
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. My name is Andrea Glandon, your remote participation manager. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Operational Design Phase Update community webinar being held on Tuesday, the 28th of September, 2021, at 20:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

Questions will be taken at the end of today's presentation and will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. I will read them aloud during the time set by the moderator of this session. During the Q&A session, attendees will also be able to raise their hand to verbally ask their question. All participants in this session may make comments in the chat. Please use the dropdown menu in the chat pod and select Everyone. This will allow all participants to view your comment.

If you would like to listen to this webinar in a language other than English, please see the chat shortly for further instructions or private message me for assistance.

With this, I will hand the floor over to Göran Marby. Please begin.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. Welcome and thank you for joining at this, what I think is quite important information on something that sounds almost poetical: the Operational Design Phase of Subsequent Procedures Final Report Outputs. As many of you know, [September 12th,] the Board directed me and the Org to prepare for an ODP to assess the resource 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.

operational impact of implementing future application rounds of the new gTLDs. The ODP is, for us—and I think very much for the Board—the key step in the consideration of a consensus policy recommendation, so the other outputs or the final report approved by the GNSO Council. I also want to take the opportunity to actually thank the community members who worked so hard for such a long time to provide the recommendations and also for the GNSO Council for all their hard work.

The Board has requested the ODP because, as you can imagine, this is a fairly complex thing. And we want to make sure that we provide the Board with very good information before they make their decision but also doing that in such a way that's transparent for the whole community as we do it, which is something that many of our community members talked about when we did this the last time. It is a very large, important project. And I've spoken many times—and you've spoken to me—about the importance of this next round in serving the global public interests.

Today, this includes nearly five billion people online today, as well as the rest of the world's population which are actually not connected yet. For me, the next round would provide an opportunity to make the Internet more accessible for more people around the world by offering domain names in native scripts and languages. I think that's created an opportunity for people to connect in a different way—create their own communities (private communities, social communities, or commercial communities) in a better way to connect with people in their own native language. There are billions of people who prefer to read, that maybe sometimes only can read and write in Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic,

Devanagari or any other non-Latin scripts. And expanding the top-level domain options through local languages and scripts will help to provide access to local information on top of the global information on the Internet.

The Internet is fantastic, and one of the things that's fantastic about it is it's global and local at the same time. Many of the interactions we have are actually quite local. At the same time, it ends up giving this fantastic opportunity to be global. This evolved local connectivity, I think, would inspire local innovation, affecting their daily lives.

The availability of many top-level domains also provides a space for innovation and differentiation. This allows new unknown services using domain names to emerge. And implementation of this application round is a complex operational process and we need to get it right. I hope that the proposed design that results from the ODP will help the Board and the wider community understand what we're trying to do and how to do it in a very transparent way. And I'm caught by the word "transparency" a lot because it means a lot.

When—I have to say if and when—those recommendations are approved, the cost incurred during the ODP are considered to be a part of the relevant cost for the next round. So I know that those questions will come up because the Board has put aside money to be able to do this. And the way we see it and the way that we understand it is that we're learning from the last time we did it. These costs occur when either the Board makes the decisions or after the Board makes the decisions.

For anyone who thought that we haven't done any preparation for this, you should know that we put a lot of work into the preparation of the ODP. We also worked a lot before the ODP decision was made to be able to maximize the time and resources dedicated to the project and ensure a really good final operation design assessment.

So while the Board's ultimate decision, the resulting implementation, cannot happen until the ODP is conducted, the ODP would not delay the launch of the next round. Look at this from a life cycle perspective because a lot of the work we're doing up front on the impact assessment, implication, and cost and resources will save us time when we actually come into implementation by removing obstacles in the planning phase. But also note that this is not a new process. But we do it more transparently and comprehensively than we did it before. ICANN Org, together with the Board and the community has always done this. We do it differently this time.

So during today's session, the ODP will provide an overview of the specifics of the SubPro ODP, update you on work that's already been done and share a preview of what's to come. And we actively seek input from the community once the ODP work has started and really has the relevant information and give you relevant milestones that we will detail in the workplan. Looking forward, as always, to engaging with you. And I'm looking forward to hearing your comments and questions from this first time we go and talk about it.

Over to the next one.

NANIG MEHRANIAN:

Great. Thank you, welcome. Hello. Welcome and thank you for joining the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Operational Design Phase webinar. My name is Nanig Mehranian and I'm the program manager for Subsequent Procedures, or SubPro. We are excited to share with you some updates as it relates to SubPro and, as such, do hope you find today's session to be informative.

In terms of what we will be covering today, I will provide an overview of the operational design phase or ODP, go over the objective of the ODP, recap on where we are vis-à-vis the Subsequent Procedures (SubPro) policy development process (PDP), provide an update on the separate ODP Board resolution, and the respective ODP scoping document. Lastly, I will go over various stages of the work involved with the ODP.

I will then hand the floor over to my colleagues, Lars Hoffmann and Chris Bare, who will provide an introduction to the SubPro ODP scoping document. Then they will dive into the 12 SubPro scoping areas identified. The team will also provide an overview on SubPro ODP or planning, mainly, ODP projection of work, community engagement, and what ODP resources are available to you. Last but not least, we will have a question-and-answer session at the tail end of today's webinar.

Next slide, please. Next slide. Thank you. Objective of the operational design phase. For the purpose of the operational design phase, it's to perform an assessment of the operational impact of the implementation of the GNSO Council policy recommendations. This is done in order to facilitate the Board's determination on whether the recommendations are in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN. The Board will request an ODP in cases where it deems the

recommendations to be complex in nature and also have an operational impact on the Org. The Board will determine scope and timeframe within which it expects to receive the operational design assessment—the ODA, which is the final ODP deliverable. Of course, as Göran mentioned, the community also plays a role in the ODP as Org will solicit feedback on the assumptions, facts, and figures that underpin Org’s ODP assessment.

While ODP’s name is new, the task at hand is not particularly new. Rather, it is an enhancement of the existing processes within the consensus policy implementation framework, the CPIF. The ODP reinforces a new structure and formalizes the existing processes in a more transparent manner.

Next slide, please. Thank you. In December of 2015, the GNSO Council initiated a policy development process (the PDP) and chartered the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group with the task to develop, where needed, new policy principles, recommendations, and implementation guidance to clarify, amend, or replace existing elements from the 2012 round.

Earlier this year, the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group issued their final report, which was approved by the GNSO Council February. The SubPro final report is the culmination of five years of work and contains over 200 affirmations, recommendations, and implementation guidance that is collectively referred to as the final report outputs.

On the 24th of March, the GNSO Council transmitted its recommendations report to the ICANN Board, and the Board is now considering the outputs contained in the final report.

Next slide, please. Due to its level of complexity and the fact that these recommendations will have a significant worldwide impact on implementation, the ICANN Board has requested Org put resources in place to conduct an ODA in its September Board resolution.

Specifically, the Board request Org to notify the Board upon ODP initiation, provide regular updates on the progress of the ODA (Operational Design Assessment), and expects the ODA to be delivered within ten months of the ODP initiation.

Additionally, the Board has authorized funding of up to nine million U.S. dollars to fund internal projects needed for initiation and execution of the ODP in addition to other related work that may be required to support the ICANN Board's consideration of the SubPro final report.

During the past few months, the Board and the Org have worked together to create a structure and outline of the Board-determined scope referred to as the SubPro ODP scoping document. The scoping document is a set of questions that the Board is requesting answers in from the Org. The Board has identified twelve scoping areas to which our colleagues, Lars and Chris, will dive into within a few minutes.

Next slide, please. The ODP stages of work. SubPro OPD is a significant undertaking for which the Board provided approval of up to nine million dollars outside of ICANN's operational budget. As such, Org has engaged

in a number of preparatory activities in order to lay the foundations to conduct the ODP.

The first stage of work, the stage we're currently in—internal project organization—is where Org's internal infrastructure will ramp up, evolving and building on the existing work. We are currently developing the project management framework of capabilities, building out the resources needed to execute the ODP, developing and launching of SubPro ODP webinars, as well as other community engagement activities.

Once the internal project organization phase is completed, Org will execute the operational design phase and deliver the operational design assessment based on the Board-determined scope.

During the third phase—the Board consideration—the Board will review the policy recommendations, the operational design assessment, as well as the public comments, and make its determination on the final report outputs.

In terms of length of each stage, it is estimated that the internal project organization stage will require three-plus months of work to ramp up, evolving/building on existing work, of course, followed by the ten-month ODP execution phase as per the Board's request with the ODA delivered to the Board. Lastly, the Board consideration is estimated to take three months.

Should the Board approve the final report outputs in terms of next steps, the Board will provide direction on implementation, and SubPro will move on to the next phase of work.

This is the end of my presentation. I will hand off to my colleague, Lars Hoffmann, who will take us through the SubPro ODP scoping document.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Nanig. Hi, everyone. I'm Lars Hoffmann. As Nanig said, I'll take you at least partially through this scoping document. I'll hand it over, halfway through, probably, when you're bored with my voice, to Chris. A link to the scoping document you can also find at the end of this presentation. You can also go to the website, [ICANN.org/odp](https://icann.org/odp). From there, it's relatively easy to find the SubPro ODP, and the scoping document is there prominently displayed.

If I can have the next slide—thank you, Andrea—as a background, many of you will obviously recall that the PDP working group in its final report published over 300 affirmations, affirmations with modification, recommendations, and implementation guidance. And these are collectively referred to as outputs in the final report, and I think the council has taken on that term as well. And so have we. So that's what we mean if we use that term.

So to inform the Board's consideration of these outputs, the Board has tasked ICANN Org to provide answers to the questions that are in this scoping document. And the goal of this is really to develop a high-level operational implementation model for future rounds of new gTLDs based on these outputs in the final report.

The scoping document focuses on the immediate next round. It also considers, however, elements for subsequent rounds after that for the purpose of scalability. And just so we are clear in the context here, the

immediate next round is defined as the new gTLD application round following the 2012 round, while then subsequent rounds after that obviously are defined as those that follow the immediate next round. Catchy title. We are working on it maybe.

The scoping document is organized in twelve topic areas. More on that in the coming slides. Each of these topic areas contain high-level questions that are aimed to generate meaningful analysis and obviously comprehensive responses as well.

Andrea, if we can see the next slide, please. Thank you so much. So, as promised or threatened, you see the twelve scoping areas here. Chris and I will provide a little more detail in running all these different topics. The scoping document is structured that way, and each of these areas then has a number of questions—in some cases, quite a lot, and in other cases, maybe not so many. But for those of you familiar with the final reports—or even if you’re not, it may be interesting to know—the twelve scoping areas here in some cases obviously encompass several—more than just one—of the 41 topic areas contained in the final report. And we did that because it is easier to organize in slightly fewer topic areas. But all the topics are obviously covered.

The next slide, please. Thank you, Andrea. So the first area is what we call governance. This area focuses on the structural and process requirements for decision-making, accountability, and controls, as you can see on the slide. The bullet points here are kind of the general areas that are included in the governance topic. That’s true for all the bullets on the subsequent slides.

And if you go to the scoping document, you see that ICANN Org is tasked, for example, to design the ICANN Org and Board governance structure for managing and overseeing the implementation of the outputs, if indeed they're approved by the ICANN Board, of course, determine what best practices can be used to manage an IRT of this complexity, maximizing productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness—of course, this is in addition to what is already detailed in the consensus policy implementation framework; we refer to that as well as CPIF, which obviously guides the IRT work; so that goes without saying: we will work alongside that, obviously—design a proposed process flow for the predictability framework—a big topic in the final report—and propose criteria and process for handling GAC consensus advice in future new gTLD rounds. So with all these slides that are coming here for the topic areas/scoping areas, more detail and more questions can be found in the actual underlying document.

Andrea, the next slide, please. Processing and operations. The focus is on ICANN's processes and operations for applications for new registry operators and other related support. And here can you see the big-picture topics? Some of the questions that pertain to these areas are for ICANN to propose possible application submissions and processing flows, including, for example, the GAC early warning system, to design, propose criteria and processes for different types of evaluation—i.e., how will the evaluation process vary on the different application types, such as standard applications, community applications, and applications that may represent geographic names, brand applications, and also very importantly, especially for the immediate next round, how IDNs are consider in all of this, internationalized domain names. Propose criteria

and processes for different types of objections that ICANN has been asked to do, as well as develop criteria and process for issues such as contracting processes and onboarding. ICANN also been asked in the scoping document to provide operational process flows of how ICANN Org's data protection and privacy practices can be applied, and determine what resources and tools would be required to address unforeseen DNS stability issues that may result from implementing the outputs.

This brings me to the next slide, please, Andrea. Thank you. The third topic area: global engagement and linguistic support, localization. Here the focus, as you can see on the slide here, is establishing engagement, awareness, and communication, and supporting engagement for IDNs—internationalized domain names; I've just said that—and universal acceptance—UA, as it's often abbreviated. And according to the scoping document, the Board has tasked ICANN Org to propose mechanisms to support the inclusion of local languages and scripts, assess what outreach and engagement strategies could be used to reach audiences across multiple regions around the world—specific also to the applicant support program—determine what resources ICANN Org may use to promote universal acceptance solutions for new gTLD applications, and also, for example, propose additional internal tools or resources, if any are necessary, to support the inclusion of multiple languages and scripts throughout the application process itself, as well as the launch and the registry operations processes as well.

And this is the next slide, please. This will be the last scoping area from my end. Oh, I was worried there for a second that I was on the wrong slide. Thank you, Andrea. We're good. Contractual Compliance, the next

area here, focuses on ICANN's policies that are put in place to enforce contractually binding commitments on new gTLD registry operators resulting from the outputs.

And here ICANN is really just tasked with two questions according to the scoping document. First, what are the proposed criteria and Contractual Compliance processes designed for complaints generated from new gTLDs that are delegated as a result of the outputs? And how will Contractual Compliance's current processes for registry complaints integrate with its proposed process for complaints resulting from new gTLDs that are delegated as a result of the outputs?

And I think that is all for this slide. With this, I'm passing the baton on to my colleague, Chris Bare, I believe, who will talk you through the remainder of the scoping document. Thank you. Chris?

CHRIS BARE:

Thank you, Lars. My name is Chris Bare and I will take you through the other areas of the scoping doc. The next one is system and tools. As you can expect, this is about the hardware, software, and other technological tools that will be used to support the outputs for the program itself. This includes things like the application software, the way we will interact with applicants, the evaluation tools that will be used in interacting with the evaluation panels and the like.

There's a lot of criteria that will go into this. One of the main things will be, of course, the support for universal acceptance and e-mail address internationalization. Also, we need to ensure that these new systems actually integrate with the existing ICANN systems that we use today.

Another thing that the operational design assessment that's done in ODP will talk about is the testing methodologies that will be used to ensure that the tools are effective and working. We also hope to have an idea of what the capacity for each of these systems will be and, also, an understanding of the service-level agreements and the responses times that will be needed for a variety of activities associated with this.

And one thing to keep in mind is that there is always a focus on the security of the systems and the data that resides in them as well. And while, of course, systems and tools ... a lot of work will be done as part of the assessment. As you can imagine, a lot of this is also downstream work that will become more clear as many of the processes that are developed come up with their business requirements.

Next slide, please. The next area is vendors and third parties. And one thing to remember is that, in the 2012 round, we had approximately a dozen services that were outsourced to about two dozen different vendors that were doing that work. And you could think that's actually quite a bit of effort in order to identify the criteria and select the appropriate vendors for that. So a big part of this work will be to identify which of the process going forward will need a vendor or a procurement to do this. We'll also be figuring out what criteria will be used in identifying and selecting those vendors.

We'll be using the ICANN procurement process which will involve request for proposals, potentially requests for information as well, to go along with that. And while the assessment itself may not be specific as to which vendors we would like to select or we'd select, it would

hopefully give an understanding of where the vendors would be needed and how we'd go about selecting those when the time comes.

Next slide, please. Another big area is the resources and staffing. So this is about the human capital and the internal resources. So if we think about the different phases we have, we are currently in the ... Sorry. Let me speak specific. We're currently in policy implementation. We have the ODP that's in the tail end, and that's what we're talking about at the moment. But after that will come the actual implementation work, as well as eventually the operational timeframe of [inaudible] once the round is launched. And at various points along the way, resources will need to be adjusted as needed. And part of that is ... Or I should say the responsibility of that falls here. So an understanding of that demand throughout the different phases of the project is what will come out of the assessment as well.

Next slide, please. Another big area, of course, is finance. And this is here the calculation of the fees and the cost associated with the program will occur. So the design build, and actual launch of operations will all have a cost, and they will have to be calculated out, and finance responsibilities will be where that resides. The estimation of fees of the applicants, including any specific fees that might be in there—as an example, the objection filing fees—will need to be figured out, as well as a fee for registry operators once someone is contracted for any services that arise out of this next upcoming round.

One thing to keep in mind is that the 2012 round was well over \$300 million, so this is not a trivial aspect of the program. This is actually a very critical aspect that will need to be brought up and fleshed out.

Next area, please. Next slide, please. So the next scoping area is risk. The overall risks to the Org and to the program related to business, legal and reputational will be considered here. We need to look at implementing the recommendations and outputs of the final report and how they conflict or interact with the ICANN bylaws, any interesting policies or contracts, or any future changes in the law that we see coming down on us from different jurisdictions.

There's also the fact that some of the outputs may unclear to us or may not have received consensus, and those may need to be discussed as well for whatever potential risks come out of that. And of course, security, stability, and resilience are part of our mission as well. That will need to be considered.

Some of the things that might be brought up specifically are, what would be the risks of a material delay in this launch, and what could cause that? Would it be a natural disaster or such? And another one that's listed here is, what would happen if there was a large shortfall or excess of funding, and how would it impact our estimates in how we could deliver the program?

Next slide, please. So another aspect that came up in our discussions was, what are the dependencies or prerequisites to opening the immediate next round? There is the ongoing work within ICANN that might touch upon this—some of the other programs or project or initiatives that might be going on. The same holds true for any advice or community recommendations that are outstanding. Some of them may also have an impact on how the implementation of subsequent

procedures move forward or if there are any other community work out there that can have an impact as well.

Again, here I mentioned the idea that there might be a place where policy guidance either did not receive full consensus or was unclear in some way. And there may be a need to wait for clarification on that. And also there is the fact that, if any area of this feasibility assessment is ODA and is then able to come up with a solution, then that will need to be identified as well, in which case some way to address that will need to be found.

Next slide, please. Throughout the scoping discussions that occur, the idea of global public interest came up several times. And with the final report on the global public interest and the framework that came out and the pilot that started in FY '20, there is the likelihood that the outcome of that could be part of what needs to be considered for the operational design assessment. So a section has been set aside for that as well: how the global public interest framework will impact this work.

And the last slide, I think, on this topic, please. This is the timeline. This is probably one of the more interesting ones for a lot of people. What is the overall timeline to get all of this work done? This includes the designing, the building, and the launching, getting the resources, developing the tools—all of that kind of work. And as you can see, this is also broken down by phase—what's going to happen at each phase. As you can imagine, some work might be a prerequisite to other work occurring. All those will need to be figured into the timeline that gets presented to the Board as part of the operational design assessment. This is definitely one of the aspects that's going to be a [inaudible].

With that, I believe we can move on to the next slide. So that was the end of the scoping areas. One of the next things we'd like to talk a little bit about is how the Org is planning to move forward.

So, with the next slide, Nanig in her opening slides talked about three-month internal project organization, the ten months of ODP, and then the Board consideration after that. And that is represented here in the middle section of this slide. The main takeaway from this slide that we'd like you to have here is that the ICANN ecosystem, in which case we talk about the community and the Board and the Org—and this has been mentioned many times in the past—all have a role to play as we move forward here.

The work of the ODP is done by the Org, but there are interactions with the Board and interactions with the community that are expected to occur during this. As you can see here, in the Board section, we have the interaction with Org on ODP, and at the bottom in the community section, we have the ODP Org engagement. My colleague, Lars, will be talking a little bit more in that engagement in the next slide, but we wanted to make it clear that, throughout this process, there is interaction with the Board and the community at various points, various milestones, along the way.

With that, I'll hand it back to Lars.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Chris. Just a couple of slides or just one slide, in this case, actually, on the engagement. The last slide has just some helpful links, really.

Community engagement during the ODP. So this consists of two different mechanisms. Those of you who listened to previous webinars or read up on the ODP will know this. There's really nothing new here. One aspect of the engagement essentially is information sharing. So throughout the course of the ODP, ICANN Org will keep the community up to date on the progress of this work. This may include published updates, [inaudible] cadence [inaudible]. These will be webinars, announcements, blogs, webpages—the usual array of ways to provide updates on work progress.

In addition, we are also very happy to connect with community groups, for example, during ICANN meetings, be it virtual or, as far as I'm concerned, very hopefully in person very soon. If there's a stakeholder group or a supporting organization who would like to meet with the ICANN Org ODP team during those sessions, I think that's something that we can arrange, time permitting, obviously.

And the second aspect of community engagement is when we seek input from the community. This will occur when specific milestones are reached and also detailed in the process paper. Milestones will obviously be detailed in the ODP workplan once that's finalized. And so when those are reached, ICANN Org will seek community input on the facts, figures, and assumptions that we used during the ODP and as part of the assessment. And these requests for input will be directed at the entirety of the community—all community groups, SOs/ACs, stakeholder groups, constituencies, RALOs, and individuals for that matter.

At that time when we seek that sort of input, we may also conduct webinars or publish a blog or provide any additional information for other means to provide more context to the request for input. Again, happy to meet with community groups if timing allows and it's desired. So that's really about the work of the ODP where we engage the community.

Then there is another case which is if a policy issue arises. So this really is about a situation where, during our assessment, we notice that there's a concern, an issue, a problem, a misunderstanding, or a lack of understanding, that concerns the substance of the intent of an output from the final report. Such a policy issue will then be taken directly to the GNSO Council. And that is because, as a reminder, the final report has not yet been adopted by the Board. For now, it lies before the Board for its consideration. The GNSO Council has adopted the document and is asking the Board to do the same.

So therefore if there's an issue that goes to the recommendations, to the intent of the substance thereof, Org will take the matter to the Board. And if they agree with that, they will refer the matter then to the GNSO Council to seek clarity. And that will happen mostly by ICANN Org, but it will then go to the GNSO Council liaison for this purpose only. So the GNSO Council is encouraged to select a liaison to create a line of communication, if you want, between the Board, ICANN Org, and the community in case a policy issue arises. Other than that case, ICANN Org will engage with the entire community as we would on any other matter.

And once again, I'm pointing to the process document, which lists roles and responsibilities, including the engagement that I spoke about, the roles of the GNSO Council and the Board, etc.

And that brings me to the next and, I believe, final slide. So you see here, as promised or threatened, there's just a couple of links. I know that you probably won't be able to click on these in the Zoom room. Obviously, the deck will be made available after the call. So if you have any questions, there's an e-mail address here as well. This will be a publicly archived list.

And with that, I'll pass it back to Andrea, I believe. I see a hand has gone up, but we're going to go, I think, Andrea, to you first. No? I thought that Maarten has his hand up as well. I'm not sure. Andrea, over to you, first of all.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. One moment, please. Yes, I do believe that we do have some closing remarks from Maarten. You can go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I saw some questions in the Q&A. Are you going to handle these first? Because, for sure, it's good to have the community attend and contribute to discussion, and it'd be good to go over the questions.

For us, at the Board, this ODP is really a way to get a better feel for what we are deciding on. The policies as such are clear and we know that there's a lot of aspects that still need deeper diving. I saw some remarks in the chat that referred to that, too.

And, basically, this has been a process that always has been important for the Board before taking its decision. Going through ODP is not to add time but is really to put a frame around to make clear which steps were taken and to be able to follow progress for the community, for the Board, and for the organization to do its stuff, it steps not in isolation but in continuous and transparent interaction. So we really encourage the community also to engage and continue to engage, ask questions, make suggestions. And I see some clear questions here in the chat I'm sure we will go into shortly.

So to successfully implement this new round, it really deserves some careful action and careful planning. Yes, we've done a round before and we learned from that, but it's implementing these lessons, making sure the next round is even than the one before. No doubt that the time and resources we spend now will save time during implementation which will follow the ODP and the Board decision based on the feedback we get.

So with that, thanks a lot, Lars, and for the team. And back to you.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you so much. We will now go to the question-and-answer session. If you would like to ask a question, you can click the Q&A box at the bottom in your Zoom screen and type in your question. You may also raise your hand. If you raise your hand, you will be unmuted but you may also need to unmute on your end, just to make sure that you aren't double-muted.

We will take a first quest from Anne Aikman-Scalese. You may unmute her line.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Hi. I think my question is just about the timing in relation to how much time have we spent thus far in SubPro to get there. I'm wondering if a lot of the issues that have been scoped here are actually issues that were already addressed in SubPro and in the policy recommendations coming out of GNSO Council so that they really, in many cases, are a matter of IRT consideration. And how is it that they need to take that much time and an additional 18 months—is it?—when the policy process is supposed to answer many of those questions. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Could I answer that question?

LARS HOFFMANN: Yes. Go ahead, Göran.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. And thank you, Anne, for a very good question because it goes to the heart of things. Yes, the community work deliberately—for how many years; seven years, six years; I wasn't here when they started so I can't really tell how many years it was ... But it shows it's a complex issue. As you probably have seen during the presentation, there are many issues still to be decided upon. We're going to focus on one, which will be, what will the cost be to build the system? Which for some

reason my Board wants to know that question. When I go to decisions with the president of the Board, they always ask me, “I want to know how much it costs and how you’re going to pay for it.” And I think that’s a fair question.

But to be able to answer that question—remember, I’m only taking one of all of the questions in turn—you actually have to design the system. And then you have to go and speak to someone who can actually deliver the system to you. And then, before that, before we ever design it, there are a lot of questions you have to ask. So it takes time.

And I think that the ODP doesn’t add to the time. I actually do truly believe, when we look back on this one, it took several years to do this last time—many years. And the policy was [inaudible] as well. Yes, we learned a lot [inaudible]. So I think it’s going to be of total time shorter than this time. But there are questions that we have to still engage with. You have to ask that simple question to the Board: how much it’s going to cost. We are doing everything to make sure the overall time is as short as possible because that’s what we focus on, not this particular part.

And you’re right. When it comes to the IRT, which handles a lot of the questions that are done ... But remember, the last time when the Board made the decision, there was no application guidebook. We’re trying to avoid the criticism that I think that we rightfully got, not collectively like ICANN Org or the Board but we as community, that there were [parts] of this one that weren’t that transparent. And who made the decision and how did we end up doing this and why some things became policy and some things maybe not.

So I don't think it's a long time. As Chris said, we're talking about a cost base of more than \$300 million or \$350 million. In total, the whole thing is going to be in the \$450 million range or something, depending on how many applicants, which actually leads me to another question. One of the decisions we had to make is, how many applications do we actually think is going to come in during a certain timeframe? And we have expectations [about that one], but I still think we have to delve a little bit into that because that would have an effect on the sizing of the whole system.

I hope that answered your question.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. We have two questions that go together, so I'll read both of those. The first one is, is that another three months staff will take to start the ODP? Could you please elaborate why it may take this time beyond the seven months already used to plan the ODP?

And the second question that goes along with that: The \$9 million allocated—what goes into this? Is it for new staff, volunteers? Or what exactly is it meant for? Please clarify.

GÖRAN MARBY: May I answer this question as well? Because it's a good question. And thank you for asking it.

The first part of the answer to the question is [a bit of a technical] bookkeeping thing. Remember that the policy said that this is not something that has an effect on ICANN's operations. So it's not part of our budget. So [remember] the people who are working for us today. We are going to use a lot of them actually to work on this project now. Then we literally have to move them out of the ordinary budget—I'm going to put my camera on so you can see my waving my hand as well—into the next budget.

That being said, if we want to pay those people salary, the Board actually has to make a decision. They now have salary but it's under sort of a different bucket. So it's a mechanical thing. And then you would say, "Oh, that would lower the cost inside ICANN Org." Now the problem is, of course, we would have to continue to the work we do in ICANN Org, so there is an additional cost. So it's a technicality. That's one part.

And the other part is we are 400 people in ICANN Org and we are doing a lot of things all the time, which is we're fully occupied anyway, which means that we also need to get resources to be able to do this for a fairly long time because it will take some time to implement this. And we will use anything from hiring new people—if you go to the ICANN place for new hires, you will see that we have a lot of open positions that I welcome people to come into—but we're also going to take temporary workers in. We're going to have consultants helping us to make sure that we do this as fast and efficiently as possible.

But again, I don't want you to see the \$9 million as a, "Oh, we didn't have that last time." This is really what I think, at some point, we have

to do the work. It's before the Board makes a decision, it's after the Board makes a decision. In the IRT or whatever it is, the work needs to be done. But it's the same amount of work.

I hope that answered both of the questions.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. One moment for the next question.

Okay. Our next question: why is this regarded as complex when most of the rules and processes adopted in 2012 remain? There are a few new elements, but most of the changes recommended are straightforward.

GÖRAN MARBY:

I'm going to start answering this and maybe leave it over to Theresa. Or someone else is going to help me. But I think you've seen in the presentation today all the complexities that still exist, plus the fact that there is no system that we could put that in. We don't have a computer system or a process for doing this because remember that last time, we did it once and we did it fantastically together. How do we handle all those applicants? We don't have that system. We have to build it.

So, yes, I agree with many things of the policies that are already done, but there are also, as we talked about some other questions here—I saw some questions about it, how are you going to handle [inaudible] closed generics—there are still things ... I wouldn't say policy but still related to. And there are also, I think, clarifications that we sometimes need to have. And that's why we have the GNSO liaison for this as well. There will be questions that we also want to make sure that we

understand correctly before we go and implement something. And I think you'll agree with me that it's better to do that before the Board makes a decision than afterwards.

So I think it's a little bit of a simplification to say, "Oh, this is easy to implement. Let's just go and do it." And I can understand where you're coming from with that, but I think that we've proven today it's a little more complex than that.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Yeah, I'm happy to add onto that, if I may. I think that, as was reflected in the scoping document, there's—and I know there was another question related to this—there's quite a few dependencies related to this that need to be looked at. There's also a lot of lessons learned from the prior rounds that can be applied to this that we need to be taking a look at.

So I think, just as it took the community some time to come together on certain things, it's now really time, as an organization, to look at what these dependencies are, making sure that we get this right, and working with the community around that to make sure this next phase in this next round really is inclusive to the next billion users that could be potential applicants. Thanks.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. Our next question is: The process for handling GAC advice is outlined in the ICANN bylaws. Could you expand upon what the ODP will do as part of scoping for that?

THERESA SWINEHART: Sure. I can get a start on that. So in the current round, there was some other GAC processes that were around providing input on the application, such as early warnings. So the same time of process is proposed for the subsequent rounds. So that involves some level of process or relooking at processes around how to do that.

So I hope that helps answer that question.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. Our next question: There is still considerable ongoing work on UA and LGRs for many languages/scripts, which is relevant to IDNs. Will the Board's consideration of these issues impact its decision on when or how the next round will be launched—i.e., could these issues possibly result in delaying the next round? If so, please explain why.

THERESA SWINEHART: I'm happy to take a look at that as well. This is something that we certainly do expect to be coming out of the ODP-related work. And we're very cognizant, as you've heard Göran and as you've heard us speak about this, that the importance of the next round to greater global inclusivity of languages is very important. So we anticipate that this is something that the ODP will also help respond to on this specific question.

And as you know, as an organization, we also doing quite a bit of work around universal acceptance and IDNs and certainly look forward to the community's work on this, as that will be instrumental to running this in

parallel as we're looking at this question in the context of the ODP as well.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. Next, we will go Martin Sutton with a live question. You may ask your question.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks, Andrea. I just wanted to pick up on a couple of points. Göran mentioned earlier that it should be less time to prepare and implement the next round when comparing with the last round. I think we've got to be a bit more ambitious than that. It should be a lot quicker than last time as I mentioned earlier in the comments and questions with a lot of the complexities we went through the last time. Other complexities have been worked on by the community on a volunteer basis for the last five years. So those are contained within the outputs of the report.

And I do understand and appreciate that there does need to be significant work done to understand, clarify, and implement that activity, but we do have a wealth of experience already in the past. Systems-wise, I'm surprised if we haven't already been looking at that based on previous inputs from ICANN staff a couple of years ago, where there was a preparation document looking at some of the aspects of implementing the next round and being prepared, essentially, to accept a report and outputs to be able to think about how that would be delivered.

So I would emphasize the point that this shouldn't be just a little bit quicker in delivering than the last round. This should be a lot quicker in delivering than the last round.

And what I haven't seen in the transparency that Göran was talking about for the ODP is in the transparency of the scoping exercise, which has also taken seven months, by the looks of it, to complete. So it would be useful to ensure that the transparency aspect is followed through within the OPD initiation and delivery. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you, Martin. For some reason, your standpoint doesn't surprise me at all. I don't want to go into debate with you. It could be fun for you and me, but not for the rest.

Just to point out a couple of things, which is sort of funny. Last time we did this, we got 26 recommendations. And now, thanks to the hard work that the community did, we have 100+ guidances this time, over 300 outputs. Yeah, it takes some time to go through them because we really want to make sure that we deliver on the community demand on this one.

Your questions ... I understand where you're coming from, and I have no issues where you're coming from. We are here. We are having this conversation, openly and transparently, going through a lot of those issues that we have to tend to. I hope and feel that you really appreciate that. Thank you very much.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. Our next question: Would the ODP deliver a draft applicant guidebook based for community review? And an estimated timeline? New entrants that have waited patiently to have a fair opportunity to apply will need information early on to assess and plan.

THERESA SWINEHART: I can take that one. So there's no intent to create a draft applicant guidebook as part of the ODP. And an estimated timeline will be included in the operational design assessment. So that's part of that work that we'd be having underway. Thanks.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. Next question: could you please provide the list of dependencies ICANN believes impacts the next round?

THERESA SWINEHART: I can take that one as well. So there's many areas that you've seen in the scoping document as well, and the ODP is certainly intended to flesh out several of these different topics. And we can't say definitely at this point, but some of the topics that have an impact are name collision, closed generics, auctions, the IDN, and universal acceptance. And certainly this part of the work that will be included in the ODP. But as you'll see from the scoping materials in the presentation, there's several different moving parts that are dependencies that will need to be resolved and be harmonized in the right way to make sure that we can move forward on a smooth course on this.

So hopefully that helps answer that question.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. Our next question: Just to clarify, three months to prep for OPD, ten months for ODP, then three months for Board approval? 16 months total?

CHRIS BARE: Hi. I can take this one. Yes, that is the correct thinking. It would be the three months for the internal project organization, then ten months for the ODP, and then approximately three months for Board approval.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. Our next question: What work can be done by the community/Org concurrently? For example, the policy calls for the RSP pre-approval process. This is something that seemingly could be done without too much additional work, and if it occurs concurrently, we will not have to delay the ultimate round even further.

CHRIS BARE: This is Chris again. I'll turn on my video. This is something we've been discussing internally as well. There are likely aspects that come out of the final report that would be able to work concurrently with ODP. But those are things that we do need to identify. So you mentioned RSP pre-approval. There's potentially other ones as well.

GÖRAN MARBY: Any more questions? These are very good questions, by the way.

ANDREA GLANDON:

One moment, please.

Okay. We do have a live question from [inaudible]. Please ask your question.

One moment while we open that line. [inaudible], we are trying to open your line so that you can ask your question. Please unmute your line.

Okay. I think we will go on to our next question in the Q&A pod: Assuming that we go through this process of building the system we need to implement the next round, does ICANN believe that this system will be readily available to utilize for subsequent rounds after the next one? Will we need to go through another ten years of deliberations in preparation for a subsequent round if we can get the system right this time?

CHRIS BARE:

This is Chris again on this one. I believe, yes, we are expecting the systems we put into play and the processes we put into play will be usable for future rounds as well. That is, I believe, one of the requirements for the final report.

However, if there are policy changes between rounds, those would need to be figured out and incorporated into updates and changes to those processes and tools.

GÖRAN MARBY: May I make an edit to that? So you mentioned it's not going to take ... The time for doing this is a fairly short time. The long time is for the community to make its work. And that's in the hands of the community and not the ICANN Org or the Board.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. We're going to go to Jeff Neuman with a live question. You may unmute your line.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. Hopefully, you guys can hear me. Göran, I'm trying to play out the timeline in my head with the 16 months for the Board approval from now—or hopefully Board approval. The way I'm working out the timeline, given that there's not going to be a draft guidebook at the end of the 16 months, which I understand, you're talking at least another, what four to six months to develop a draft applicant guidebook, plus another six months at least, at the very minimum to finalize the guidebook. So now we're talking 28 months from today. And then we're talking about, even if the stars align and everything were approved, still the pre-evaluation program, the communication period, the application window—all of that stuff that's built in.

I'm not sure, once you consider all those timelines, that it is saving us any time by doing this ODP, unless we can explore ways to do things concurrently, like the RSP evaluation program, like having an implementation team that starts working on a guidebook, and other things. But if we're going to do everything sequentially, I think you're going to find it's going to be more than four years from the time that

the report was delivered to the Board, which was in March of this year. So I just would love to find ways to figure out how we can do more things concurrently. Thanks.

GÖRAN MARBY:

First of all, right now it feels a little bit like we're predicting when COVID is going to go away. There's a lot of ifs and buts there. But I remember you and I had a conversation about a year ago when there was a discussion about the DNS abuse. And at that time, you thought that this program, you were actually going to see its creation in 2025, which ...

So the timeline is ... We will always look forward to figuring out ways to make it shorter, but we also have to follow process that's up in the bylaws and the process set up by the GNSO. You know that I'm always open for questions and for seeing if there are things we can do differently.

But I think it would be good if we were to take it one iteration more. We are in the process now of building up the team, finding the resources, doing all the work. And it's a ramping up period, which is tough for us in the sense that we've formed the project, we're getting the talent in, we're getting the people in, we prioritize something so we make it happen. And as you've seen, there are—I see that chat that everything is—you know everybody who's involved in this. And Cheryl and [inaudible] would note there's a lot of questions that we have to get answered before we can go forward to make a decision at the Board, which you recognized many times. And I'm happy about that

Let's do one more iteration when it comes to ... So you will see a little bit more about where you are in the—what is it?—40 different projects that we set up as sub-projects to this one. Or 35. I can't remember now. And then we can have the discussion because it's also a risk. [It's easy to decide that] maybe we should start an implementation team before the Board makes a decision. But it's also then fact that there would be a risk of doing things. And I'm always willing to discuss it. But let's wait for one iteration. I hope that's okay, Jim—sorry. Jeff. I don't know what's with my brain today.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. Our next question: Coming back to the \$9 million, is the funding of this coming out of the remaining profit from Round 1? How much profit is left from Round 1? Could this unspent profit be transferred to Round 2?

GÖRAN MARBY:

Xavier, would you answer that? I just want to say we don't have profits. We are a not-for-profit. Just to make sure that I can at least make that one.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Göran. And thank you, Phil, for the question. And Göran already addressed one of the points I was going to make, which is simply we do, as Phil knows and everyone knows, have some leftover or remaining funds for the 2012 round, which unfortunately is not completely finished because there are still activities happening around

the remaining applications, and those are in various processes currently that continue to draw on the resources, including consuming some of those funds.

So the remaining funds of the 2012 round, which are approximately at the moment \$70 million, are going to be—that's the decision that the Board has made—used for the purpose of funding this preparation to the next round, including the ODP. And therefore, under the approach that the funds for this program are dedicated to the New gTLD Program, not necessarily specifically for a round, we're expecting and intending to use any remaining fund of the 2012 round to help carry out the work pertaining to the next round.

So, yes is probably the answer to your question, Phil. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Okay. And the next question: You listed closed generics as a dependency, but SubPro looked into that in great deal. Is it the staff's intent to reopen that, even though the PDP already has dealt with it in the PDP and the final report?

LARS HOFFMANN:

I can take that, Andrea. Paul, thank you for the question. I think the topic of closed generics came up under the issue of possible dependencies. So, yes, the PDP did not produce any recommendations on closed generics. Staff is not intending to open the issue, is not intending to create policy or address it any other way. The community has tried and has not come up with a recommendation.

But we do have GAC advice on the matter. And so the ODP, I believe, will look at whether the GAC advice ... how that is compatible with the immediate next round and whether in fact that is or is not a dependency. I don't think that question is answered or has been answered. Then the OPD will hopefully set out to do so. But there is no intention of opening the policy issue as such. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. And we do have another live question from Martin Sutton. You may ask your question.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you, Andrea. I'm just thinking about some of the items in the scoping document that includes looking at the risk towards the next round. I'm just wondering if Org has already or will be, early on, looking at risk associated with sort of a protracted delay in rolling out the next rounds in conjunction with the wider ecosystem. So there's a lot of Internet governance issues that have been emerging over the last few years and they continue and they're growing risks and issues. So I'd be interested to know if that would be included as part—the risk assessment—of the ODP. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN: I'm happy to take—oh, go ahead, Göran.

GÖRAN MARBY:

So you're asking a very good question which is complicated to answer. First of all, I trust the ICANN community to have done [deliberate] work and everybody is complimenting the PDP workers. Some of them are, as you recall, really do deserve the recognition that they're getting for the good work they've done. Most of the Internet governance issues that are related, to my knowledge, has been about things like abuse or other ones that we've been discussing, like reporting systems or the handling of the WHOIS system and other things. And I don't think that anyone has actually asked me a question of, if we don't get a new round, it's going to be problematic with a new governance model.

But I actually think that you're pointing [inaudible] the whole thing. I agree with you that this is something we need to do, but for the public interest. This is a public interest thing that ICANN is doing. We're a not-for-profit organization providing a service to the world. And I definitely think, by doing this thing, we will, as I spoke on in my opening remarks, do things better for Internet users, current and new, in the world. And that's what we focus on. We don't focus on specific business interests in that sense. That's someone else's work to do, and many of you who are on this call specialize in those things.

So I know that I interrupted Xavier from talking about risks. There's a lot of common themes in this that I heard since I joined ICANN but also learned from my own team and you guys and also in the questions we received coming up with the ODP in the direction we did. You have to make sure that you understand the risk going into this project decided by the ICANN community. You have to make sure that you have mitigations for all those risks. And that's really what we're thinking about.

So I wouldn't—sorry, Martin?

Sorry, Martin, I don't know if you said something.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Sorry. No, I just got interrupted and just had to get out of the room.
Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Okay. Sorry. So I know it's very hard to answer the question, but I think it's in everybody's interest to do this as soon as we can with the quality that we need to do it in a very transparent way for the benefit of the Internet users of the world because it's a public interest thing.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. At this time, we have no further questions.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Andrea. Maarten, I know you took the floor earlier. Would you like to wrap it up?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I assume you mean this Maarten?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Yes. Sorry, Maarten.

GÖRAN MARBY: We just got one final question, by the way, by Jeff, who asked, when can we expect the next update for the community.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Do you have a date for that, Lars?

LARS HOFFMANN: We do not. We don't have a set date for that, Jeff, I'm afraid. I think it will come during the ramp-up period. I think once the project plan is finalized, that's probably a good moment to provide an update on what that contains. And if there's anything before that that comes up of relevance, obviously, we will share that with the community as well. Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. And of course, this will be subject to the community meetings that are coming as well. This will be constant touchpoints where you wont only be able to interact with Org and learn from Org but also interact with each other.

I noticed in the chat that, across the community, there's also a few different opinions, some of which still have to come together. So I do hope and believe that this ODP process that will provide this timeline will take us through the whole process to address all these areas that have been indicated and will help guide the discussion and help us to

build step by step, progressing towards the decision that the Board will take in due time on this policy.

So I really appreciate your interest and understand that, in some part of the community, the eagerness to start sooner rather than later is bigger than in other parts of the community. And that's natural. This is why we are a multi-stakeholder community and will come together on this. So thanks to the organization for their [preparative] work, their diligent work, on mapping all these points out. Really, the aim is to come towards building on the policy itself, learning together, and coming to the right decisions when the time comes. So, really, thank you.

Yes, Martin, I can answer that. They're in the three-month ramp-up now following the Board decision. Göran stepped up with his team even further in the preliminary thinking to engage in that.

So thanks for that. Thanks, Lars, Göran, and the team for the update. Looking forward to engaging with you also in ICANN72, if not before. Thank you all very much.

ANDREA GLANDON: We did have one other question from Anne Aikman-Scalese.

GÖRAN MARBY: Let's have Anne have the last word as we have a couple of minutes.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay, great.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks very much, Göran. I really just wanted to echo something that Jeff Neuman said. I was a fairly active member of SubPro, and I wanted to suggest the possibility that, in the scoping document, where you refer to consulting with the GNSO Council liaison regarding unclear policy issues, notwithstanding the fact that that's Jeff and you'll get good response, the truth is that it's an IRT that is the proper role there. I'm consulting on those types of issues and it's really far more efficient to empanel your IRT and work concurrently with the operational design phase, empaneling that IRT subject to a later actual approval of moving forward, because, rather than being sequentially, working concurrently would be more efficient. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Lars, you want to start with that?

LARS HOFFMANN: Yeah. I'll give it just a quick whirl. Göran. And just a quick reminder—and thank you for that question, first of all. I think it's good to clarify this. I'm glad you asked. The Board obviously hasn't adopted the final report yet, so the ODP is informing the Board decisions on that matter or the outcome of the ODP: the ODA. So if and when the Board adopts the report and implementation starts, then obviously an IRT will be formed as stated in the CPIF. So at the moment, we are in a stage where the role for the IRT is not there yet because it's the implementation review team and there's nothing to implement at this time. We're just

operationally designing a phase and informing the Board's discussion on whether to adopt or not.

Göran?

GÖRAN MARBY:

So I think it's an interesting question because the Board resolution will say at some point at time that the Board tells the ICANN Org CEO or its designees to do something. The IRT ... The implementation is run by ICANN Org. And then you have a community interaction to make sure that we do the right thing. So it's not a decision-making body in that sense.

What I think you're proposing is to have another interaction with the GNSO to see if you can advance, but that's not an IRT. That's something different because the IRT is a part of a specific process. And I said in the chat—and I broke my [inaudible] rules—I think that's a fair discussion to have with the GNSO: how to interact with the GNSO. We proposed a liaison model to make sure that we have someone to talk to. The GNSO would like to organize itself differently. I'm positive and I know my team is positive to have that dialogue. But it's not an IRT, which I think you know. But I understand your sentiment.

I hope that was an answer.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Thank you. I'm suggesting just a broader cooperation in scope with folks who are actually involved in the policy development during the SubPro process.

GÖRAN MARBY: I'm the first one to recognize that I think ... And I've spoken about this before. I think we're making a small mistake. When the GNSO Council [has stopped a] PDP, the working group doesn't really formally exist anymore. And I think we've seen in many of the complicated issues that we have that it might not be the best way of going forward for our ability to have conversations and asking questions. And really the fine folks in the PDP we had ... They helped us a lot during the actual PDP process. We had really good conversations. To be able to have that conversation would be very ... I think personally—and ICANN Org thinks so officially—that would be a really good thing to do. It's a process change. I think we're sometimes too bureaucratic to do process changes. I would love to engage with the GNSO Council and the GNSO about that suggestion, but it's not an IRT.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESEL: Okay, great. I think it would be fantastic to open that discussion to be a more flexible process than in the past. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. And we do have one more question. "When will the ODP workplan be released? I may have missed a comment on this."

LARS HOFFMANN: I apologize. I was frantically trying to unmute. Thank you, Justine. You have not [inaudible], so the workplan is one of the first outputs and we do not have a timeline for that. I think it's going to be published as part

of the ramp-up period or at the very least at the very beginning of the assessment period. So you saw the timeline—three months and then ten months of assessment. So I don't want to put a time down, but within the next three to five months. I'm going to say that. I might get in trouble, but I will do my very best to make that happen as much as possible.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Can I add one more thing? Sorry. I'm probably now going to say what Theresa says. So the ramp-up period is recognizing that ... First of all, we don't have all the resources in place 100% from Day 1. But everybody gets that.

The other thing is the ramp -up period is where we start ... It's not like we're not doing anything. We're doing ... I was very close to saying a profanity there. We're doing a lot of work already with the resources we have. We're adding resources, we're doing more work, etc. And a lot of those things we're doing in parallel. So it's not like we're doing it sequentially, waiting for someone to throw all the curveballs to the next one. It's just that we need to ramp up. And in the conversation with the Board, we wanted to set the expectations with you guys. We want to set the expectations right. We don't have 100% resources to it from Day 1. There will be a period where we start slower and then we increase our time.

So look at the ramp-up period not like nothing happens. A lot of things are happening, but not everything is happening.

I hope that clarifies a little bit more.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you so much. We do not have any further questions, so that will close today's conference call. Thank you so much for joining, and everyone have a wonderful rest of your day.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you very much. I think this has been really fun. I'm looking forward to having a continuous discussion with you all again.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]