
ICANN75 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and GNSO Council
Tuesday, September 20, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 KUL

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Welcome, everybody. It's just after 9:00 and it's our pleasure to meet with the GNSO Council to discuss some of the topics of interest that we shared beforehand. It's good to have you here Philippe also in your last week, and smiling as well as being slightly sad, I'm sure.

What we're doing here is addressing a number of questions that have been asked by the GNSO Council. As I understand, you wanted to share with us about your discussions about the PDP tracker, which is one of the ways of improving policy processes, after which we will go to the SSAD and WHOIS question, and then last but not least, we will talk about the question that the Board asked to the GNSO as well as all the other constituencies. The floor is yours.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten. Yes, it's my last week as Chair. If God permits, not my last week ever [laughing] It's a pleasure to be here with you and Board members and councilors. Would like to cover two topics, the first of which is what we call the PDP improvement tracker and the other one which you would be familiar with is the WHOIS disclosure system. On the first, it's probably an all-embracing term that we use to describe the initiatives that council has taken since the strategic planning session we had at the beginning of this term in December, to improve the post approval time of the policy recommendations that we hand over to the Board.

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.

So it covers a variety of initiatives that council has taken, including things that might seem as trivial as the interaction between the Board and Council, and for example the invitation that we sent to have a presentation right after the approval of a final report, we did that for the curative rights for IGOs, and the next Council we will be looking forward to that interaction. And more ambitious items such as trying to improve the backward compatibility of the policies that we develop. ICANN and GNSO is at a point where everything we develop is coming on top of something else and there is a need to try and figure out what are those interactions, and we work on how for example the scoping phase can integrate those reflections to make sure that the two are consistent.

I'm not going to go through all these initiatives as we sort of rated them in terms of complexity, but there is obviously one that is of huge interest to the community, it's the Operational Design Phase and the pilot and how we approached this possibly improve it with regard to the policy development process. We have had over the course of this week a number of discussions on this, not only on the ongoing ODP on SubPro but also the potential side effects, for example of focusing on one particular ODP and resource wise, which is under the remit of the Board, what impact that might have on other activities. So for this in particular, and possibly just as illustration but also to generate some discussion with you, I would like to turn to Thomas to say a bit more on the ODP, the discussion that we had yesterday in particular during our informal session as well as what is planned with the community at large

and in particular, ALAC who we will meet with on Wednesday. Over to you, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks so much, Philippe. Good morning, everybody. This is Thomas Rickert for the record. Thanks so much for the opportunity to introduce this topic to you for discussion. Now, when we discussed this with the Council yesterday, there was huge agreement amongst councilors that the findings of the ODP are important work; however, we also learned that there are plans for a GDS liaison to be a participant of the PDP Working Group while it deliberates and works on consensus positions, and we are of the view that as much work as possible that can inform better decision making by Council as well as the Board, should be done during the phase when the community is at work. Because fixing things after the GNSO Council has come up with consensus recommendations or even worse, at a later stage, causes delays and as we have seen with the SSAD, requires course corrections after the fact, which are difficult to do once we have the community aligned on recommendations, so to alter them is always difficult.

And therefore we would like the Board to consider ways in which we can get as much intelligence as possible during the community work. And we think that the GDS liaison position or the work of the GDS should be sufficiently resourced by the org, and maybe you can help with achieving that so that maybe not in the very early stages of the community work but once we see that the Working Groups converge to consensus and know what the working groups will likely come up with, the org starts fleshing out what that would entail, technically,

organizationally, financially, and timewise to implement the recommendations that will likely be part of the consensus call of the PDP Working Group. And by doing so, maybe even remove the need for having an ODP at a later stage. On top of that, we do not think all ODPs require an ODP in the first place, but doing as much groundwork as possible in the earlier phase will allow for a PDP Working Group which constitutes of the community to course correct recommendations that might be too cumbersome or have negative side effects financially or whatever to other projects at a very early stage.

So in doing so, we would also hope the org is able to sufficiently resource its staff so that implementation efforts can be handled simultaneously for as many recommendations come -- as much policy that comes out of the GNSO as we might have. These policies are not developed overnight, but what we have seen particularly with competing for resources for the SSAD as well as for SubPro can probably be avoided by planning ahead carefully so that all community efforts that turn into consensus recommendations can be dealt with without the need for allocating resources and competing priorities, but handling them simultaneously.

And that is no way to be perceived as criticism for the work our excellent staff is doing at the moment, we know they're doing their best, but they have only so many resources, and I think it is for us jointly to ensure we enable staff to handle the implementation work simultaneously as it gets ready for implementation. So I think that is pretty much it. My colleagues will let me know if there is anything I forgot to cover.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that. So really appreciate also -- we always want to look at how we do the policy process better so implementation is also more automatic. I think at the same time we all know there are no endless resources either and when the resources aren't clear, it's very important that we determine what the resources needed are for the specific solution at hand. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: In response to that, I think as Maarten says, it's very important. And the point you made about trying to look into some of these issues during the PDP and during that work, actually, we are -- I'm currently serving as a liaison from the Board to the IDN EPDP and we are testing out that in that EPDP. So there is a resource now added to the IDN EPDP from staff to look at, to help us raise red flags, like if certain issues might potentially prompt an ODP at a later stage or prompt issues with budget or those kinds of things, that could be raised to the Board earlier and perhaps provide feedback to the PDP Working Group. So I think we hear that, and it's a kind of continuous improvement. The ODP itself, the last couple of them are in themselves an experiment in which we go forward on as well. Just wanted to add that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, interesting idea. It occurs to me though perhaps it's not just a resourcing issue on the side of org but also in terms of community engagement as well, because you're basically taking on much more work on the front end. So how will that play out and how would you ensure that is available as well? Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT: I think you are right, I think it's a joint effort. We spoke a couple of months ago, maybe a year, everything a big bubble in the pandemic, but I think you are right, the community also needs to up its game in order to come up with recommendations that are easier to implement and have the implementation of the recommendations inside, so I think it needs maybe a re-think in the entire life cycle. And we also have the need for potentially doing data impact assessments or Human Rights impact assessments as we move on. We have that in the boiler plate language for charters and for issues reports already but not as formalized as it could be. And the CCOICI is for example working on these types of things as well. So I think if we embed GDS work into the PDP life cycle so that also when we go to Public Comment that we can let the community take a look at a potential implication or the impact on the ecosystem at an early stage and absorb the feedback. It might cause additional work for the community but at the same time will save a ton of time and efforts if we do that earlier. So I think everyone is willing to accept the sacrifice of slight delays if we then can spare

ourselves the requirement to even alter consensus recommendations that have gone through the Council already.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you, I think this is an excellent conversation. And as you know, we do agree because we have added two active GDS liaisons to the PDPs right now and we're always open to have a discussion about how we can help facilitate the discussions within the community. Only one small thing, and I know that you didn't mean – we will never be right sized at the organization, we will always be wrong. Either we will have too much or too little to do. And it's always hard. We went out about three years ago and said there will come a period where we will be understaffed because we saw that coming, started talking about it, started hiring people. Unfortunately, COVID came, didn't make it easy to hire. But we started. And the Board was very gracious and actually gave me permission outside the budget to start hiring people just to make sure we can do that. So we have been in that process.

The problem is not really to hire people to do much work. The problem is you can't fire them when you're doing less PDPs, so you will always have this planning and the importance of what the discussion we're having about prioritization. It should be a natural part of what we do and not a negative discussion in that sense. We want to be sure we come out as soon as possible, but it's been tough, we've had some really big PDPs, the WHOIS we have now done twice, we have the

SubPro, next round, we have 250 review recommendations, some quite big, we have the grant program. we've done a lot of work and right now as I am sort of sorry for, through the implementation we now have a lot of different public consultations. Especially implementation takes an enormous amount of resources from the community as well. So as Matthew says, I'm not as negative. Sometimes it sounds as it is. Because we actually do produce a lot together. There's a lot of things done. But I still think there are things we should be doing together. My staff and myself [inaudible] ready for having those conversations, and thank you for the positive reactions to us.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Philippe. Please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten. And by the way, the previous speaker from Council was Thomas Rickert. And just to build on what Matthew and Göran just said, I think there is wide recognition that the ODP work is necessary, not a question of wasting our time, I think this is clear in the discussions that we have had so far this week and before. As to the -- what would befall to Council, certainly the question of resources is really important, I would add there is also the fact that part of the responsibility is also in the scoping work, the way we make sure that the effort that is required as the elements that are relative to implementation during the PDP work is proportionate. Because we

know we can waste resources by being all embracing and anticipating too much in a way of that work during the policy.

The last thing I would add is and probably that would lead us to the second question, is that timing is everything, to make sure that we don't waste resources, and that -- well, especially for the ODP, the ODA, I should say on the SSAD, there's a need to make sure if we don't want this to have an impact on SubPro, for example, to – I wouldn't say expedite but make sure we proceed as quickly as possible to ensure there aren't people standing and waiting for others to have completed their work. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Philippe for the question on the question two. Can I ask? Becky?

BECKY BURR: Yes, thanks so much, this has all been a very interesting process and the Board has been following the work of the Council's work and the small group's work closely, and also has had a significant amount of discussion about it. We spent a lot of time talking about sort of what does the community see as the value of this system and is there a shared understanding among the community of what the system is and is not? So we think, it's our understanding that the purpose and the potential value of the WHOIS disclosure system which I will call WDS is to simplify the process of submitting access requests to participating registrars and potentially informing consideration of the SSAD policy

itself by collecting usage and outcome information.

One thing we are very interested in knowing is whether the Council agrees with this description, about the value of WDS, do you see additional benefits that we haven't listed here. The other side of that is, it's our understanding that this system is not, it's not a policy, doesn't override the community's policy making decision and it is not implementation of the SSAD policy recommendation. In particular, it doesn't include an accreditation or identity verification, doesn't provide for any kind of automated processing, doesn't provide for third party reviews of misuse of the system, and doesn't allocate costs to requesters or have any kind of billing system built into it. It won't obviously recreate WHOIS as we used to know it and it won't relieve registrars of the obligation under applicable law to possess a lawful basis and therefore to apply a balancing test, nor will it relieve registrars of obligations they have under applicable law regarding trans border data transfers.

The second thing is, we are very interested in the council's view on whether the community has a shared understanding of what the system as proposed is and is not and what it would do. And if the GNSO Council determined that the proposed system with the limitations described above would provide value, the Board is prepared to act on the council's recommendations expeditiously. We do have a couple of things we would like to suggest -- just suggestions, they're not recommendations, just thoughts that we have.

One thing is that there is no question that this will provide data, that the system would provide data. The question is would the data it provides be definitive? Would we continue to argue about it and the like. And it seems that to make the data definitive, we really need widespread use of the system by both registrars and requesters, that seems like a critical feature of this. But this does seem like something that the community could solve rather easily, including in parallel with system development, community could develop a policy, a consensus policy that requires registrars to participate in the system and that permits registrars to require requesters to use that system. One thing that seems worthwhile thinking about.

Also we have been talking a lot about the privacy and proxy service, and it seems like the Council could consider whether the system should incorporate requirements coming out of the PPS AI policy, there are a lot of the same issues that would need to be resolved would come up here, so that does seem like an opportunity. Again, that is something that those details can be worked out in parallel so long as the Council can confirm that it has identified value and that the community understands what the system is or is not.

So the bottom line here is that if the Council determines that the system with the limitations described would provide value, we can move to conclude our consideration of your recommendations expeditiously, and we think there is an important value in moving swiftly to make a decision. We have a little bit of a window, and the sooner there is a decision, should that decision be to move forward, the sooner we can

take advantage window, the less likely the development would negatively impact other development projects, including development projects associated with new gTLD round with SubPro and the like, sorry, that was a long winded answer but I thought we would go through and let you know where the Board is thinking on this.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I have got Kurt Pritz on the line. Kurt, is this on this subject? Please allow Kurt. While we try to connect Kurt, Philippe, reaction from your side?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten and Becky. This is Philippe here. Obviously -- there are probably three questions in terms of how Council intends to be transparent, make sure that the GNSO Council and the community at large understands the remit of what is intended here and there is indeed a question mark on how we can make sure that people are clear on what that system will do and what it won't do, as well as in -- in absolute terms, as well as relative to what was approved, and I think that even procedurally, I wouldn't call it a challenge but certainly a question mark on this and how we do this expeditiously. There's also a recognition that this needs to be not only on the data strictly speaking but also from the lessons that we would learn from that, this initiative to be representative, hence the potential need -- and I am being cautious -- of an incentive for people, for contracted parties to join in and make sure that we get what we want as far as the data is concerned.

The small team met on Saturday, some of the questions or some of the elements to answer the questions were provided by staff on the exact remit of what that proof of concept will be. Council intends to approach this as quickly as possible for the reason you gave, i.e., the need to take a decision including the go-ahead from the Board, I think we are all very conscious of this. It is at this point for the small team to consider and report back to Council, I think we are all confident we can do this as quickly as possible.

I think at this point given that we have only had the information pretty much two days ago, as you would know since you're a member of that team, we won't have answers to that, but what we can say, and I will hand it over to Sebastien to take that forward, is that we are all conscious of the need to do this also for the reason we gave earlier, the timing to do this as quickly as possible. There are concerns as you would understand the side effects of the effort required from GDS on this to other projects, so it's also one -- certainly an element of motivation for the GNSO community to work quickly on this. So with this, I would like to hand it over to Sebastien Ducos to take that over.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Philippe. This is Sebastien Ducos, I would turn on my camera but I tried a bit earlier and my bandwidth is not very good this morning. Thank you, Becky for your question, and I have to say that with full context it makes a lot more sense than the one line question I received yesterday which I was struggling a bit with. So on the positive

side, on what this does, I think I agree with you. I think that I would put a bit more weight on the fact that it does bring to the requestor community an easy access, one-stop shop, it's an easy single point of entry. Because of the fact that they would have to fill in a form, answer specific questions, the guidance there to submit a request hopefully will bring better definition of what they want and why they want it rather than just an urgent email for whatever data they can get their hands on, and I'm characterizing, not saying this is what all registrars [indiscernible] but let's say it is our hope there that it would help that work.

And obviously on the registrar side, the fact that that data comes formatted, in a clean way and somehow pre-vetted for all the elements they require, will be very helpful here. And I used the analogy on Saturday, and was told that was probably not the best analogy, but I'll use it again here. CZDS, the system this is based on in terms of a technical solution, has some elements of that. So CZDS is used by everybody to access zone file data, it wasn't like that before, it's not a pure contractual obligation in the sense that a registry operator can decide to go and share their zone file data on their own independently from the system. But it turns out it works well enough -- nothing perfect in this world, but it does work well enough for everybody to have in the end decided to use it. And in fact, contracted parties that weren't part of the new gTLD also decided to jump on board at a later stage. So if the tool fits the bill, there will be a need for marketing this thing obviously. And speaking now as a contracted party, I know there is interest to ensure that will be what will happen. But yes, those three as

strong points for it.

Now, there is one thing that surfaced last week when we received the document, which I would see as a problem in this regard. And that is that according to the plan that we read last week, the plan would be for the process to verify that the request is made for a domain that is sponsored by a registrar that is participating. And should that gate not be passed, the process doesn't go any further. That wasn't what we had heard in July and August.

This was information that came last week that raised issues. We asked to staff where that was on Saturday, and the question was noted but no answer was provided immediately. That I would see as a problem. In the sense that there is a way for this system to be useful also for registrars that decide not to use it, in the sense that once a request has been flagged, an email is sent to the registrar saying hey, now there is a request for data that has been made, and I could understand that a warning from the system to the registrar cannot send all the data via email, and particularly the personal data of the requestor, but we could find, I believe, a way to formulate that warning in a way that gives enough information, particularly the domain name I would suggest, to the registrar to then fall back on existing policy, and registrars have an obligation to respond to requests. It says nowhere that it needs to be a request that is directly formulated to them. Some registrars prefer receiving those requests not through email but through one of their formulas, and that is all fair and good. But if the system was able to raise a request to a registrar in a clear enough fashion, I would believe that

the registrar would have to answer.

Now, again, I'm not developing policy here on the fly, it's not my job, but I think on that point it would make the tool more useful. And then I'm sorry, there is a lot of chat, I am completely unable to follow two things at the same time. So I hope that answers your question on the policy side and to make it shorter on the negative, I think you have listed all the elements that we have noted too. I didn't pick up anything that was missing. In any case, staff in their paper provided a thorough table of their comparison, and we will go as a small team through that table to be sure it reflects our point of view too. But from my initial read of it, it was thorough and quite explicit in what it did and didn't do compared to the SSAD. I hope that answers the question.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think as well as it could be at this moment. I see Göran's hand up and after that, checking with Kurt whether he is on this topic or otherwise.

GÖRAN MARBY: Actually, Kurt has been waiting for a long time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If you were unable to hear Kurt, I was here remotely, and he was definitely on the previous topic and was suggesting to take it afterwards.

KURT PRITZ: It was on the previous topic so if we have a minute afterwards, I think it's a good proposal Thomas made. But let's carry on with this discussion.

GÖRAN MARBY: So first of all from org and staff, I really want to say thank you for the cooperation we have had with the GNSO small group. This has been a very unusual way of doing it, and it's been a really good experiment from our side, so we would like to compliment and thank everybody in that group for graciously letting us take the time and really have good conversations. If I had stars to give out, I would give one.

So just a small comment. The discussion about the functionality you have discussed, Sebastien -- yes, we can do things like that and that is really if the requestor makes a request and the registrar is not in the system, we can always work that out but not in this timeline, and not for that money. And then you ask, how much longer will you take? We don't know the answer to that. We know it's going to be more complex but we haven't gone in and said this is like one month, two months or a half million or \$100,000. We haven't done that. The only thing we can say really is that it will be complex and it will take a longer time. But if that would be something that you really want us to look into, we can look into that. That of course will take time to do that. So of course it delays everything, so that's why my team is a little bit reluctant on saying -- you all know this and one of the good things with the small group is that a lot of them have knowledge about how to build data systems. But we are not the decision maker here, you are the decision maker in it.

The second thing I want to say is something about timing and prioritization. As Becky alluded to, we have right now in our planning process the unique ability -- and I don't want to put the Board and GNSO Council in a situation to be forced to make a decision. But resources are resources. We had said we need three months start up here, because you know that my staff is doing a lot of stuff right now, so we take three months to start the project, might be two months, something shorter, but it's about three months and then we say it's going to take, to deliver the system out to the world, nine months, which is a short period of time. If we get a decision fairly soon, we can start and as we see right now, that would not impact some of the major projects coming down the road. It will have an effect on some of the things we do in [ITP] and will always have an effect, but as we see it right now, it won't have an effect for instance on the next round, SubPro, development on that, and timing. It won't have a real effect on the grant giving program. But here we are, and this is what makes it so complicated.

So if we wait, we can't delay the other processes, because that's important. I mean the first discussion we had this morning was when the community has done something, you want to get it started. So we're in this Catch 22 together, and I really don't want to pressure anything and anyone in this one, but honestly, if the Board and the GNSO agrees to do something, we cannot wait too long because then it will have an effect. And I am sorry but you asked me the question, how it will affect. And we said right now if you make a decision, we could start doing it

without having a major effect on the community-led initiatives but if we wait, I have to come back and ask the question, which community-led initiatives do you want us to prioritize?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, and I think we are clearly coming to a joint conclusion that more work needs to be done. In the first place by the GNSO, and we look forwarding to working proceeding expeditiously and hearing from the GNSO, and we stand ready to consider soon how to do it and the early engagement by both the GDS team and also the Board [has a liaison and the work of the small group is recognized in this.]

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten. Yes, we appreciate on the council side and recognize the importance of being clear on what is expected here, as well as the unambiguous response from Council on the need for this as well as the conditions for this. And to pick up on what Göran just said, what we're doing here is something new, as well as for other topics as well like Closed Generics, and I will take this opportunity to thank the Board for getting involved. We know it's a lot of effort from your side as well.

And I think from Council's perspective as well, although that is somewhat innovative practice, there is a fine line and we want this to be robust in terms of policy development, and I think we are robust at this point and we will keep going this way. Thank you, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Good discussion, and I think clarity on where we stand on this right now. With that, Kurt, thank you for your patience. I understand you come in on the PDP improvement tracker.

KURT PRITZ: But I think that's okay. Let's go on, we have 15 minutes left for the last item. I would encourage continued conversation about Thomas' recommendations. It's not necessarily about more work but rearranging the work so we're more efficient in our investigation of the ODP to date. So I encourage us to continue thinking about that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Very much appreciate that and we all agree on that, continuous improvement is important, we want to do this better and better together, learning from what we do and what we experience. So with that, thank you for also considering our question. Because we are really truly very open towards constantly improving the collaborative actions as well. So what can we do together to further progress achieving our strategic priorities? And with that, the intent is not to look at the issues directly in the face of us but also how we take that further towards the longer term perspective.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Maarten. This is Philippe here. And we appreciate that this third question is something that is pretty much systematic and put forward to each and every member of the community. It's always a question which is a bit to some extent difficult to answer by the GNSO. Difficult not because we don't have an answer or elements to this but because we have so many that would need the strategic objectives, priorities of the Board. Obviously what we do on SubPro what we just talked about on the SSAD, the elements relative to the interaction between the Board and Council, Council and staff, all of this is part of your strategic priorities. And in particular, the need for cross community discussions, I think that is something that is important for those priorities.

I think though over the last four to five years, and more recently, we have tried to be inclusive in the way we approach policy making, hopefully, in terms of communication. And I'm thinking of other SOs, certainly. We very much appreciate the dialogue that we're having with our GAC colleagues, not only on the soon to be dialogue on Closed Generics but more generally all councilmembers have attempted to even go beyond what we traditionally do, i.e., procedure, which is the strict remit of Council but also try and convey substantial elements of information for members of the GAC, I'm thinking of the meetings that we have had over the last two, three, years. Inasmuch as we can say something about it, bearing in mind it's the prerogatives of the Working Groups. But all these things we would consider would fall under the strategic priorities elements. So with this just as intro, I will hand it over to my colleagues to build on this, but those are the initial elements that

I can offer. Again, this is so linked with what we do on a day-to-day basis, it's a bit challenging to address this as a question. Thank you. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Philippe.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you. Matthew Shears, for the transcript. This isn't a one-time question as you said and I think it takes on additional importance because we are going to open up the planning for the next strategic plan in the next calendar year. So perhaps take the question away and think about it more broadly as well. Because what we are going to be doing is asking for how can we as a whole, as an ecosystem, work more collaborative across and achieving strategic priorities but also in other areas. So I think it's something we need to constantly remind ourselves about and ask that question. So that is something that will be coming back as a part of that planning process. Just wanted to add that on. Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that. Any more remarks on the Council's side? So let me agree very much that we constantly do indeed try to improve, as you said, and the appreciation I already expressed when we started this of early engagement with GAC, with ALAC and others, even the small group that doesn't exist of only GNSO members but also outside, to

have the process informed as well as possible from the different perspectives should be ultimately a way where we are able to expedite things in a responsible way together. So I see that as important indeed and appreciate it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Maarten, and thank you, Matthew. This is Philippe here. To your question, certainly, we will get back to you with the elements that are specific to probably to next year building up from what we did this year. I think one -- it has been alluded to by Göran, I think one of the changes between those two years or what we used to do two years ago is indeed the flexibility that we're trying to put into the way we work. We refer to staff being more thoroughly involved in small teams. We refer to the interplay between the post approval period of policy recommendations and the work of the Working Group.

I think we're trying to find -- well, to draw a fine line there without being all over the place and doing policy when not meant to be developed and vice versa, it is something that the GNSO community is keen on keeping, if only for transparency and understanding the process and yet trying to find the flexibility, so a balance to strike there. And I think this sort of flexibility is clear for this new plan, and again, coming back to your question, yes, we will come back to you, just wanted to offer an additional few thoughts.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much for that. I don't see other hands raised at this moment. So thanks, I think, for an intense and good discussion. It's clear that work needs to be done, and it's now also clear that -- yeah, we really look forward to helping as much as we can, but it is up to the GNSO for all clarity now to come back for a clear ask on how to move forward on the WHOIS, upon which we stand ready to consider that very, very swiftly as Göran indicated, and this is also the time slot that the big availability needed for SubPro development, isn't there yet, so there is a window of opportunity in terms much getting things progressed swiftly.

So having that said, thanks all for the excellent work. Also, I think one could say that the work for the small group is at least informing things swiftly, and we look forward to having the final word on that. As for the PDP improvement tracker, thank you for continuously investing in making things better and more visible, more transparent in that way as well so a good track can be kept. And with that, as Göran said, whenever needed, the org does stand ready to provide more assistance, within reason, within a certain time, and let's benefit from that as well. So with that, thank you all. And this meeting is closed. Final word?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten, I just want to thank the Board members and you for the very, very constructive discussion that we just had and it has been a pleasure.

JEFF NEUMAN: This is Philippe's last meeting. I just wanted to thank him and give public recognition for his job for the last several years. That is all. Just appreciation.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Very much agreed.

[applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]