
ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – ccNSO: Retirement of ccTLDs PDP Working Group
Thursday, October 15, 2020 – 16:00 to 17:00 CEST

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you and welcome to today’s CCPDP Retirement Working Group session at ICANN69. My name is Kimberly Carlson. Along with Kathy Schnitt, we will be your remote participation managers for this session.

As a reminder to all, this call is being recorded and recordings will be posted on the ICANN69 website shortly after the call ends. If at any point you have a question or comment, please use the Q&A pod found at the bottom of the Zoom window. If time permits, we will also take questions and comments from chat. However, the questions and comments must be formatted in the way you see on the screen. Additionally, you can ask verbal questions using the raise hand icon found at the bottom of your screen. You will then automatically be placed into the speaker’s queue. Once called on, our techs will engage your microphone, at which time you can unmute your line.

And finally, this session like all other ICANN activities is governed under the ICANN standards of behavior.

With that, I would like to hand the floor over to Eberhard Lisse.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Actually, I’m here.

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.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Okay. Stephen Deerhake, thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Stephen, can you hear us?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, I can finally.

EBERHARD LISSE: Thank you so much that I don't have to do it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, you're most welcome. Both my machines decided it was a really opportune time to reboot in the last 15 minutes. So it's been a bit of a scramble.

I want to thank everyone for participating, both members and observers. I want to thank Kimberly for her introduction. I do have one apology from Nigel Roberts who is fulfilling his Board member responsibilities and sitting in on some other SO/AC Board session, the details of which I do not know but there you go. I am not aware of any other apologies. Perhaps, Kimberly, you are.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: I haven't received anything formal.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Okay, so we'll deal with that. Attendance will be taken in the usual manner. Kimberly, has introduced this call so I don't have to do that myself.

There are two major parts for today's call, one which will be familiar to working group members which is a quick run through, again, on the proposed policy for the retirement process and the second part which will be handled by our able staff member, Bart, who is our issues manager for the working group, is with respect to the carve out of the proposed retirement policy from the formal CCPDP3 [charter]. So that's where we're going to go.

So, if you can skip to the general trigger events slide. There you go, thank you.

So, this is a review for everyone. Just went out to public comment. We got public comments back. I think there were 14 or so. Went through them. No substantive changes but I just want to run this through really quickly for both the group and for the record and for those observers that we may have on the call, given that this is supposed to be a public face-to-face meeting.

Consensus of course was that the trigger event for retirement process is to remove all of the two-letter codes from the list of country names in ISO C3166-1.

This is all about the work of the maintenance agency responsible for the ISO 3166-1 code book. This has nothing really to do with ccTLDs, per se. It's just if the underlying code points gets removed, then it fires

off a trigger event and it reinforces the principle that has been since RFC 1591 that the IANA is not in the business of determining what is and what is not a country or a territory. We leave that up to the maintenance agency and we react to the activities of the maintenance agency. So, Kimberly, next slide, please.

We do have this oddball case where we have what's known within the maintenance list as exceptionally reserved. There are a bunch that are actually exceptionally reserved, but at the end of the day, there are only four on that list that actually have CCs allocated to them and that's .eu, .su, .ac. and .uk.

The question is whether or not, from our policy standpoint, a trigger then occurs if the maintenance agency changes the status of a two-letter code in their exceptionally reserved list.

The policy, as written, suggests then that the IFO can consider the change requires retirement. If the maintenance agency makes a change, then the ISO has the option to consider their change and they can opt to retire it, and if so then the standard will apply.

Again, if in fact the IFO opts to exercise a retirement process for an exceptionally reserved code whose status has changed by the maintenance agency, their decision will be up for consideration under the review mechanism which is under development by our companion working group. So next slide, please.

We also have the issue of the IDN ccTLDs. Fortunately, for us, it's not being considered by us, really. It's being handled by the newly formed

CCPDP4 group, but at the end of the day, once retirement of an IDN ccTLDs, which has never happened yet, is triggered, as defined under our PDP, then the retirement process described here will apply to them. So that's how we're going to handle those going forward, but the actual trigger events for retirement of the IDN stuff is left up to the PDP4 Working Group. Next slide, please.

With regards to the [inaudible] process of removal of a ccTLD from the root zone, as you can see the working group consensus was it's got to be removed subject to the time and considerations within the policy, once it's removed from the 3166-1 list by the maintenance agency.

As you can see there, the rationale is very simple, that we're trying to maintain coherency between the list of country names and 3166-1 and what's in the root. Also acknowledging that the maintenance agency needs to be in a position to assign a two-letter code that was previously assigned to a new country if it needs to or a subdivision, etc. And we can see the example there regarding .cs. So that's where we stand with that. I don't think there's anything controversial. Next slide, please.

Okay. With regards of the retirement process's duration, it's triggered by maintenance agency action with regards to the ISO list and then the actual process insofar as our policy is concerned begins with a notification from the PTI, the IANA function operator at the moment, to the ccTLD manager that you've got ... There's been a change with regards to your underlying two-letter code status in the ISO list and therefore we're [inaudible] process, retirement process up.

We stipulated as a working group that the process ends as specified time when the retirement plan for the ccTLD corresponding to that country code in the maintenance agency’s ISO list is executed.

We also recognize that our policy, the removal of a ccTLD, is actually at the end of the day an administrative and operational process carried out by the IANA function operator and does not need specific clarification within the policy document. And we therefore exclude its removal from the other ccTLD from the DNS root as part of the policy. Next slide, please, Kimberly.

So, as we discussed and agreed to, had public comment the basic duration as stipulated in our proposed policy is five years and that is going to be the case if no other arrangement is made between the ccTLD operator and the IANA function operator.

Based on our discussions, we decided that three to four years appeared to be too short. We saw in a review of a historical record that date extensions had been requested and had been granted. A working group decided that five years is reasonable. We acknowledge that it could be shorter if the ccTLD manager and the IANA function operator—in this case, PTI at the moment—agreed that that makes sense.

So, that leads us to our next question that we looked at. Next slide, please, Kimberly which is the absolute maximum duration and working group came to the conclusion that that should be no longer than ten years and we basically came up with language to extend the five year to a maximum of ten-year assuming that there is some sort of

voluntary arrangement/agreement between the ccTLD manager involved with the ccTLD and the IANA function operator. And that requires a rather formal retirement plan.

Retirement plan is optional, if in fact there is no request from the part of a ccTLD manager that's responsible for a ccTLD that is subject to retirement. If they think they can do it in five years, they don't need to put up a retirement plan. But if they want an extension, then they will need to do so.

And as you can see from the slide, there's no hard and fast rule as to whether it's five years or it's automatically ten years. It could be six, seven, eight, whatever they sort out in their mutually agreed-to retirement plan.

So that's where we stand basically with the policy, per se. Next slide, please, Kimberly.

This is what it looks like. If you go down, you can see the trigger event at the top. Notice the retirement after the trigger event at the removal of the country code from the ISO table.

If you go down the left-hand side, you can see negotiation between the IANA function operator and the ccTLD with regards to a retirement plan, with regards to an extension of the retirement timeframe, with regards to the execution and conclusion of the plan, whereas if you go down the right-hand side with no arrangement, no negotiation, etc. It's a maximum of five years with removal of the TLD out of the root zone. So, next slide, please.

So, as I stated previously, if the ccTLD operator does not feel there is a need to extend the retirement timeframe of five years, then a retirement plan is optional.

The working group determined that all the registration policies and management of domain names is clearly out of scope for the policy and so we left that out, and as you can also see in the slide, we did an extension up to ten years if the ccTLD feels it needs it and can come in to some sort of cooperative agreement with the IANA function operator.

And we've got an annex to the policy which helps the ccTLD manager and the IANA function operator define requirements under this retirement plan. Next slide, please.

So, again, a reminder to the community and to the working group, although you guys know it but to the broader community who might be participating today that this policy is really directed at ICANN and the IANA function operator, currently PTI. It's not suggested in any way that it amends the way that ICANN Org interacts with the IANA function operator, who at the moment, is PTI but may not be. Ten years down the road, who knows?

It does not change the role of the ICANN Board. With respect to their making decisions with regards to what they've always been making decisions on with ccTLDs, with respect to the delegation and [inaudible], only removal of the ccTLDs from the root zone. So, next slide, please, Kimberly. Thank you.

Another issue we looked at was the applicability of the policy and does it apply to all ccTLDs? At the end of the discussion, it is determined that, yeah, there's no existing policy on retirement with regards to ccTLDs.

This applies to per longstanding ccTLD, ccNSO standing. If a ccTLD is a member of the ccNSO, then it does apply to them. If they're not a member, it provides guidance to the IANA function operators to how they may proceed, and hopefully they will adhere to it and solicit the cooperation of the non-ccNSO top-level domain member who under circumstances beyond their control is having an issue with the maintenance agency. So that's where we stand with that.

It should be noted again that this policy is directed at ICANN and is in the scope of Annex C of the bylaws. Next slide, please.

So, we did a lot of stress testing with this policy—16, 17. We had I think 17 now because we had another one recommended to us.

And the stress testing really involved really oddball, what we call, corner case situations to see, hey, if this really oddball thing happens, what's the outcome under the policy and is that an outcome that makes sense or not?

We went back during the course of doing this and adjusted a few things here and there, but by and large, it's come out okay on the backend. So we do not see any need to really do any adjustment to the policy proposals based on the stress testing. And that's also as a result of suggestions from the public comments. Next slide, please.

And as you can see, we did receive some comments during our public comment period, and as I previously stated, no need to address the proposed policy as it was written and presented to the community.

We determined in reviewing the comments received, and we did with all due respect, and I thank everyone in the community for submitting comments. Comments were addressed, included in the stress test, and we had a couple that really were not relevant to the ccTLD environment which were out of scope of our remit.

We will address the comments firmly giving our responses in the final paper which will be coming out in a bit. But at the end of the day, the working group did not see a need to address the policy proposals based on stress testing and the public comments received. Next slide, please.

So, here is a question which I asked actually the last time I guess we got to meet with regards to the temperature of the room and the level of support for the proposed retirement process. This I guess is where Kimberly gets to run the poll. The question of course is: do you support the policy proposals based on the retirement process? It looks like that's up for you guys to click on. Kimberly, as presenter, I will abstain from answering.

KIMBERLY CARLSON:

I'll give it another couple of seconds as there are a lot of observers on here and not everybody will want to vote.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's cool. That's fine. We got time. I want to give Bart the last half so he can go through the carve-out.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Okay, it looks like the voting has slowed down. I'll go ahead and show the results.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Do I do that or do you do that? You must do that. Yes. Okay, thank you. The 7% that said no, I'd be curious to know why. If you want to raise hands, I'll take a couple of questions on that topic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a webinar. They can't raise hands. They must paste into the chat.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh. Okay, can you paste into chat? And where does it go, chat or Q&A? No open questions from Q&A.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Stephen, the 7% represents just one person.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Ah, okay. All right. Speak or forever hold your peace.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe that person wants to speak up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Do we have a hand? No? Going once, going twice. If you have concerns, by all means, throw it in the chat. I'm just curious on that.

All right. With that, I'm not seeing anything. I'm going to close this out. Can we have the next slide, please?

Okay, the second half of our conversation today revolves around the recently proposed idea of carving out the proposed retirement policy which I've just discussed with you from the overall mandate charter of the CCPDP3 Working Group.

As originally constituted, there were two parts that were planned to come out together, which is the retirement policy document which we've just reviewed again and review mechanism document which is under development.

It has been proposed—thank you, Kimberly—that we separate out the retirement document just discussed and the review mechanism and split this into two CCPDP subsets, 3a and 3b.

At this point, I'm going to turn over the discussion to our able issues manager, Bart, and let him carry on the remainder of the discussion until we get back to AOB. So, Bart, the floor is yours, sir. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Stephen. Kim, can you go to the next slide please. So, in order to understand probably and to illustrate the need to or the

proposal to separate, I want to go back first to say the original issue report and why the two were combined in the first place.

So, it started with a question. Originally it was very clear there needed to be a policy on the retirement of ccTLDs that was—and the need for that policy was identified by a previous working group and the council also decided, at one point, that needed to take place and under a policy development process there is no policy.

A second issue that was identified was the need for a review mechanism and some of you will be aware of the, say, part two of this PDP. That's the development of the review mechanism. And at the time, it came to the floor again with the discussions around the IANA stewardship transition.

One of the proposals which has now been—is still worked on—is the IRP (the independent review process) and, at the time, it was proposed to include all the decisions relating to delegation, etc.

I would say a lot of the ccTLDs were not very happy with the inclusion and they identified the need to develop a policy in this area. This also goes back to, say, one of them main documents—say, RFC 5091—where it was identified there needed to be an independent review panel relating to decisions IANA has made.

So, this came together in 2016-2017 with a request of the council and the question of the council whether or not to combine the two in one PDP. And the reason for combining is that a review mechanism should

apply to retirement but it was not policy for retirement, and so what should go first?

So, it was, say, the review mechanism was identified as a high priority and the retirement as well. There was a whole discussion, not just by the council but with the broader community about how to combine this. Should this be run as two separate PDPs? Should it be one PDP or two sequential working groups? Start with the review mechanism or start with retirement? Do one PDP or two parallel working groups or two PDPs and run them in parallel? It's almost the same as doing one PDP with two parallel working groups. Next slide, please, Kim.

So, at the end and after an extensive discussion, it was agreed that the review mechanism and the retirement topic should be combined under one PDP.

And the reasons for doing this is to avoid one major complication which would mean either to revisit the review mechanism or the retirement working group, if one policy was concluded before the next one. So that would more or less strike out having two PDPs.

The other reasons were less, I would say, important but still did contribute to [inaudible] is the availability of people to run two parallel PDPs. If you look at the number of volunteers needed, etc., it would put a high burden on the ccTLDs to participate into full-blown PDPs at the same time and looking at the same type of people.

Another reason for combining was that the total duration of the processes would be more limited and it would reduce the duration of, I would say, the formal decision making.

Once you've reached—and the understanding was that parts of the processes could be done in parallel, so once you have a public comment period, for example, as is currently or that was currently the case, the other working group could start developing the policy, etc., as what we're doing right now.

And at the end, it would reduce the burden on the council, and more importantly, on the members and the duration of the decision making. The members and the council will just have to take one decision on the total package.

So, these were the reasons at the time for combining and the idea was to do the retirement first because that would create the basis for the review mechanism. Next slide, please.

So, if you look at the current status, the retirement policy, as you could have seen, as Stephen just showed you, is done. So, it's completed and it's ready to go into its final decision-making phase. So, seek council and member support for the proposals.

The review mechanism has started somewhere in April but, however, the expectation is that it will take at least another nine months, although they made considerable process but that's due to, for example, at least one comment period which will take about 90 days. So the cc period and the review of these comments as well.

So, before the—and then afterwards the working group will then revisit the proposed policy again.

Now I'm getting to the major argument to propose a separation, so to carve out. If you look at the way the retirement process has been designed, it is proposing instances where the review mechanism should apply, and effectively there are two.

So, there is no real interdependency anymore between the retirement process and the review mechanism, like there is no real interdependency between the review mechanism and other policy documentation. Next slide, please.

So, the proposal is to separate the part one and part two of the CCPDP3. What does it mean? It requests the council to initiate a process of carve-out which effectively means a public comment period where the community is asked whether such a change is supported, and say the issue manager has to do this at the instigation of the council.

And if supported, then the final paper of the retirement working group is to be considered the final report of the retirement process and it will be submitted to the council and to the members to support the retirement process.

And if, say, in a most optimistic schedule, the retirement process policy could be voted upon by the members or at ICANN70. So that's somewhere in March next year. Next slide, please.

So, before taking the temperature of the room and handing it back to Stephen, first is are there any questions or comments on this carve-out or this principle of carve-out?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm not seeing any. Are you?

BART BOSWINKEL: No.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Anything in chat? Nothing in chat. No questions from anyone then on this.

BART BOSWINKEL: If there are no questions, before you do the next call, I just wanted to highlight one comment. There is one person who cast a no vote in the previous temperature of the room and states it was an error. So, the good news is everybody on this webinar was in support of the proposed policy. So now we can go to the next polling around the carve-out.

So, the question is in front of you. Stephen, will you take it from here?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. I appreciate it. Thank you, Kimberly, for getting the poll out. I will abstain. I will give it a couple of minutes for everyone

involved to weigh in on this proposal, that we separate out the retirement portion of the working group charter and push the nearly completed—well, essentially completed—document forward for consideration by the community and by the council before taking it up to the Board, hopefully. So, please weigh in on that if you would. Kim let me know how things are going.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: We'll give it another couple of minutes—maybe a minute—just so we have the same number of votes for the last poll.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah. I trust your judgment on that. I leave it up to you to sort out when to pull the plug.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Okay, we're at the same threshold at the last poll, so I'll go ahead and end the poll right now.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, great. And let me know when we get results published here in front of us. Okay. We seem to have a high level of support for the carve-out and I thank everybody for that. I do believe it's the way to go forward. If nothing else, it will stop us from continued bud of jokes on the ICANN Board with regards to how long it takes us to develop policy.

I do see again we have a no vote of 7%. If anyone wants to express their displeasure with this idea or just wants to be anonymously contrarian, that's your right as well. But if you wish to speak out, please raise your hand or put something in the chat. I'm not seeing anything--

BART BOSWINKEL: Leonid has his hand up, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Wait, who does now?

BART BOSWINKEL: Leonid has his hand up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Why do I not see him on my list of participants?

BART BOSWINKEL: Because you're looking at the panelists, not at the attendees.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: You're right.

LEONID TODOROV:

Hi, this Leonid for the record. Well, first of all, thank you very much. That was a very impressive work done to date which I tried to follow to actually share with my membership.

It was I actually who didn't support this carving out and the only reason is that, I mean, I can understand the rationale for that. Still, I'm concerned that these PDP working groups, they are just multiplying. Sorry for that analogy, like coronavirus, they're spreading like the coronavirus. It's really hard to actually follow all these tracks.

I believe that yet another challenge the community is facing is that it will be increasingly hard to attract more people to volunteer their time and effort to these multiple groups. So I thought of some concentration rather than separation of these activities. So that's why I thought that it would be probably not so much rational to separate these work streams. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Leonid. Actually, what we're trying to do here is to simplify things a bit by wrapping up the retirement document and the working group associated with producing that policy and shutting it down sooner rather than later. So I believe, in that respect, we are working in the direction that you would like to see us go which is fewer rather than more. Please correct me if I misinterpret what you're stating there.

But one of the intentions of this approach is to simply wrap this up. It's done. There's no need to involve continued ICANN staff support and

expense on supporting a working group that's basically dormant because its work is complete. And if its work is complete, I'd like to push it forward out of the working group and to its next destination.

That's my view on that. Please correct me if I misinterpreted anything you've said, sir.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Eberhard's hand is up. Eberhard first and then Patricia.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Leonid, to put this in a short sentence it's either we have ... There is nothing on the horizon, but either we have if something were to come up, we have a retirement without a policy or we have [inaudible] but without a finalized mechanism for appeal. That's basically the two options we have.

Like Stephen says, since the work is done, it may make sense to push it forward to the community, and if the community agrees, vote on it and make it become policy, at the previous retirements were made w other policy at all and in one or two instances cost a little bit of grief with the participating parties. So maybe it really makes sense from where I'm standing to say it's better to have a policy without an appeal mechanism as no policy and no appeal mechanism.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Patricio?

PATRICIO: Yeah. I agree with what Stephen said and also Eberhard. Leonid, this goes exactly in the direction you like it to go, in the sense that this work is already done, there is no point in keeping it alive. Better to finish it, so there will be fewer groups to keep track of. I think that's what you want.

So, if you've misunderstood the intention before, perhaps you should consider if you would like to change your vote.

BART BOSWINKEL: Leonid, you want to respond?

LEONID TODOROV: Oh yes, thank you very much. Now it's getting clear—I mean, more clear. Thank you for these explanations. My only concern is that policy without [inaudible] mechanism would also stir some concerns but obviously outside of ccNSO and make this a problem quite politicized in the eyes of some other stakeholders. But that's a different story, I believe.

But thanks very much for the explanation. Indeed, I missed some bits because of my poor connectivity, but now it's just clear for me. Thank you.

So, I recall my negative vote. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I'm happy to be part of the team here that convinced you to withdraw that so we have unanimity. Thank you, sir.

BART BOSWINKEL: One more argument and then we go into the next slide. So, one more argument of doing this is if we wait too long with, say, asking and going into the decision-making process around the policy, people will have forgotten what this policy was about. So you ask them to take a decision on something that is not on the top of their head. And I think that's even worse than waiting or that's probably a very bad outcome. So, that's another reason for asking. So now it's done to go into the decision-making phase, rather sooner than wait until the review mechanism is completed.

So, Stephen, let's go to the next slide, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes. Patricio, I assume that's an old hand.

PATRICIO: Yes, it is.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you, sir.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, thanks for the support for the carve-out.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: So you understand the next steps is the working group will finalize its paper on the retirement process. I think that will be done fairly quickly. The working group chairs will then submit it to the and send it to the issue manager and who will then—and that will probably be done in parallel—request the council to carve-out the retirement proposals. And if council agrees, I'll as the issue manager, launch a public comment on the final proposals combined with the carve-out and stick to the minimum period of 40 days. So that will take us into early next year. And once it's clear that the carve-out is broadly supported but I think this work—say, your sense is already a good one—then we'll go into the formal decision making. That is the council, need for council support, and a ccNSO members vote which hopefully be around ICANN70.

So, these are the next steps you can expect with respect to the retirement process. Back to you, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. I want to thank everyone for their support on this proposal to do this carve-out. I think it is the proper way to go forward

and get one less working group going, continuing, etc., because goodness knows there's enough going on at ICANN with regards to community involvement, so if we can actually wind something down, I think it's a good thing and I thank you guys for agreeing.

I think, Bart, that's about it. We have a timetable. We would like to get a final report out around ICANN70, as Bart just stated. And I think we can do that.

We will continue to push forward on the review mechanism. We're getting the point where [inaudible] beginning to [put] the paper so we'll have some actual words to kick around which will be good in that group going forward.

I think that wraps it up for this part of the meeting, unless I'm mistaken, Bart. Is there anything—

BART BOSWINKEL: No, this it. So I hope it was at least informational.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I hope it was, too. Thank you. Kimberly, if you could put the agenda up, then. Thank you, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: There is no AOB, maybe.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yeah, [inaudible] AOB in next meeting but next meeting is really up in the air. We may well be done unless we have one more meeting to break out the champagne.

Is there any other business, then, from anyone? Any concerns, questions, comments from both members and observers, given that we're a virtual face-to-face meeting? I have to switch between panelists and attendees, apparently.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Stephen, no hands are raised.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I don't see any either. Wow, that being the case, I suggest we adjourn the meeting, stop the recording. Thank you, Kimberly. Thank you, ICANN staff, whoever is there also working behind the curtains. I wish everyone a great rest of their day. Stay safe and enjoy the rest of ICANN69. Thank you very much, all, for participating. Thank you, Kimberly. Thank you, Bart. We're good.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]