
ICANN82 | CF – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and ASO
Wednesday, March 12, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 PST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello and welcome to the Joint Session of the ICANN Board and the ASO. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-harassment Policy. This is a meeting between the ASO and the Board so we will not be taking questions from the audience unless the chairs choose to do so.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Remember to please state your name for the record, the language you will speak, if other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. All are welcome to use the chat. Please note that the private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session host, co-host, and other panelists. I will now hand the floor over to ICANN Board chair Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Wendy, and welcome, everyone. I believe this is the last bilateral meeting of the day, if I'm not mistaken, right? So, welcome. Hans, I looked at you and I said, "Haven't I already met you three times this week?" You serve on multiple committees, clearly. Well, welcome. A very warm welcome to everyone. And

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.

I'm going to turn it over to Christian Kaufmann who's going to moderate the session for us.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you, Tripti. Welcome to the Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board and the ASO. As usual, we have a couple of Board members here and the NRO CEOs plus the SO/AC. And as usual, we have sent some questions to the ASO, two of them, which you can see here on the screen. They are all about ICP-2, the topic of the week or decade, if you want. And Hans Petter will take the lead of commenting and answering them. And then we go with the dialogue from there. Hans Petter, it's all yours.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, thank you so much for that, CK. And if we could switch to the other slide set, then I prepared some slides on this topic. I thought it would be useful to do a quick recap first. So, if the slides then come up. Is there anything I can click on? No. Oh, right.

So basically, I added a couple of slides at the beginning to basically set the scene. What is ICP-2? Because I've been in meetings all day and for each meeting I go into, there is a separate set of acronyms and TLAs and TBFs or whatever you call them. So, I thought maybe just quickly recap before going into the questions or topics from the Board.

So, the Internet Coordination Policy 2, this was from the early days of ICANN. ICANN started a document series, which has later been abandoned. The criteria for establishment of New Regional

Internet Registries was accepted in June 2001. And at the time, I was the chair of the Address Council, the position that Herve has now. So, I've kind of been around since this was created.

And that document was set up to provide for criteria for recognizing new RIRs. And some of them were sufficiently large proposed service regions, so a Scandinavian RIR would not pass the criteria while a LACNIC and AFRINIC would. Support for local numbering community and a set of technical capacities. And that's all available on the ICANN website. The URL is a bit misleading because it's from 2001, not from 2012, but I guess that's just an archiving issue.

There is even a history before that. So, I added this for reference. RIPE NCC was formed already back in 1991 and APNIC in 1992 and ARIN in 1997. And the documentation around that were found in RFCs. So, in 1466, that was published in 1993, there is a description of the RIR system with some of the criteria there. So, the history in this, it kind of starts in the ICANN context in 2001, but it goes back even to 1993. And you may even find some older RIRs on how numbers resources were allocated even before that.

So, why do we need to revisit this? It's 25 years old, so it's time to have a look at it. The internet has changed and there may be other things that you would like to document now. And the relationship between the RIRs and ICANN has also changed, so it's a good time to look at it. And two of the areas that we've particularly focused on is that while this was a criteria to establish RIRs, that kind of

implies that those criteria needs to be maintained during the lifetime of the RIR. And they should be documented explicitly.

And then, of course, if we don't maintain that criteria on an ongoing basis, there should be a process to de-recognize and replace an RIR with something else because we need the internet to continue to work and not be dependent on individual institutions. Now, of course, that's a bit scary since I'm the CEO of one of the RIRs. If somebody would be, not recognize me anymore. But that is really to set the bar for me to continue to perform on the necessary level.

So, the project started in 2023 where the NRO, Number of Resource Organization Executive Council, that's the CEOs of the RIRs, asked the volunteers on the ASO Address Council to help with two tasks. One was the implementation procedures of the existing ICP-2. And the other one, which we were done and approved by the ICANN Board in December, the other one is to strengthen and review the RIR. And that's kind of the intro. And that brings me to the first question on the outcome of the survey. Any questions so far? Crystal clear.

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN

I was surprised about the RFC component for RIPE. I did not know that.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

The RFC component for?

CHRSITIAN KAUFMANN	For RIPE?
HANS PETTER HOLEN	Well, not necessarily for RIPE. It's for both APNIC and RIPE.
CHRSITIAN KAUFMANN	Still didn't know that.
HANS PETTER HOLEN	Oh. So, when I grew up, RFC 2050 was what everybody talked about. So, yeah. You're not quite as old as you look then. Well, I have more gray hair, right?
CHRSITIAN KAUFMANN	No, I have more gray hair.
HANS PETTER HOLEN	Oh, yeah. Well, you have more hair, right?
ALAN BARRETT	No fighting.
HANS PETTER HOLEN	Yeah. So basically, the remaining slides now are the same slides that were used in a slightly different order at the APNIC meeting two weeks ago, where the Address Council met and analyzed the result of this questionnaire. If you want to have a look at the details

that we published here, you can use your phone to scan it or type in this URL.

And we had two processes for this. It was an ICANN public comment process, where we got 14 responses. And we had an RIR questionnaire, which was the same questionnaire, same questions, but we just ran it through the consultation process on both sides, so to speak. And we got 298 responses. And then the ASO AC carried out a qualitative analysis to inform the next version. And while there were tick boxes to indicate strong support, and you can count them, this was not the vote on the principles.

In the pre-week, when the Board held a virtual meeting on this topic, there was a group of African states there that were very concerned that it looked like their comments only counted as one vote. And that's definitely not the purpose here. This is about analyzing the merits of the comments rather than the numbers of them. The numbers, the response of the data is public. You can analyze them yourself if you have the time and want to do that. The reports have been published, and there was also a report from ICANN on the results there.

So, you can see here, we have documented and shared the methodology that's been used. And you can see the distribution between the different regions. It's good to note that 18.5% comes from Africa. So, while there are concerns that AFRINIC is not represented on the AC, at least there is a good number of submissions from the African continent. The outlier here with 154 replies is from APINIC, and that is something that you can read

more on in the report, that we conducted a linguistic clustering analysis to identify repeat comments, including that approximately 150 of the 298 responses belong to clusters of highly similar responses.

And then this was carried out using bidirectional encoder representation from transformers. So, if you're like acronyms, BERT to identify clusters. So basically, using a large language model, artificial intelligence, in order to generate your answers. Now, whether this is good or bad, that we can leave to the readers here. The content is analyzed, they're similar or the same. So, they've all been taken into account. Although one can suspect that somebody has generated a large number to make it seem that a certain view is widespread. Or it could be that people are using large language tools in order to translate and get their message through because their language isn't English. I don't know.

But yeah, the summary of the comments received were that there needs to be a balance of authority between the NRO EC and ICANN, and that input from stakeholders needs to be included, such as RIR communities or the ASO AC, the GAC, the RIR communities and members. There were also raised some concerns with the principles. The role of the NRO EC needs clarity. There is the possibility of becoming gatekeepers. Existing RIRs may have a new RIR. Giving ICANN the final authority could contradict the independence of the RIRs. ICANN may gain a lot of power. Now, reading the existing ICP-2, ICANN already has the authority to

approve new RIRs. So basically, there isn't a change there. It's just a continuation of the current situation.

Others felt that ICANN has a global oversight role and hence that the involvement is appropriate. The role of stakeholders and the process behind should be transparent. Multi-stakeholder involvement of the RIR community is indispensable. And then, there is also a summary of the numerical reportings here for those that want to have a look at that. But as I said, this is not really a voting exercise.

De-recognition. Process leading to de-recognition should be clear, transparent and well-designed, of course. There should be defined a grace period to help provide guidance and corrective actions, makes sense, including opportunities to appeal, possibility addressed by the addition of remedial phase in the RIR lifecycle between operation and de-recognition. And de-recognition should really be last resort.

Respondents who disagreed with the principles stated that de-recognition should not be immediate, automatic or due to minor temporal lapses. Several comments addressed the implementation principle, meeting ICP-2 requirements should be objectively verifiable. I'm getting a strong light in the middle of the text here, so it's a bit difficult to read.

The process leading up to de-recognition should be clear, transparent and well-defined. There should be a smooth, clear handover process in case of de-recognition. And de-recognition should be last resort. The phrasing of the operational principle

indicates a de facto presumption of de-recognition in the case of a continuing non-compliance. The roles of NRO CR and ICANN needs to be clearly defined. And here you can also see the different responses and how they're balanced out.

General comments. Of course, we thank everyone who had the patience to submit additional feedback on the process. General comments have covered a wide range of topics and summary cannot do justice to them. We have shared a short selection of the feedback that we found particularly useful. So, some commenters appreciated the specificity of the questionnaire format. Respondents requested more time to provide feedback, particularly organizations that might require larger reviews prior to sharing input.

A more structured approach over an ad hoc one is preferred. Methodology used here did not allow for the consideration of other RIR structures, nor did it recognize the existing architectural model of the system. The questionnaire has limitations. There may be topics that are relevant that are not covered in the questions. RIR communities would also like to have greater insight into the work of the NRO NC and more sustained opportunities of engagement. Communities should have the opportunity to contribute to this process.

And on the implementation considerations, the implementation is likely to be complex and will require careful detailing and this will be updated text. The RIR system is yet to evolve a dispute resolution mechanism along the lines of ICANN. And in the bigger

picture, accountability and ethics needs to be mentioned explicitly. RIR system needs to be considered within the larger framework of the evolution of institutions, external forces, jurisdictional issues and the development of technology.

Outer space could be considered a region and there is actually work going on in the interplanetary internet project that we have had discussions with on this. So, it's not just a joke there. And if you really want to have a look at the raw data, it is available so you can do your own analysis. So, then that's really my answer to the question. So, I know I see the questions coming up. Chris.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you, Hans Petter. I just had actually a really quick question. The point here, the fourth bullet on the process where it says the methodology used here did not allow for the consideration of the RIR structures, nor did it recognize the existing architectural model of the system. That jumped out at me. Do you know what that means or is intended? No? Okay.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Well, I think this was a closed survey on principles proposed by the NRO NC. So, that was what this was limited to, right? So, it was not an open suggestion on should we go blockchain or any of those things that not frequently is suggested, but have been thought about out there. Anyone else?

HÉRVE CLÉMENT

Perhaps just a comment. So, you was very complete in commenting the result on the questionnaire about that. What I wanted to underline is the huge work it has to be for the Council. And thank you to all the members of the Council to have analyzed the process, the questionnaire and the answers to produce a draft. But I think you will talk about the policy draft just after that.

You was right to say that it was not a vote. People saying that you support some specific principles is not a problem. But if you don't support, it's very important for us to have the rationale behind the I don't support. Because if that which is very constructive in giving answer on to give giving us ideas of social legitimacy of what we could have said in terms of principle regarding this update of ICP-2. And I think that's the important things.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

One comment from my side. The overview of the participation rate was something like close to 300 on the RIR side and 15, 14 or so on the ICANN public consultation. And the first second that looks like that the ICANN people don't care. That is not true. What was actually different is that some constituencies have aggregated their views. So, you had a view from a particular group of people, which was then expressed as one submission, as that was not about voting, but giving a realm of opinions of what the people think about didn't really make a difference. But one should not read into it that the ICANN community didn't care about it.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

No, I fully agree with that comment. And taking back to the call in the pre-week on this as well, that was explicitly made by people from both ALAC and from the African states that had submitted a joint statement there. So, they were really concerned about or wanted to emphasize that they wanted us to take their input seriously.

And just to be very explicit on the voting here, if you look at the results on the bottom, you will see that on the average rating, there is 49.8 that have a negative indication here, which is why it's very important to analyze not the numbers, but actually the substance of the comments. Because it was pointed out on this call also that they were very confused that somebody has says, I strongly disagree, but the arguments for disagreeing was actually in support. So, the numbers, to some extent, does not bring value into this. It's the comments in itself that does.

And I'm kind of putting this very explicitly on the table now, so we don't come back to that later on and saying that we misinterpreted this. We've been very careful in looking at the content in the comments.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you. Should we go to number two? I bet you have slides for that.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

I have. Yeah. I like to be prepared there, but Chris still have a question.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Sorry. I was wondering whether to hold this till the end, because it's a bit of a meta question rather than focused on this, but I thought the discussion around the AI generated content being submitted was fascinating. And I was curious whether a, this is the first example in RIR policy discussions where you've seen that, and either way, whether this has sort of been caused for some reflection on any sort of approaches going forward to where we might see this because presumably it may well come back again.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

To my knowledge is the first I've seen, but John, you want to comment?

JOHN CURRAN

John Curran, CEO of ARIN. The good news, I guess, is that this particular survey was about getting good ideas. And so, whether you get a good idea from 1, 10 or 30, it doesn't matter. And that's kind of how you think about how the IETF works. It's predominantly, we get good ideas from wherever they come from and we try to make the best technical standards. When you look at the RIR policy process, most of us have very similar processes that are based on, there's RIRs, I've said at ARIN, if you're a dog, but you know how to type, you could probably participate in our process

and we wouldn't know because you can type good ideas onto the public policy mailing list.

At the end of the day, there is some places where support's measured. And in the RIRs and IETF, it's similar. It's the rough consensus sort of protocol. And it's usually done interactive immediately after the presentation of a topic. So, immediately after a policy proposal has just been reviewed and gone over with a community present and remote. In the IETF, same thing, humming in the room in a working group when the presentation has just been done.

So there's a risk, of course, that some enterprising person will teach AI how to hum and figure out how to be in the room or do the equivalent on the online registration, the meet you protocol. But as long as we're very careful about the show of support to a very specific time immediately after the presentation, it's a fairly narrow window. And that means that when you do a survey like this, you almost have to use it as for a place to look for good ideas and not per se a polling of support one way or the other. Because nowadays, even with the best tools, you can't tell if there's duplicate surveys with lookalike input. It's going to become increasingly difficult.

JIA-RONG

Hi, everybody. I'm Jia-Rong, the Director General for APNIC. So, this occurred more from the APNIC region, so I thought I can share a bit. Because during the APNIC AGM, one of our community members did speak up about this topic. So, the explanation or

justification for it is because some people's language ability is not so strong. So, they do rely on computer assistance to help to convey the ideas.

Now what turned out is a different story in some ways because there's a lot of duplication. But I think taking the points that John Curran made already, I think we can all agree to that. It's not about the number that's the support, but looking for the quality of ideas behind it. And that said, the justification for using computer assistance actually does in some ways make sense. Like if your language is not strong in English, then you need to convey your ideas. You could use computer assistance to do that. So artificial intelligence would be one of those tools.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you. Hervé?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Yeah, Hervé Clément, ASO AC Chair. So, you spoke about, so I was during the AGM, so listening to the answers regarding the language and the problematic to be flexible enough in a certain language, which I can completely understand because I am French. I understand. But the other thing that within the questions and within the answers we had, we could have some answers in German, in French as well, etc., and we were able and the Council was able to understand and to translate as well. So, it's something that could be understandable and we can manage with answer in

other language than English, even if English is the official language for the community.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you. Any other comment, question to that one? Then let's have a look at number two.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Thank you. So, thoughts on the likely outcome of the ICP-2. Well, the easy part here is on the process. So let me start with the process. In October, the principles were published and the consultation has come out and there is no consultation report. So, that's kind of what's been up now so far in the process, right? There was a principles document developed by the ASO AC and we've gotten community feedback and there is a report out on this.

So looking forward, what's next? The ASO AC met two weeks ago at the APNIC meeting and drafted a revised ICP-2 document. We're currently reviewing and finalizing that. And that's based on input from this consultation process. And then when this is finalized and ready for publication, then it will be published both in all the RIR regions and also through ICANN channels. And we will take public comments on this versions as well.

And if the wind blows in the right direction and everything goes correct, we should then be able to present the result of that at the next ICANN meeting. It's a tight timeline, but at least that's what we're trying to do now. And then the ASO AC will definitely get feedback. And then there is a plan to then provide a revised draft

after this. And then during the autumn, present this at the RIR meetings where the second draft and then the revised draft can be discussed. And then we will come into a final review and then begin the NRO and ICANN approval and adoption process.

So, that's the high-level overview of this. If you want to put it out on the timeline, similarly, we know at ICANN82, at ICANN83 in the middle here, the draft document will have been published. We will have public comments coming in. We will be taking feedback from the RIR community. And we've already started talking to-- I talked to GAC leadership about engaging with them at the next meeting and how we would make sure that they're fully aware of this before the meeting and whether we should do a public session at the next ICANN meeting or whether we would interact directly with the interested communities. So, that's now all in the planning phase and going into the planning for ICANN83.

And then at ICANN84, yeah, depends a bit on the exact date on whether we will then have a final document or whether we will be working on that then. That's yet to be seen. The further out in time you get, the more uncertainty there is on the exact dates. But I just got a spreadsheet now broken down with activities and dates on all the activities. So, there has been extensive planning work between ICANN and RIR staff behind the scenes here. And we all know what to do and in what order, but of course there may be changes. I don't think it's worth sharing and publishing that spreadsheet, but at least we are at that level of planning. Any questions to the process?

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Not a question, but probably actually a comment. Because I said it now once or twice on stage this week. From an ICANN Board perspective, we are not waiting till a document revised review two times comes our way end of the year. We are actually following all the steps in between and certainly we'll have a look at the first document draft which comes out now. I would assume it finds its way in our workshop as well. And who knows, we might even be the one commenting as well, potentially in the public consultation or in the surveys.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah. And I know there has already been talks about time on the Board workshops in December and January about this as well. So, we're really trying to think ahead here and make sure that it's also on your radar when it comes to planning.

So yeah, textual description of the next steps here and also a list of all the different regional meetings that fits in here. We've already had an APNIC meeting. There is an ARIN, LACNIC and RIPE meeting coming up this spring. But the draft will then be ready for the autumn season most likely. So yeah, I think I've covered most of this already. Yeah, the important point here also is that there is an African Internet Summit in September and we're then also aiming to present it there so that we can have a community discussion in Africa on this.

Yeah, so that's actually just repeating the same slide again, but I don't want to dwell into too much of the details there. And then the last part, what's the expected outcome? So, then I just simply

copied and pasted the why revisit ICP-2. And really, why are we doing this? It's the ongoing responsibilities and the recognition in addition to the need for a review after a quarter of a century. So expected outcome, update criteria to reflect 25 years of experience, and then the ongoing and the recognition. I think that would be my summary on that one.

CHRSITIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you. So, you were not falling for the question. Thank you. Any questions, comments from our side? Alan.

ALAN BARRETT

Thanks. This is Alan Barrett. I want to note that there are no representatives from the AFRINIC region on the ASO AC at the moment. Hans Petter, I know a minute ago you said that you're planning some outreach at the AIS in September. Can you tell us more about outreach that's already happened in the AFRINIC region or in Africa, and the response to the survey that you may have received from that region?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So, I don't know specifically how that has happened, but I showed you the numbers in the first slides on how many responses we have from Africa. I haven't seen a breakdown of the feedback there compared to other regions, so we would have to come back with an analysis on that.

But when it comes to representation on the ASO AC, I have for years now repeated to anyone I meet from the African continent that I would really like the community to come together and see if they can elect representatives to be on the ASO AC. Of course, there are procedures in the region. It's a bit difficult because there is a role of the NomCom there that does not exist recently. But a pragmatic approach to the community coming together and appointing some community representatives. There is no public receiver in charge of AFRINIC that has the powers of the Board. In theory, he has the powers to appoint the Board-appointed representative to the ASO AC, but this ball is really with the AFRINIC and the African community. And now I see hands both here and there.

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN

Kurtis, then John.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I'm just going to add that, of course, as part of the ICANN outreach, there's also the ICANN GSE team and the AFRILAC that will reach use for the outreach and the circulation that doesn't necessarily replace the ASO, but just do for the outreach.

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you. John?

JOHN CURRAN

Yeah, just if you take a look at the input that was received in the survey, actually, AFRINIC had input larger than some of the other

regions. Certainly, any party that was interested in participating had ample opportunity either through the survey or through the ICANN consultation process that was held as well. It was either one. Going forward, we expect those to be equally open processes. And as we get a more focused draft out of the ASO AC that incorporates the input and it's a little closer to final form, I expect you'll see some very significant review in the AFRINIC region, obviously, because there's a lot of interest.

The fact is that, as I said, the AFRINIC participants have had no problem participating from those stats, and we don't expect there'll be any challenges going forward either in their participation. If anything, it will get easier as AFRINIC gets back on its feet and gets more governing structure.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Thank you. To add to that, I even have explicit confirmation from the public receiver to authorize use of AFRINIC resources to hold the webinars and mailing list discussions for the following going forward. So, at least the internal staff processes as AFRINIC now, there has been management approval for spending time and resources on this process going forward.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Good. Tripti, and then Hervé.

TRIPTI SINHA

I have a comment. I just wanted to say thank you for the work that you've done on this and revising this after 25 years, because even ICANN find itself at a moment in time where we need to look at our processes and things like reviews and our bylaws and so forth. We've been an institution now for 28 years and plus or minus one year since the transition, depending on when you start to count. But it's just a good thing to do to keep a house clean, and so I just congratulate you for all the work that you've put into this.

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you, Tripti. Hervé?

HÉRVE CLÉMENT

Yes, to come back to the AFRINIC representation issue, it's something we have repeated so far. Of course, as the chair of the ASO AC, it's a very big concern having nobody from this specific region represented in the Council. So, it's something we talk a lot regarding the legitimacy and the representativity of the work we are doing.

Apart from that, most of our meetings, our discussions are open and it's open to everybody. So, I welcome always AFRINIC members as a community to be part of the discussion when it's open. And Nick, the vice chair of the ASO AC and I have been able to participate on site on the last African Internet Summit meeting. It was in Mauritius in last September. We had a very useful talk and it was very useful for the AFRINIC community to have answers to their questions, because there was a lot of anxiety regarding the

AFRINIC community, regarding ICP-2, and it was very useful to have the discussion.

And that probably is the reason why during the questionnaire, finally, the comments from the AFRINIC, as John said, was not very different from the other, finally, and it was a good thing. And we organized also specific webinars to the AFRINIC community with the help of the AFRINIC staff and did something. So, we will continue, of course, during the next step of the process. Thank you.

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you, Hervé. And with that, that actually concludes the questions we had. Thanks a lot, Hans Petter, for talking us through. Do we have any other questions, comments here on stage? There are no drinks outside, as far as I know, so there's no need to rush. No? Okay.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So, if you want drinks, I can invite you to the upcoming RIR meetings, where we also have socials with drinks. But jokes aside, there are interesting discussions of both discussions in the regions and also possibility of discussing the ICP-2 with the members of the RIRs there. So, ARIN55 in North Carolina in April, LACNIC in Brazil in May, RIPE in May in Portugal, and APNIC, the first autumn meeting, beginning of September, in Vietnam. So, I'd like to invite you all to come there, and maybe especially the ICANN Board members that live in the region would be really great to see there. I know you're tight on budget, but it would be great if that would be possible.

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN Thank you, Hans Petter. Oh, Alan.

ALAN BARRETT Thanks. This is Alan Barrett. So, something everyone at this table is aware of, but I think it may be worth mentioning for the public record, that in parallel with this process to update ICP-2, I'm aware that the ASO AC also came up with some procedures for implementing or enforcing the existing ICP-2. And since last time we got together on a table like this, the Board has approved those procedures. So, I'm sure you're all aware, but I'm just mentioning it. Thanks.

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN Thank you, Alan. Well, in that case, I give it back to Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA Why?

CHRSTIAN KAUFMANN Well, you gave it to me, so I'm handing it back to you.

TRIPTI SINHA All right. Well, thank you. This has been a very good discussion. Thank you for walking us through your process, Hans, and it looks like we've been meeting a lot this week, so I'll probably see you at

another meeting. But this meeting is adjourned, and let's go enjoy the evening. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]