ICANN76 | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and GNSO Council
Tuesday, March 14, 2023 – 09:00 to 10:00 CUN

WENDY PROFIT: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the joint session of the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council. This session is a discussion between the GNSO Council members and the ICANN Board, and we will not be taking questions from the room. Attendees are welcome to chat among themselves. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. And please note that the chat sessions are being archived and are governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Lastly, a reminder to the speakers, please state your name for the record every time you speak, and please speak slowly and clearly for our scribes and interpreters. And with that, I hand it over to the chair of the ICANN Board, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wendy. Welcome, everyone. And thank you, John and Greg, in particular, for putting this meeting together, for joining us in this conversation. We've been absolutely quite delighted with the progress that we've made, in particular, on SubPro, and things just seem to be moving along very nicely. I know we have a set of questions that are going back and forth, but if you don't mind, I would like to turn it over to Becky, who will go over the discussions we had yesterday when we met, the four of us. So, Becky, if you could go over the four items.

BECKY BURR: Thank you, everybody. This is Becky Burr, for the record. As Tripti said, we've been working hard and working closely with everybody in the community to move forward. And we have identified four key things that need to happen before we can set a launch date—it's information that is required by Org to prepare a timeline and plan for the Board's consideration.

So, what we have discussed doing is asking various parts of the community to come up with plans and timelines to provide them to us by the end of ICANN 77. And thereafter, that information would go to Org to prepare a compiled plan and timeline for the Board's acceptance after that.

The four conditions, just to be clear, because I think it's important that everybody understand this is a significant undertaking. It's going to require a lot of time and resources from all of us, from the Board, from Org, and from various parts of the community. So, I just want to go over in carefully the four parts.

So, the first thing is that the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council have to agree on a plan and a timeline, and then start work for consideration and resolution of the 38 pending recommendations. We have already begun talking about, I know the Council has already begun talking about how they want to interface with the Board. The Board is working on that, but we need a plan and timeline. That is not to say that by ICANN 77 we must resolve all 38 of those, but we need a plan and a timeline and a commitment to get that done.

We also think that ICANN Org and the GNSO Council need to talk about and agree on a working methodology to expedite the policy implementation work, considering the applicable implementation review team guidelines and the consensus policy implementation framework prior to the start of the IRT. And then ICANN Org and the IRT need to agree on a work plan and implementation timeline.

So, this is a very collaborative effort, but we understand in order to get this done in a timely way, we are going to have to expedite the policy implementation work. That doesn't mean cutting corners. It doesn't mean shutting anybody out. It means thinking about how we can work efficiently, consistent with the rules that we have.

The third thing is that there is an ongoing dialogue on closed generics between the GNSO and the GAC and ALAC, and we need to understand what the project plan and timeline for completing the agreement and then expediting any subsequent policy work, if any, is needed on that. So, again, this is not everything must be put in place, but we need to understand what the timeline is and what the community and various parts of the community are going to commit to in terms of a timeline that they're working towards on this.

And then finally, the members of the IDN EPDP need to identify all the outstanding charter questions that will impact the next applicant guidebook and develop a plan and timeline to deliver the relevant recommendations for that. We know that there are a lot of issues that need to be resolved with the IDN, but a subset of them need to be resolved before the applicant guidebook can be completed. And so all of these timelines need to be put together with great detail and with everybody sort of pulling, rowing in the same direction and committed to working in those ways.

So, again, we did have the opportunity to talk with the GNSO Council leadership, but we want to make sure everybody's on the same page here.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Sally. John McElwaine, just so everybody knows too, Greg DiBiase and I are the vice chairs. Sebastien Ducos couldn't be here, but he's either attending remotely and/or has been keeping track and getting up to speed on all of these issues. And we really do appreciate the meeting we had yesterday to talk about all of these plans to put together for the implementation work relating to subsequent procedures. That's a lot of information you just provided, Sally, but we really do appreciate that.

I'd like to hit on a few of the broader points and then we have some of our fellow councilors that are more into the work and weeds of the subsequent procedure. And I think Paul will talk a little bit. One of the questions there was what can we do to stop re-litigation? Because that's really going to be what will slow down the implementation process. And I think the Board can help just by reemphasizing to the community that the IRT is not going to be a place where we're going to re-litigate issues. If we do that, we simply know it's going to take too long to put this great work together.

One of the things that we are committed to do, as we talked about, is working collaboratively. So we'd like to see heavy Board involvement. And the GNSO Council intends to do a small team, which again, which Paul will talk a little bit more about, to address some of these outstanding issues. And so having a Board liaison and Org liaison to those groups would be a really good start. And also, that small team intends to be inclusive. We're going to be talking more about that in our GNSO Council meeting during this week.

So with that, Paul, let me turn it over to you if you have any more specific comments on the SubPro work.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. So Paul McGrady, for the record. Just to hit a few things that John mentioned. I think one of the challenges, and this is sort of at the all IRT level, not just SubPro. One of the challenges is that IRTs have historically been grounds for re-litigation of issues. And as John indicated, that one of the messages that would be great to have from the Board is that that's not their purpose, whether it's a SubPro IRT or something else.

The other thing to keep in mind is what might appear to be a gap by some who are reading policy outcomes, whether SubPro or otherwise, may actually have been something that was discussed at great length and with a broad collection of individuals. And so again, the idea is that whatever the Board can do, the question is how can the Board help.

One of the things the Board can do with any IRT is that they should send the message that the policy outcomes really should not be disturbed in an IRT process. If there are deviations that need resolved, then if the Board and Org signal that that process is the IRT, that's where they're going to land rather than through some other process.

Again, the IRT should respect the Council's role in relationship to the policy issues that arise during implementation process. If they're unaddressed policy issues, in other words, if they've not already been discussed during the PDP, it needs to come back to Council for resolution and not through an IRT process or some other process.

Our next ask is an active Board liaison to every IRT. I think that's really important so the Board can see things coming down the path before they arrive. Once they arrive, everybody's pretty dug in, so that would be excellent.

And again, in order to avoid these problems, early engagement by the Board and staff during the PDP phase, I think, will result in fewer things that people are worried about in the IRT process.

I want to talk just a little bit, as John mentioned, we are working on what is essentially a refreshed small team for the SubPro issues that the Board has raised in their document. I can never remember if there are 33 issues or 36 issues, but frankly, compared to how many recommendations are in the SubPro work, it's a very small amount of issues that have been raised. But they do need to be addressed, and so we are refreshing that small team to take a look at those, and that's obviously going to take a little bit of time. But there are some general things that we wanted to highlight.

So, for example, there are some things in the SubPro PDP that were evolutions in process. So, for example, the predictability framework for use after the applicant guidebook is finalized is somewhat new, right? The final report confirms something called the SPIRT, which is meant to keep change logs and all those kinds of things. And so, there are sort of novel issues that this IRT will be facing, and so we are going to have to provide some background on those as well as those things come up to the IRT.

And then the last thing, and I know this is kind of processes, so maybe not as exciting answer as you guys had hoped for, but we are in the middle of PDP improvements, and so we are looking to see how we can improve or make changes to documents like the IRT principles and guidelines, as well as the consensus policy implementation framework to make all of this easier for everybody all along the way. So we just wanted you guys to be aware that we're looking at this at not just for SubPro, although that's the work that seems to be the most urgent in front of us, but IRTs generally.

So, with all of that kind of chunky stuff, I guess we'd like to ask you the same question, which is how can Council help the Board keeping the IRTs online? And if you have ideas on that, we'd love to hear them. If you want to say, great question, we'll take it back and talk about it, that's fine too, but we thought we should ask.

BECKY BURR: First of all, thank you for a very complete and thoughtful answer. It's wonderful to have, to just sort of dig in with the real dialogue and some strong suggestions here. I think all of your suggestions are really great. The recommendation for early engagement in the PDPs is a critical part of this, and I think it goes to one of your questions about the ODP process as well. Active liaisons who are engaged and able to bring issues back to the Board, able to initiate conversations.

I think one of the themes that we've talked about with the Council, and Matthew and I spent some time talking at the Council strategy session, is that we really think it is critical to move from a sort of formal arm's length, we're going to send you a letter, we're going to get a letter back and have a conversational relationship with the Council at every level whenever these issues arise. It's an experiment for us, but I think so far, so good.

So, there are some more things that we should think about and come back to you on, but I actually think you gave us a very good list of things that we can do. Avri, do you have more?

AVRI DORIA: Not much to add. I certainly agree with the whole notion that we have to track, that we have to be there, that we have to be present. It may be more than one liaison with several of us working together. It's sort of a liaison function just dealing with that, but certainly like the idea that we should be participating in the IRTs as liaison, listening, taking things back and forth, also with the small team. So, no, I think that it's a great setup for finding a way to keep working.

And just to add that the Board itself has been looking for ways to sort of make our processes quicker, so that when we get recommendations out of PDPs or recommendations out of processes, we can process them much more quickly than perhaps has historically been the case. So, we're looking to sort of match that kind of facilitation with our own facilitation. So, thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Any other councilors have anything to mention about the SubPro work? Okay, Tripti, I think we're going to hand it back to you. Or would you like us to go to our questions?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, why don't we just now go through our standard set of questions? By the way, thank you very much, Paul. So, would you like to respond to our question first? Actually, we just did. Sorry, we just did. So I'll turn it over to you to address our ...

JOHN MCELWAINE: Yeah, I think our turn for questioning, although Paul beat me to one there early, snuck one in on your question. So, I think the first question we had is, we split this up by councilors as well, so it's going to be on the issue of the PDP processes. So I'm going to turn that over to Thomas Rickert to ask the questions. Thanks, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: So, as you are surely aware of, we have guidelines for Board members serving as liaisons to ICANN community groups. And then we have GDS guidelines for the role of the GDS liaison. And those shall more or less build on each other. So, the Board liaison will keep the Board informed about current developments in a given working group and talk about potential issues that could be an impediment for approval of recommendations that might come out of the working group. And then you have the GDS liaison talking to the Org team about potential implementation issues, but also trading back information, back and forth between the Org and the working group.

And we thought that one way to improve collaboration is actually to make the liaisons talk to each other. Because you guys get information about potential impediments to approval without the context of the implementation issues that the Org might face. But when it comes to your deliberations about Board approval, you ask the Org anyway. So, we thought that it would be a good idea to maybe cut that short, make sure that the liaisons have a formal role of liaising with each other, which might entail changing the guidelines for both the Board representatives as well as for the GDS liaison, so that we can maybe have an early warning system about things that might not be ready for prime time when they're presented to the Board. Reduce the risk of recommendations being brought in front of the GNSO Council just to find out that the Board has an issue with it.

So, we do understand that there is a limited number of reasons as to why the Board can't approve recommendations. And in the best interest of ICANN and its community, that might be a test that can only be done at the very end, once you have the complete picture. But I think for other items, it might be a pretty straightforward and maybe logical step to require the liaisons to liaise with each other, so that the Board is also apprised of issues that are relevant for when it comes to implementation issues.

And I think that John has called upon me, that's basically the first point, 1A, not on IGOs, because that might also help reduce the risk of a requirement of an ODP for that matter. Because if we have questions surrounding the implementation smoothened out up front we might skip that phase of an ODP.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thomas, thank you. I can't actually see Theresa Swinehart from where I'm sitting. Is she in here? She's there. Hi, Theresa. So, obviously, I'm just reacting to what you've said without having consulted with Theresa, so that's my caveat, she's over there. Because she's going to be the senior staff lead as she currently is on this.

I think it's a really interesting idea. It's one of those things, as you say, it sounds quite logical. My question would be, do you think there is anything happening at the moment, or perhaps rather not happening in the way that we're managing that process, to which that's the solution.

What I heard you say is you're anticipating it would be a logical and sensible thing to do. Why wouldn't we do it, which I absolutely hear, but I'm also interested as to whether there are anything specific that you understand or you share that, say, so for example, if we had had this before, this wouldn't have happened. Not to find blame, but just to understand exactly what kind of problem we're trying to solve.

THOMAS RICKERT: Now, it's difficult to tell, because we don't know what information you're getting and whether you are actually getting information out of the Org on implementation issues at that early stage. But I would assume that on things like SubPro or the EPDP recommendations where we find out later that you have difficulties in processing them or you have additional questions where we saw the need for the idea of the ODP being introduced in the first place, maybe in retrospect, such a simple step could have made things easier for our sites.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. So, in response to that, actually, at least for the IDN EPDP, we are doing that. I'm one of the liaisons and Alan is the other, and also, it relates to the ccPDP on IDN as well. So, we have two other liaisons for that, and we coordinate between the four of us. And also, one of the things that you mentioned in terms of, I guess, front-running some of the issues back to the Board and with the Org in terms of implementation, that was brought up actually, I think, three or four ICANN meetings ago by Donna at that time. And that actually has also been kind of tested out at the IDN EPDP. And I believe right now there is a GDS person that is following that and feeds back to the IDN team at ICANN and the liaisons as well as the Board IDN working group.

So, it might not be fully documented in that way, but I think it's probably good to re-look at the guidelines for liaisons. But, yes, we are actually starting to do what you're suggesting already. But we should make it more formal and consistent for other PDP works into the future as well, I think.

BECKY BURR: If I could just add, I think what you're hearing from Edmon is, in some part, some lessons learned from EPDP phase two, where I think if that there are some things that we could have done early in the process to make sure everybody was on the same page about what the implications of the policy recommendation were, what the sort of legal parameters were, and there was an agreement within the PDP about what those recommendations were relating to, some of the issues in the ODP that required us to have an ODP could have been resolved in the policy development process. So I think we have to be consciously thinking all the time about sort of what questions are going to be open, what implications are not being tied down, what room is being left for magical thinking in the conversation. And that's the job of the GNSO participants in the PDP primarily, but not exclusively, the Board liaisons, or everybody has to be very conscious of that and take the time to say, okay, we're about to make a decision. Do we really understand all of the implications? And if we don't really understand all of the implications, how do we get to a point of understanding the implications, at least, that we need to understand before we make a final policy recommendation?

But what Edmon was suggesting is going on with the IDN EPDP, I think, reflects the fact that we're all incorporating the lessons learned there and we're all moving forward in that direction.

SALLY COSTERTON: I was just going to sort of put a bow around it. I mean, I think exactly, Becky, it's all about it's iterative, isn't it? We're learning as we go. And it's always good to go back and say, how could we do this better? Is there a better way that we can sort of make that more structured? Edmon's saying, look, we're doing this anyway because it makes sense. So I'm going to take that away as a let's go and have another look at it as a whole. And with that spirit in mind. And thank you for raising it. I think it's a really helpful point of focus.

TRIPTI SINHA: Becky, would you like just to add some more information to question one that's on the screen?

BECKY BURR: I really do think the EPDP phase two is a really good indication of if we look at that and we sort of do a post-mortem on it, we can tie not all of the things that needed to be addressed in the ODP, but a lot of them back to some questions that could and should have been asked in the policy development process, some information that could have been provided about costs and those kinds of things during the process.

Now, obviously, you can't say what the cost is definitively until the policy recommendation is fully developed. But you can have a sense of sort of where costs are going. You can have a sense of some of the issues that needed to be teased out in the ODP. And I think what we should be self-consciously doing is looking at the phase two, looking at the ODA and saying, how could we have answered those questions in the policy development process rather than putting them into the ODP?

So I do think we actually need—this is part of—in my sense, we've done two ODAs, ODPs now. We've said we're going to do a review after two. That's the kind of exercise that would be very useful to do. But I honestly am convinced that we, with a more careful or a more conscious approach to questions and difficulties in the policy development process, we can minimize, not necessarily eliminate, but minimize the scope of ODPs when they're needed.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Becky. Go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: I wanted to add a little bit. Becky got most of the stuff that I would have said. There's a couple other things, though. Even within SubPro, we were speaking to the staff folks from GDS every week or every other week. I think part of the problem, and it's another piece that's come in, is the conversations.

For example, many of the issues that showed up in the ODA and the ODS were things that had shown up in letters, the going over the wall types of letters, but we never really discussed our way through them. And so they sort of ended up feeling unresolved and therefore needing to be resolved in ODS, and now they become part of the pending.

So I think making some of these things more effective—but I did want to say that during the SubPro, we did follow. We did talk quite frequently and share the issues between—though the liaison role at that time was a little less formal than it's become over the last year or so, and there was less talking by the liaison within the meetings. So I think it's taking these things more mature.

And yes, I really wanted to emphasize what Becky said about the ODP and the ODA. It was an experiment. We did two of them, see where we're at, see how they work, see how they should be used, and they are things only to be called on on need. So hopefully that review can start once there's a little bit of thinking leeway to look at them and sort of say they were really good in part and they were really good at other parts, but how do we use them better and when do we actually use them? Not that we should have anything as complicated as SubPro again approaching us real soon, but we'll see. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Just a quick note also, you suggested that liaisons should be on other PDPs as well. I think the current process is that the GNSO, the working group invites the Board liaisons, so it's probably for the GNSO process side to invite Board liaisons as well because, well, actually in my experience for the IDN EPDP, obviously we were proactive in asking the working group to invite us, but for some of the other work, even for I think the applicant support group, I don't know whether there is a Board liaison. Maybe the GNSO side can be more proactive in inviting Board liaisons to those group as well.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Edmon. Any other questions on this? So shall we move on to the second question on IGO names? So the question is, can the Board give us a clear statement of, A, what if any steps are still required to finally resolve the issue of IGO names, including, for example, one timeline to approve the IGO curative rights recommendations and then for implementation? Two, what is the status of the notification system for second level IGO names? Three, what is the status of the Board GAC consultation? Moving on to B, what are the timelines for these steps and when the handful of two-letter second-level names which match IGO acronyms can be finally released? And once again, I'm going to turn it over to Becky.

BECKY BURR: This is not my favorite issue. So first of all, thanks and kudos to the curative rights team who came back with a great package of recommendations. I understand that—I'm not going to predict anything before it happens, but it's in the air that the GAC is pleased and is going to sign on to the curative rights recommendations. And that will override some advice so we won't need to do some of the issues on curative rights, which is great, that can get started.

The piece of GAC advice that is outstanding is the piece of GAC advice that said we want a permanent pre-registration notification system. The Board resolved that we were not going to support that approach and indicated that as an alternative, Org was going to provide a post-registration notification system and once the post-registration notification system was onboard, we would release the reservation on IGO names.

I'm not going to make excuses here. I'm going to tell you we are remiss in bringing that system to fruition. That's just a fact and it's not a good fact but I don't think I can do anything other than say our bad, that we will get shortly the information we need to say that the post-notification registration system will be on board by X date. I can't tell you that now. I'm sorry. I wish I could. But we will have that for you shortly. We are commencing the consultation with the GAC on that. There's some changes. The GAC is very busy at the moment as you can imagine the Board is too.

But what I'd like to suggest is we know that there is pent up demand for releasing these reserve strings. We know, for example, that some of the IGOs themselves would like these strings and that some registries would like to make these strings available. There are some concerns we have about providing sort of first right of refusal to IGOs when there are other perfectly legitimate non-abusive uses of those strings. So we're also thinking about, is there some way to make the strings available to brands, for example, who have a trademark in those strings.

We're really at the brainstorming phase on this and we'd like your input and we'd like to hear from people about—it's going to take some time for the post-registration notification system to come online. Not a huge amount of time, but more time than we would like and so what are the things that we can do in the interim to fairly get those strings out in a way that addresses the desires of IGOs, registries, brands, and other potential users. So mea culpa on the system not being ready, but also an invitation to do some brainstorming on interim solutions.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Hi, everyone. This was my question. And Becky, thank you very much for being so frank and honest. It's really refreshing to hear that and really appreciate what a challenging issue this has been. It's been one of those ones that's been running on for a very long time. It's involved a conflict between GNSO recommendations and GAC advice and we do really appreciate that it's challenging to work through all of the procedural and other issues. So I really appreciate getting that update and that confirmation of what's what still needs to be looked at.

We haven't really discussed this as a Council, but one thing off the top of my head that occurs to me, and I think that might be what you were alluding to, is maybe within a .brand where there wouldn't be other users for the string because it's a closed space anyway. Maybe if there were the consent of the relevant IGO to have that name released, maybe that might be something that could be built in. But I appreciate the concern in a more open space that if one were to release the name for the IGO in question that, yes, you would be closing off the possibility that there might be others who had wanted that name as well. So I think we'll all we stand ready, I think, to assist you with this if we can do. So thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any other questions? All right. So you did send in a third question. Should we just move on to that? So that had a two-part question. One was about getting to the next round of gTLDs. We did start the meeting with that. So, any further questions on that? Are we comfortable with getting to where we need to be?

JOHN MCELWAINE: Yeah, I think Becky's answer on that really covered that topic well.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. So the second question was an update on the WHOIS disclosure system, which again would go back to Becky. Becky, you're going to hold court today.

BECKY BURR: I'm going to be quiet after this, I swear. I was looking forward to Avri speaking before me on this. Okay. So the Board did act on what I believe is now officially entitled the Registration Data Request System, which somebody has suggested we might shorthand to redress or red dress—

oh, Avri. That was, either one of us. The Board directed that the system be launched within 11 months of the date of the resolution, which was the 27th of February. I'm not going to steal Ash's thunder, but I think we might be able to do better than that.

We have been able to accommodate the requests from the small team, and I just want to say the small team work was great, and it was very helpful. I think it was an example of a good way of working together. We know that there are more asks out there that can be considered and brought online after the initial system itself comes online. But I think we're sort of charging forward on that.

So I think we're in a good place to move forward with this, get it going. We did ask that the GNSO Council consider policy development to ensure that there is maximal widespread use of the system by registrars and people requesting information. There have been some questions about what the law enforcement exception carveout meant, and all we were suggesting was that, of course, if you get a warrant, you're going to have to respond to the warrant, and you probably can't force law enforcement to go through the redress system. Maybe redress is better. I don't know. But there's nothing that would preclude law enforcement from using that system if they wanted to.

But we really do think that there are two things that are critical. One, the system has to be used, because if there is not widespread adoption by registrars and those who are seeking information try to get information in other ways, then the data that we get will always be susceptible to the, "This data isn't good because not everybody was using the system" or any of those things.

So, we need something to ensure the integrity of the data that we're getting out of that. We think it is through the broadest and deepest use of the system possible. If you guys have a better way of ensuring that rather than through making a consensus policy that registrars use the system, we're willing to listen to that. But we do think, considering the fact that the SSAD system, the policy developed on that did require registrars to use the system, that maybe it's not a huge lift to get that done. And I do think the other part of this is registrars should be encouraged to send requests through that system so that we get it.

The other thing that is very important and that appears in the Board's resolution is, there is a concern that the system could be deemed to be a failure simply because it hasn't solved the problem that you get data when you ask for it. And the system is not going to solve that problem, right, because GDPR is still there. There is still the need to balance and do the balancing test and all of those things.

So, we absolutely think it is critical to get success criteria agreed on. And that's what we want the community through the Council to do. Tell us what you think success will be from that system. And please don't make it, "make the GDPR go away," because that's not going to happen. But I think we're moving forward on that. I will leave all of the timeline stuff to Ash, but I do think we have good news on how quickly that can move. But please consider our requests regarding use of the system and the success criteria.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Becky. And we're excited about this initiative, too. I think as we expressed, the small team that drafted the addendum is reconvening as soon as possible. We're certainly going to tackle with urgency how to increase participation or encourage participation and define these metrics for success as soon as possible so we can incorporate these into the design and that we're ready to go when it rolls out.

PAUL MCGRADY: I think sometimes we don't celebrate our wins. I think sometimes we are very quick to apologize when things go slowly. In this case, this went quickly. And everybody, I think Board, staff, Council, community, everybody piled onto this. And it's just, from my point of view, a wonderful victory for the community. So thank you to the Board. Thank you to staff. Thank you to the members of the community that participated in this. And I think we should note the win. It's a good outcome, and it was a speedy outcome. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Paul. That was indeed a collective effort. So congratulations to everyone to getting us to where we are. Yes, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah. Just building on what you said, Becky, on how we can make this successful or at least increase the chances of this being successful. And some in this room have heard me say this before, but when disclosure requests hit a contracted party, under GDPR there are two scenarios that are imaginable. One is that you need to fulfill a claim that can be raised against you. So you have a legal obligation to disclose. For those who want to look it up, that's 6.1c. So in fulfillment of a legal obligation.

And in that case, you need to respond as a contracted party, right? But then other disclosure requests where somebody says, well, I have an issue with this or that, then the contracted party needs to work on that based on 6.1f and check whether there's a legitimate interest. So they can, but they are not forced to disclose. And in these cases, they might as well say, well, request or please go to this new fantastic tool that coordinates disclosure requests for the entire industry. So there's a legal way, while it's being compliant, for contracted parties to try, encourage the use of the new system. And I think that should be considered, deployed to the best possible extent so that we actually get data and that hopefully that can take us to the next step in fleshing out the system more.

BECKY BURR: Thank you, Paul. I think this was really a great success. And here's to many more.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any other questions on this? All right, well, I believe that brings us to the end. There are no more questions, so that brings us to the end of the session. But I would like to pivot off of what Paul just said in terms of wins. Potentially, there are some more wins down the pike in the near future. So I'm hoping that we will, by the end of this meeting, be able to pass some resolutions. So hopefully we're on the path to do that. And if you have any concerns, please let Becky or Avri know. Thank you. Over to you now.

JOHN MCELWAINE: No, just I think in wrapping up, thank you to the Board. We look forward to continuing dialogue, whether it's in meetings like this or in small groups, because we really do think that will be the next way to get all of our work done efficiently and in the best interest of the community. So thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]