people as ALAC and GAC, but there was a compromise because they asked for 3 members and 3 alternates. They were not given this. So there might be concerns raised on the call, we don't know yet. So we'll see how it goes. I'm aware the GNSO wants to move on with this process.

One more issue which, unfortunately or fortunately, I'm going to lead on is the GNSO response to the Board on the financial sustainability of the SSAD. And it looks to me right now that the GNSO as a Council has no agreement as to how to reply to the Board. Because, on the one hand, the Board indicated somehow quite confusing during the call a few weeks ago about, if after the analysis of financial sustainability they find that this is not sustainable, they're going to get back to the GNSO and say take a policy decision. We will argue in here. At least I was arguing that this is a Board fiduciary duty to make this analysis and then to take into account, to approve recommendations or not. There seem to be general agreement on the Council, however, that if Board find the SSAD not financially sustainable, they will still forward recommendations back to the Council so we can decide what to do

---

with them, whether to get back to the EPDP or find some other way. However, as far as I understand, some of the councilors—and I think that it includes our councilors as well—want the Board to get back to the GNSO in any case. And here, this is something where I personally disagree. This is somehow the so-called we have to square on the GNSO level because, of course, with every opinion, we have to find some sort of consensus.

The last point is this framework for continuous improvement, which I believe GNSO Council sent around and it hasn't got any feedback. So this is something where stakeholder groups and constituencies have to contribute. But we haven't gotten any feedback yet except from ISPCP and they told us, "We didn't have time to go through this." So this is basically all the feedback we have. However, it might be quite an important point to actually work on these because there was some discussions someone asked—and perhaps something for us to discuss later at the NCSG level—whether we want this strange structure which will have some sort of continuous work on some process which are not only in the GNSO remit but also stakeholder groups and constituencies, like for example, the implementation of the Work Stream 2.

I will pause here. I don't know, I have not read the chat. I don't know what is going on there. This is it, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much, Tatiana. Do we have any questions for either Tatiana or Tomslin? I guess you can either type them on the chat or

---

raise your hand, and I'll be happy to hand the floor over to anyone who has questions. Okay. So there's none.

I'm just going to note Tomslin just posted on the chat the link to public comment proceedings which NCSG has any drafting initiatives started. So this is a list where you can see which are the comments, who are the volunteers, and whether or not there has been any comment that is actually assigned to somebody, and you would like to join or help in the effort by any means. So please take a look at these links.

Also, Tomslin noted on the chat that the SSR2 comment is due April 8. So in case there is anyone who would like to contribute to this discussion or even chair this comment, please let us know as well, just so we can start working on that. Thanks, Tatiana and Tomslin.

I just would like to add one or two points. The first one would be about the abuse discussions we did. You might remember I did send some updates to the list about that, but we did host of call with the contracted parties about abuse initiatives and discussions. And this was like one or two weeks before the announcement of the DNS Abuse Institute, but the idea there was for us, the two groups, to establish some sort of conversation around DNS abuse. And at the opportunity, they mentioned that one of the definitions that they're working with is the definition from the Internet and Jurisdiction Network. They also brought back some of the discussions that have been hosted so far. So this is a part of the Policy discussion that we wanted to continue. And we did form an ad hoc working group for that, and anyone who wants to join this effort, they were not really follow through, but in case

---

there's anyone who would like to help or lead these discussions, please let us know. I do agree that we should maybe be addressing this topic here as NCSG, just so we are prepared for this movement that Tatiana has just mentioned from parts of the community like ALAC and other parts forcing for these debates to be hosted within ICANN. So this is one thing.

The second thing I wanted to mention was just that there is a work track on inter-governmental organizations and we have one open slot on this specific effort. One of the previous NCSG representatives just resigned. So in case any of you would like to also be part of this effort, our other two reps there are Juan Manuel and Joanna. So please reach out to them in case you would like to help with this effort.

Having said that, I think we're going to move on to agenda item number three. The idea here was to have some level we'll continue the discussion on the EPDP. For those of you who don't know what the EPDP is, this is an Expedited Policy Development Process for Temporary Specification for gTLD registration data. This is an effort that was started back in 2018, and now we are at Phase 2.A. The two remaining topics for now are the discussions around legal versus natural persons, and also the feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized e-mail address. This is a topic that we started discussing back at the Policy Committee meeting this Monday, and it's something that is also on the GNSO Council agenda today. I have invited all of our EPDP members to weigh in or even bring us some short feedback on what have been the discussions so far.

---

I think Stephanie is going to lead the discussion for us, but I see Milton and Manju are also here so if you want to chime in, please just raise your hands and I'll be happy to tread this discussion as well. So, Stephanie, you have the floor.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you very much. Apologies for being late. I have been multitasking on another call. We are now at the point where I hope to get a draft of the comment that is open. It closes on March 30<sup>th</sup>. I'm praying for an extension so that we can have a fuller discussion of the issues, but even so, it'll come in the next couple of days. It gives us an opportunity to comment kind of in a wrap-up way. This comment has been somewhat discombobulated. We had a public comment period on the first phase, and then because there was dissension among the group, in other words not full consensus, on many of the recommendations, they were split. And we're now commenting on I guess they call Priority 2 Recommendations. So it's a bit confusing if you haven't been following the play by play.

Now, at the actual EPDP 2A that we are engaged in at the moment, we are arguing principally about a distinction between legal versus natural, there is a desire on the part of our colleagues in the [IPC] and the BC to publish data that pertains to legal persons. And the basis that they are relying on here is that the GDPR applies to personal data that of individuals or not legal persons. In other words, legal persons are companies and individuals are not. However, this is a distinction that is very, very difficult to make. So we don't even agree in our EPDP

---

members on whether we should be consenting to the making of this distinction. I'll discuss that further.

The other issue is accuracy. Now, accuracy has been the bugbear of WHOIS for a very long time. They've been working on accuracy since, I don't know, 2006 at least. Of course, the argument now that we are complying or attempting to comply with GDPR and other data protection regimes, and I would note that even though we agreed in Phase 1 that we would focus on the GDPR, this was going to be a harmonized policy that applied across the other 120 countries that have data protection regulation and not just those within the GDPR. That is often forgotten in the discussions but we keep reminding them. Now, accuracy in the terms of data protection legislation means [accuracies] of accuracy sufficient for the purposes for which the data subject is providing the personal information. And in the case of registered name holders, that would be to get a domain name. Whereas in fact, the entire focus of ICANN's deliberations on accuracy has been in order to benefit the third parties that access or wish to access the information. So when we had an open WHOIS, there was continued push to get more and more data and more accurate data. And I would draw your attention to the report of the EWG, which was my introduction to ICANN prior even to joining NCSG, they were looking for all manner of contact information and greater detail, you know, cell phones for legal contact, cell phone for admin contact. We still see that but of course this publishing of data would be within the context of this SSAD that we are, in theory at least, working on.



---

Now, there's another issue that has arisen recently in the context of the EPDP discussions and that is the financial sustainability of the SSAD. We have been raising this. There is a recommendation in there that the financial sustainability be examined. For those who aren't following this, the Board has come out with this OPD, Operational—oh God. I'm forgetting the acronym. Somebody help.

BRUNA SANTOS: Operational Design Phase.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: ODP, yes, Operational Design Phase. Thank you very much. And they are proposing that they, in the light of their fiduciary responsibilities as the Board, will look at how much this thing is going to cost. Please be assured that when I complain about this, it is not that I don't think the Board has a fiduciary responsibility to ensure that the money they spend is being done in a responsible way. Far from it, far from it. However, we needed that data two years ago when we agreed to work on the SSAD. And admittedly, until we had some of the recommendations agreed, we couldn't actually do a proper financial assessment. But we weren't given the funds. We were on a tight budget. We barely had enough money to ask the legal questions that we needed answered. We did not have sufficient funds to do a proper financial assessment of this. And I would note that when I was on the EWG, we paid IBM to do a financial assessment of what it would cost to build this giant system that people were imagining. I don't see why we couldn't have had that to do this assessment within the EPDP. It might

---

have cut short a lot of the theoretical stuff that we were working on. I would also note that the Board went ahead and enfranchised a group totally outside the EPD process to look at the technical feasibility of the SSAD that they were thinking of developing and we don't really have a clear budget for that either.

So I just think that to have a policy development group working for years on something when we don't know whether it's financially sustainable is folly. But some of us are near burnout on this because we've been at it for numerous years. And I mean at it, I mean at it like weekly, twice weekly, three times weekly meetings forever. We got the summer off, big deal. So that's an issue.

In terms of the actual financial costs, those who, like me, served on the PPSAI—and I see Kathy there; I know that James Gannon served on this thing as well—we had huge fights over privacy/proxy services. The IPC wanted registrars to actually pay for the serving of papers on any clients that they had protected by proxy. So there's a really no limit to how the user parties—and that would include the Business Community and the IPC, and to a certain extent, the law enforcement community—are unwilling to pay anything to get data. They've had it for free, now that it's protected by the GDPR, they are not willing to pay. So that means—and make no mistake about this—there's only one source of finance at ICANN and that is the registered name holders. So there's a tax. And, in fact, there are three options being discussed in financial sustainability in the letter that is going out on the SSAD from the GNSO Council, and I commented just last night, I think it was, that in fact Option 1 and Option 2 are the same. If ICANN

---

decides to subsidize this thing, ICANN can only get money from the registered name holder. And I apologize for that snoring sound. My dog is curled up beside me on the couch, and this is what he thinks of my arguments on this. So either the registrants get a specific tax on it, either the contracted parties add a tax or ICANN pays, it's all the same. It's all coming from the pockets of the people that we represent.

I think that's a kind of sketch to bring those who have not been following up to date on three key issues that we are debating at the moment. Milton and I are disagreeing on strategy here. I firmly believe that doing any concession on agreeing to any kind of opt-in on like a tick box or anything like that, where an individual or a small organization such as the NGOs that we represent, tick a box saying, "Yes, I am a legal person," or "Yes, I am an individual, but I consent to the publishing of my personal information." Let's be clear: we're not publishing like the WHOIS was. People at least have to have an accreditation to get access to this, but the details of the tiers have not entirely been worked out.

I see Farzaneh is typing things in the chat. Her question is, "At some point, some groups kept saying we should ask the lawyers. Did they manage to get legal advice?" We have just sent some questions to Bird & Bird to get legal advice, and there have been some questions concerning this whole issue of what the threshold is for providing advice to individuals regarding their consent to disclose. I mean, I have argued all the way along that when people consent to disclose their personal information when they register a domain name, they have no clue how far it's going, which particular data mongers—I'm

---

talking about the LexisNexis people of the world—vacuum up that data and what it might be used for, just like in so many other applications. But we never give up. We still want people to be sufficiently aware before the consent to disclosure of their data and are they aware that they might have trolls showing up at their door. I think that this is a very difficult thing to convey to people and I don't think it's necessary. I think that the onus should be on those requesting the data to justify in the context of an investigation that they want to get the data, rather than forcing individuals to consent.

Now the other important question is, can they make a meaningful distinction as to whether or not they are an individual or a legal person? And if they are employed, if they're members of the gig economy, if they are women running women's groups, I would argue that that's a very difficult question to answer.

In my jurisdiction, Canada, businesses can come under different rules, they are provincially regulated to begin with, and there may be differences between federal tax rules, municipal tax rules, provincial tax rules in terms of the status of their entity or their operation. That will totally confuse them when they answer this question as to whether they're a legal person.

The other issue that nobody wants to talk about—and I'd love anybody's advice as to why they refuse to talk about it, I bring it up repeatedly—and that is if I register names and, in my case, I have a tiny corporation to support my data protection consulting, it's a federal corporation, and my names are registered in my name except the one

---

that is a website. And those names, you would be well advised to continue to register in your own personal name so that if your company goes bankrupt or your corporation goes bankrupt or your gig economy folds and you move on to another pursuit, you get to keep your names. We never talk about that.

Years and years ago—I believe it was around 2008 but I could be way off—there was a bid to do a charter of rights for registered name holders, it was led by ALAC. It never got anywhere. But we have no obligations to explain to registered name holders how to register what they ought to do in their own self interest. And I would certainly not advise anyone I knew to register their names all in the name of their corporation because they'll go up on the chopping block in the event of a bankruptcy.

Anyway, that's probably enough out of me. I've been talking for too long. There's the update. I apologize for not having the draft comment done yet, but my goal is to try to do a round-up of all of these issues so that we have it on record what our views are. Thanks.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much, Stephanie, for the very comprehensive report. Milton, I see your hand's up and I see Tomslin as well. I'm just going to just mention that we—Farzaneh and I—did draft a letter for the CEO and Board about the so-called relation between the SSAD and content moderation. I just posted on the chat. Both the initial letter and the reply from the CEO as far as the highlighted, it was not a really strong

---

justification for this topic. Just so everybody's aware of that. Milton, you have the floor.

MILTON MUELLER:

Hello. Can people see me and hear me? Okay, good. So greetings, everybody. I think Stephanie did a very good job of running down the whole set of complicated issues that we're confronted with in EPDP. I think we all are pretty much on the same page regarding everything except the legal/natural distinction. And that, as she correctly indicated, is a more of a tactical or strategic decision. So let me explain to you what my concerns are.

First of all, let's understand what the status quo is. If we don't change anything from Phase 1, it means that the registrars, as contracted parties, can decide on their own how or even whether they're going to differentiate between legal and natural persons. And one of the options that's being floated is that the registrar will look at your information and make the inference as to whether your legal or natural without the registered name holder participate in the process at all, and that's one of the things I'm concerned about. My goal is to put the registrant, the end user, in control of the differentiation process. I'm also concerned about avoiding any authentication or verification being done by the registrars which would make the registration process incredibly more expensive and more intrusive from a privacy standpoint.

And I'm very concerned—and this is, I think, where we deviate—I'm looking at the broad environment around this debate. So we know

---

that the surveillance caucus has gone to the European Commission and done a lot of lobbying, and they've gotten a lot of stuff put into their NIS proposed directive about domain names and about registration data. We know that law enforcement and governments and GAC are very concerned about having these legal/natural distinctions so that more data will be available. And, essentially, Stephanie—and the registrars I think are with her on this—think that we can just kind of stiff arm those people and say, “We won in this process and you lost, and so you're just going to go away and give up.” I'm afraid, given my understanding of the history of ICANN that they're not going to go away, that ICANN Org is going to continue to try to satisfy them in ways that bypass the EPDP process, so I'm proposing if we can come up with some compromise that takes a step in the direction of legal/natural differentiation that is acceptable to GAC at the very least, I think we can head off some of these extra-curricular activities that would occur if we don't.

I think that this is kind of an interesting thing about the whole ICANN process. We don't see any compromises being made anymore. We see people trying to have winner-take-all outcomes because everybody's polarized into a couple of factions.

Stephanie raises the legitimate question, if we make a minor concession to try to satisfy some members of the other side, does it open the door to more demands and more concessions, or does it succeed in resolving the issues? So that's kind of an empirical question. Neither one of us knows the answer to that question.

---

I just think, first of all, there's nothing inherently wrong with making the differentiation. It's a matter of fact that the GDPR protects natural persons and not legal persons. So the law is on the side of making the differentiation if you can. The problem, as Stephanie correctly pointed out, is that we don't know how to easily and correctly make that determination particularly of cases, maybe 5% of domain name registrations that are combining home office individual users with some kind of a legal person. Maybe it's more than that, maybe it's 10% of the effective registrations. We don't really have a good answer to that. But yeah, we want to protect those people.

So what I was proposing is we have this checkbox that says, "Are you legal or natural?" and then you have a second stage, which says, "Do you have personal data in there?" If the answer the second question is yes, then it doesn't get put into this bucket with all the other legal persons. I think that would be something that would make the outcome more acceptable to GAC law enforcement and those people without really giving up anything. My hope is that that would help to resolve the issue that we would say we have addressed legal/natural. It would be harder to bypass the process and raise all kinds of problems in legislatures and so on. So that's my perspective. I'll stop there and let the debate begin.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you so much, Milton. Tomslin, you have your hand up as well so you're up next. I'm just going to let you know that I'm going to close



---

this discussion maybe by 16:32-33 because we also have invited ICANN staff to present on the ITI. Tomslin, please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Bruna. I just had a question to the team members of the EPDP Phase 2A. Because I noticed from the update from the chair to the Council that the team may reach consensus on guidelines for registrars who choose to differentiate between legal and natural. Is that assuming that whether a decision or a consensus is raised on how to differentiate, there will still be consensus on some sort of guidance on if they did differentiate? That's the question.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Tomslin. Please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, that's it for me. Thanks.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks. I was just going to ask if either Milton or Stephanie wants to take this question, or Manju? I see Manju has her hand up as well so maybe we can have Manju, and then Milton.

MANJU CHEN: I think I'll answer this because I think I can make the shortest comment to answer this question. Yes, the chair, his comments is actually on how we can reach consensus on the guidance but not

---

about the contracted party has or can choose to distinguish between natural and legal person. So for now we're discussing the languages of the guidance, so we haven't decided if the guidance is a mandatory guidance. So that's why he says we're having consensus. The consensus is on the guidance itself, the contents of the guidance but not as the guidance is a mandatory or kind of self-implement kind of method. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Manju. Milton, do you still want to reply to this question?

MILTON MUELLER: I did not understand the question. Sorry. Can somebody simplify it for me and ask it again?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I can. The question was, with the update from the chair that the team may reach consensus on guidelines for registrars who choose to differentiate between legal and natural, does that mean that there is consensus being achieved on the guidelines, regardless of whether any sort of consensus is raised on how to differentiate between legal and natural persons?

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So yeah. I think what it means is, we would pretty much stick with the Phase 1 recommendation, but as a concession or some sort of step in the direction of people who want to differentiate, we would be

---

offering guidance. And what I said from the guidance, what I see about the guidance being offered is most of it is okay with me. Some of it does involve the registrant simply designating whether they're legal or natural, and then going through this two-step process to determine where the personal data is involved, so that's all good. But as I mentioned, there's an option in there where the registrar would determine whether you're legal or natural, and I want to get rid of that. And I think all of us in NCSG agree that we want to get rid of that. So yeah, I think if there is going to be consensus on this, it's going to be in the guidance. And that will be a very, very minor concession in the sense that it's just guidance, it's not policy or some kind of requirement. I see Stephanie doesn't agree.

BRUNA SANTOS: Kathy, I see your hand's up so you are the last one.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: I don't know if you can hear me. Should I wait for Stephanie to answer? I see she's on the queue so she wanted to respond.

BRUNA SANTOS: Steph, do you want to respond? I'll just ask you to be brief on that. And apologies for asking as well.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. This guidance is not bad. Let's remember that the contracted parties bear the liability for making a mistake. If they have

---

not explained adequately to me how I decide whether I'm an individual or a legal person and I choose wrongly and somebody shows up, trolls me or defaces my house or whatever, and I complain to a data protection commissioner, they will examine the guidance. That brings into sharp, sharp focus who precisely is giving that guidance. And the contracted parties have to, in my view, as co-controllers or controllers—we still don't know what's happening in the controllership fight between them and ICANN—if ICANN provides the guidance, then ICANN is on the hook, so it better be good. That's all I've got to say on that topic.

If we agree as a committee that this is good guidance, I'm not prepared to agree because I see too many holes. I think that by maintaining that right for the registrars to decide, that gives them the ambit, particularly in jurisdictions where the employees are protected and the person registering the domain name might not have a clue about how data protection law applies to their employees—and trust me, I see that every day as a practitioner—then I think the registrars are quite right to say, “Nah, I think I'm going to call you an individual.” Thanks.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much, Stephanie.

MILTON MUELLER: What if they decide to call them a legal person?

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Then it's on them. They own the liability here. Remember that. They own the liability. That will be the first thing that people look at is the guidance. How did you advise the individual as to how to decide whether they're an individual or a legal person?

MILTON MUELLER: So you don't want the registrant to be in control of that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No, I don't. I think it's too hard to explain. As I've said before, don't forget we're also talking about people whose principal language is not English, who are not familiar with the GDPR.

MILTON MUELLER: And then these people are going to be able to initiate a lawsuit against the registrar in another jurisdiction.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Somebody can do it for them. Civil society can do it for them.

MILTON MUELLER: Come on. How much will that cost?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: It depends on the jurisdiction how much it costs, actually.

---

BRUNA SANTOS: I'm going to come in here, and please remind everybody to state their names before speaking. I'm sure the transcription and interpreters might be having a hard time right now. But can I just hand the floor to Kathy. Kathy, I am closing the queue on you. I see that Milton has started a discussion on the proposed guidance on the mailing list, and I think this is also a good environment for us to engage and discuss this topic further. So, Kathy, you have the floor.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: That was one of my questions. What was going to be the process going forward? So if it's a discussion group in the working group, if Milton and Stephanie want to organize a small meeting and bring together people from NCSG who want to talk about this, I'd be happy to join you. First of all, I want to thank Milton and Stephanie. There is nothing better than being caught in the crossfire of two great leaders of NCSG, really trying to come up with what the right strategy is. So thank you.

I wanted to inform this a little bit more. Milton, legal or natural person is a GDPR concept but there are other local privacy laws. In the United States, we have the right of anonymous political speech, and so you actually do. It went up to the Supreme Court in the 1990s. And so there is extra protection for religious groups, for ethnic groups, and political groups. So if you're going to ask questions—and I'm not saying I endorse it—legal or natural is a GDPR question—but I like the question, do you have personal data in the database? People might actually understand that. Another way to say it and I would add the question—again, I'm not endorsing it—but would you be in danger if

---

this data was published? Let me tell you who would, who include our members: mosques, synagogues, and churches around the world. As I understand it, the IPC wanted to say that it be publicly available. And many mosques and synagogues in many locations around the world do not publish their addresses anymore, and they guard their physical location very closely. They'll publish the times of their services but not mosques and synagogues. And, unfortunately, in the last decade, we've seen churches around the world destroyed. We're also talking about LGBTQ groups that are fine in the U.S. but you publish the names of people running it and their families may be arrested in other places in the world. So there's lots of other types of protections for the types of organizations that are in our community—religious, ethnic minority.

First, I have to agree with Stephanie. I don't know the answer between legal and natural persons and I've been studying GDPR and the Data Protection Directive more decades than I want to talk about. Answering that question for a domain name that has many uses is a really difficult answer. But answering the questions about, "Is this personal data? Would you be endangered? Do you have other types of protections?" it may provide additional information to people that's important. But what we're worried about is having these physical addresses once again put into a public database for doxing purposes and other things. I mean to be misused. Thank you.

---

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much, Kathy. I apologize for closing the discussions right now. If our EPDP members want to reply to Kathy’s point and questions on the chat, I would be very happy if you do so. But I do think that it’s definitely a good idea. This has raised to host a proper call on the guidance on the EPDP 2A and some space for us to have this very relevant exchanges that we have now. So thanks again, Milton, Stephanie, and everybody who joined, Manju as well.

So we’re going to move to agenda item number five. I have invited members from ICANN staff to just do a short presentation on the Information Transparency Initiative. This is an initiative that has been also going on since 2018, and the goals were to improve the transparency of ICANN Org in general and also provide new ways of user experience in the website. So I guess Jana is presenting on behalf of the Org. So, Jana, you have the floor.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Thank you. Hi. I’m Jana Juginovic and I’m here with my colleagues, Alex Hudson and Simon Raveh and Mike Takahashi, who are also members of the ITI team. Would I be able to share my screen?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, Jana. You got co-host. I sent you a message earlier.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Excellent. Do you see my screen?



---

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes, we do.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Perfect. Thank you for giving us the opportunity this morning to speak with you. As Göran wrote about in his blog which we had published on the 16<sup>th</sup>, we launched the new ITI search experience for over 30,000 pages on icann.org to give you a perspective of the amount that includes percentage-wise we have around 200,000 pages in files on icann.org currently. So today we're going to demo some of those pages that we have implemented.

It's important to note that the new primary navigation search in the information architecture is yet to be launched, so what I mean by that is this is the primary navigation here. What you would see in terms of the search that I'm referring to is here and the information architecture of the entire site is yet to be launched, as well as launching the new ITI search experience for the remaining pages. The reason we can't launch the new information architecture and navigation yet is we need more of the site complete. But we have finished a large chunk of it which we're going to demo for you, as well as the new content subscription feature. If you have any questions throughout, please pop them into the chat or raise your hand and let us know, and we're happy to hear any feedback. Be blunt as possible. The blunter, the better. You won't hurt her feelings. And let us know what you like and what you don't like.

So to begin, what we did was we launched the new search experiences. You see here in this note here for Announcements, Blogs,

---

Acronyms and Terms, Accredited Registrars and Registry Agreements.  
We have launched the New Content Subscription feature.

So I'm going to start with Accredited Registrars. Right here with Accredited Registrars on the existing page that has been replaced, there was no filtered search. So what we've done with ITI is we really implemented this new taxonomy to be able for stakeholders like yourselves to be able to do filter search and get to content more quickly. That type of taxonomy work which involved auditing all of our content, doing this content audit of everything, building this new taxonomy which we didn't have, applying some content governance over it, and being able to do filtered search allows these types of filters to be able to work.

So now, the page that used to be a very static page with just one big long table scroll, in this way you'll be able to search by either the IANA number or the Registrar Name and select your—it's a type ahead so you can type ahead and find the registrar that you're looking for, hit Apply and the search result comes up. You can download your results to a CSV file, which is helpful, but if you want to see all of them, you can see all of them. It automatically uses 20 results here for page upload to make the performance a bit easier. But again, if you wanted to see everything, you could click that button, it would show all registrars. Again, if you wanted to do another search, you would clear your search and enter your results there. So, again, that's part of those improvements that we made to improve search.

---

For Registry Agreements, this was another one we tackled. Keep in mind all of the implementation that we've done has been through feedback with stakeholders. So for a lot of these pages, we worked directly with registry and registrar operators to get their feedback and get requirements in terms of what filters they wanted to see. And then we've been working over the last two years with them, I think about 18 to 30 community leaders throughout the SO/ACs to give us feedback on the pages and features that we were working on and which some of you may have seen on the previous site, things like Board Materials and Public Comment, which are coming soon.

So for Registry Agreements, this one was a big beast, I will say, to tackle just because of the sheer volume of content within this section. There's a little less than 1200 gTLDs so it involves some work in terms of making all that unstructured content structured content. There's about 30,000-ish files and pages on this one.

So for this one, again, it was the same kind of thing of Accredited Registrars. It was just one big, long page table. So with this one, you're able to again filter by the gTLD. If you have looking for an IDN, you can enter in the IDN. So if I was interested in seeing these ones, I could select these too, hit Apply, and my search results happen here. That takes me to then a page here, which provides all the information the U-Label, the Operator, the Agreement Date, and the Agreement Type. And then if I wanted to see the documents within that particular gTLD, I'm able to see the Agreement, I can see the Authorization of Release of Reserved Names, Spec 13, it's all here.

---

It also includes the archived versions of the pages right on the page. There used to be a separate one, but specifically on this page includes the archived versions, which is helpful, obviously, if I wanted to go back and just show you. If one wanted to do it by operator, the same search experience exists. It's a type ahead. So if I were looking for an operator, you could do that.

I mentioned if you were interested in seeing the IDNs—oh sorry. This one, you can search by active or terminated agreements. Again, if I wanted to see all the terminated ones, I could hit Apply, clear my filters. I just wanted to show you for the IDNs. You can actually search by the xn or you could search by—if you had the keyboard for Chinese characters, you could enter that in as well, searchable by both, hit Apply. And on the page it shows you the U-Label and the translation right away. Again, the U-Label, the translation that exists there.

One other feature we wanted to show you is—and this will be part of that improved search that we're going to be implementing—if you want to do keyword search within just Registry Agreements, you could enter a keyword here, and if you just wanted to see keywords just within Registry Agreement so it's a filter of a keyword within that. So if I wanted to see something like .aaa, it creates a chip. You can enter in multiple keywords, hit Search. And it allows you to sort either by relevance, meaning the number of times that instance of that word appears or by the date. And again, we're going to have that across the board, where you can do with filtered keyword search within a document type.

---

So my colleague, Mike, is going to be showing you what that looks like for Announcements and Blogs. But again, it's that kind of taxonomy work in terms of tagging everything that is quite helpful in terms of being able to search for and filter your searches by specific keywords.

Again, because of that taxonomy work, we're able to implement ICANN New Subscriptions, which is new. Before, we only had one for announcements. We expanded it to include you can subscribe to Announcements, Blogs, or Registry Agreements. So let's say you're super interested in any of these three content types are topics, you can subscribe to them. In any time new content is published that's an announcement or a new blog or anything to do with Registry Agreements, you would get alerted by e-mail at the end of the day, so once a day e-mail with links to those new content that has been added to the site. Now, keep in mind, if there was a Registry Agreement page that had multiple updates in a single day, you would only get one link at the end of the day. So obviously, it's not inundating you with tons of e-mails, it's one e-mail a day or one e-mail at the end of the week, or you could subscribe to both weekly or daily, whichever you prefer, and you would get your subscriptions. You would sign up to what you want. It would show you what you're signed up for, and you can unsubscribe if you no longer want to receive it.

Now, as we implement actually more content types to icann.org to replace the existing one, we'll add those new subscriptions. So, for example, when we complete the implementation of Public Comment, you can sign up for Public Comment Alerts, either for individual public comment proceedings or for public comments in general so you could

---

get updated by e-mail when again somebody publishes a new submission or when a new proceeding is published as well.

Does anybody have any questions before I turn it over to my colleague, Mike? Or is there any in the chat which I'm not seeing?

BRUNA SANTOS:

I don't think that there's any questions in the chat. They still have an ongoing discussion about the EPDP Phase 2A. But in case anyone has questions, please just raise your hand or type them on the chat right now. I guess we can hand over to Mike and take questions at the end. Thank you.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

Perfect. Thanks, Bruna.

MIKE TAKAHASHI:

All right. Thank you. I'll share my screen now. Okay. So this is the Announcements. You'll see a similar look and feel in terms of the navigation. We have the subnav here. And then, most importantly, we have these new filters.

So for Announcements, you're able to sort and filter by a Start Date and an End Date or by a Region. Then we also, as Jana mentioned, have that keyword search for just announcements. So, for example, if I just typed in a specific keyword like "ICANN," then you would see all announcements that had the keyword ICANN within it as a keyword search filter.

---

Now, if I go back, we'll show you a little bit about the new layout of an announcement. So, for example, if I click on one right here, we've got a couple of new things. We've got on the right here a widget that shows the three most recent announcements. If you click here, you'll go back to the landing page that we just saw. Advanced Search as well will give you that capability to filter by the different types of dates or by the region.

This is actually the Subscribe button. There's two ways to get to this. As Jana mentioned, you've got the banner which we always have, and then on the right here, you can also subscribe to the content subscriptions that Jana just showed.

A nice feature that we have as well is this "You May Also Like" section at the bottom. And this plays into our taxonomy. So this is another important thing that drives the taxonomy throughout the entire site is that we've got every piece of content tag, so this page has a specific topic for open data, and so you can see right here that other content like it will also appear. This feature is available on Announcements and Blogs as well.

So if I move over to Blogs... Blogs are very similar to announcements but obviously we have authors. So, in addition to Start Date, End Date, and Region, you can also sort by Author. So if I wanted to see, for example, the post by Göran, you click Search, select, and then Apply. Then you'll see all the blogs posted by Göran. So if I select one like this, we'll see that. We've got the blog post.

---

We also have a feature where the authors are clickable cards that show their bio. So if I scroll down to the very bottom here, you'll see for Göran we've got a bio card. And the same for Maarten. Okay. And we also have keyword search as well for blogs.

The last one that we have here is Acronyms and Terms. So this is similar to a lot of the features that we've been showing here. You've got the ability to filter by a specific acronym. So if I typed in IDN, for example, you'll see that the results will immediately show for that particular query. You can also toggle between the different letters. So if I wanted to see everything that started with E, we can.

Everything here is translated, so if I wanted to see the Spanish version, I would click on Spanish. We'll see the translated version in Spanish. I go back to English.

You'll see that we also have a section here for Related Terms. So this will link to any other related terms within Acronyms and Terms, any other supplemental information for the website, as well as the definition. And then if there are other related terms within the definitions, for example, they'll link back to the specific term itself.

Any questions on Announcements, Blogs, or Acronyms and Terms?

BRUNA SANTOS:

Mike, thank you very much for the presentation as well. We have two questions. Actually, one comment from Manju saying that maybe it will be better to post the search filter on the side and not necessarily on the top of the pages.



---

Also, there is one question from Juan asking when will the website be operative but with regards to the whole timeline of the launch insofar? That's it.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

As far as when it will be operative, it already is operative for these ones. So, Mike, if you would go to the homepage and you'll see that those new 38,000 pages that we spoke about have replaced the existing ones. If you click on Announcements within the main navigation, Mike, if you go to News and Media, and you click on Announcements or Blogs, it's already replacing the current content. Same with if you go to Registry Agreements, it's replacing it. So we already replaced it. So it's already been implemented for that 38,000.

As far as the remaining content, obviously we'll be adding more content replacing it throughout the rest of the year. So I hope that addresses your question in terms of operational. So the next one we plan to launch is, obviously, Public Comment, which should be coming out later this year. As the content is finished developing, again, we would just replace the existing one until most of the content has been replaced, and then we're able to launch that new navigation.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you. One additional question, the last one, is whether the website keeps a history of search. That's it.

---

JANA JUGINOVIC: Whether the website keeps a history of search? Can you explain?

BRUNA SANTOS: Like in the data on the words that we have searched on any of these opportunities or bars, how is that part?

JANA JUGINOVIC: That's actually a good question. In Google Analytics, they do track the most searched for words if you're looking for that—and if Mike is pointing to that main search there—Google actually does have and it tells you what words are most searched. It doesn't obviously identify who is searching. It's anonymized data that Google Analytics provides in terms of which terms are most searched. Was that your question? So yes, we do have insights in terms of what people are searching for the most.

You also have data in terms of what pages are visited most. Again, some of it is you can draw conclusions from if something is most visited. It may be because that content is most interesting to the majority of users, or maybe just where it is located within the navigation or the information architecture. So we're making these decisions in terms of what took place because you kind of have to determine whether it's based on because it's a more priority content that people want to actually look for or it's because it's just easier to find.

---

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you. Thank you, Jana and Mike, for the presentation. It is really good to see how the website has improved so far, and I guess it's on behalf of the whole NCSG when we say that. We're looking forward for these features to be implemented for public comments and so forth. So thank you very much for the presentation.

I guess we're moving on to one last agenda item. We're very behind schedule so I'm going to skip the Governance and Participation discussion, just so we can have it on the list. I'm going to directly hand the floor to Ephraim to present on the Cross-Community Working Party on Human Rights. So, Ephraim, you have the floor.

EPHRAIM PERCY KENYANITO: Thank you so much, Bruna. I'm very excited to be here. So I'm going to be very short. We're very much behind the schedule.

The Cross-Community Working Party for most of us here on the call—I can see very familiar names—have been following a bit closely so I'll just give a few updates. Some of you might know that over the last one year, we've been trying to come up with a tool, some metrics to try and map [works into] recommendations against human rights and international human rights. There's a [inaudible], which Stephanie points out, in terms of the people who participates with the same people. And it seems we're getting fatigued. Maybe it's the COVID itself or it's the situation. We're given that different [inaudible] we already worked to a need and the Bylaw is already in place.

---

So the next steps. This is just a call to action that we can have a conversation after this. We'll plan a call after this to just see how to integrate the group and make sure that the group is more active, especially given it seems we are going to be remote for the next foreseeable future. So how do we move forward as a group, and how do we keep monitoring human rights, implications of ICANN policies or processes so that it takes care of everyone's human rights concerns.

I think I'll leave it there so that I can allow for the next items on the agenda and for the next steps. Thank you so much.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you, Ephraim. Thank you for the short intervention. Do we have any questions for Ephraim or about the CCWP on Human Rights? If not, if there's any AOB that members would like to speak on, this is also a good opportunity. We have two minutes left on this call.

In the meantime, I'm just going to highlight that in 30 minutes, we have the GNSO Council session that's starting, so please join just so you can hear to the continuation of some discussions we hosted just now about SSAD, about the ODP, and as well as the EPDP Phase 2A. Other than that, tomorrow we also have a plenary session about Voluntary Registry Commitments. Kathy will be the NCSG representative at this plenary session that's going to be also joined by a lot of other parts of the community like ALAC or IPC and many others.

---

If there isn't anything else, I would like to thank everybody for sticking to this call, for attending it, and also for helping me. Take care, everybody, and please be safe at your home. Hopefully one day or by the beginning or end of this year, beginning of next year, we'll get to see each other again. So, thanks again for joining.

Maryam, I think we can stop the recording and adjourn the call.

MARYAM BAKOSHI:

Thank you so much. Thank you, everyone, for attending the call. The meeting is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**