MICHAEL KARAKASH:

Hello, and welcome to the first meeting of the Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team on 16 May 2023 at 13:00 UTC. My name is Michael Karakash, and together with Leon Grundmann and Elisa Busetto, I will be the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. We will read questions and comments allowed during the time set by the facilitator of the session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're not speaking.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Lars.

LARS HOFFMANN:

That's right. Let me get my camera back on. Thank you so much, Michael. Welcome, everybody. As Michael said, first meeting. We probably only need about three or so until we're done. One wishes. Right. I'm going to take you through the deck today. Welcome, everybody. We had a long list, great number of signups. I think we are

---

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.

standing at over 65. We have an overview later on the deck. I think Leon was driving the slides. If you can go to them to the next slide just for the agenda, please. Thank you so much.

Also, spoiler alert, next week we'll do a largely administrative agenda, work our way through a largely administrative agenda. So today, the purpose is really to welcome everybody, introduce you as the team from the Org side. I don't think we will do a roundtable with over 60 people on the call in an hour's call. I don't think that's a good use of anybody's time. I saw that some of you have already used the chance to introduce yourselves and send greetings from your locations. I think that's a very nice thing to do. I'm going to introduce myself and the team in just a moment.

The agenda here you'll see for today, I said administrative, welcome and introductions, some context. And we'll talk about the work methodology of the IRT. We'll give an overview of provisional schedule, and then links to resource materials, references, and next steps, and also look at the agenda for next week.

Very good. I think the next one is a divider slide. Two more slides, please. While Leon moves the slide forward, a reminder that the slides as well as the recording of the call will be on the IRT community wiki page. I don't know if somebody from our team may have the link handy to post that into the chat. Otherwise, I think there's also links in the deck, and we can do that at the end as well when there's the reference slide.

So first of all, my name is Lars Hoffman. I'm a senior director for Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs with ICANN. I've been with ICANN for 10 years. This is the first IRT that I'm leading. So you work at ICANN, you learn something new every day. I hope that it won't be the last and I'm very much looking forward to it. It's been a long time coming.

We have a lot of the people, a big team behind me or in fact next to me. Some of the people who work will be working substantively on this project are listed here as well. Angelina from Comms, Antonietta, Elisa work also in the same department as I do. They were helping will these calls and also work on policy language. Francisco, a colleague of mine, also from the GDS team, has been working and will continue to work on the Registry Pre-Evaluation Program. Isabelle, also in my team, will also work on Applicant Guidebook language. Kristy is working on Applicant Support. Leon and Michael and Peter are also working on Applicant Guidebook language and will be shepherding various topics as we move through this IRT and hopefully draft together an Applicant Guidebook for the next round of new gTLDs.

We have an e-mail address, the bottom here, nextround_policyimplementation@icann.org. Short and snappy. If you have any questions, feel free to e-mail us. Obviously, you can always also reach out to us directly or in fact use the IRT mailing list. The next slide, please.

I apologize, we're not going to do—if you can just one slide back, Leon. We have a lot of people supporting this project. There's a lot more people working on this and then the different implementation streams to get the next round off the ground. So again, we decided not to do a

EN

roundtable, we'll have a face-to-face IRT meeting in Washington, D.C. during ICANN77. So I hope we can then put some faces to the names as well. I will ask as we go through the IRT, obviously, that when colleagues speak, they introduce themselves so you're familiar with faces and know who's working on what. Sorry about that. Thanks, Leon. The next slide, please.

Just some statistics or information about this group. I think this is a relatively up-to-date number, knowing Elisa is responsible for that probably a minute or so before the call updated. We have 68 members signed up so far. Obviously, this is an open group. So people are welcome and encouraged to join throughout its lifetime. There's the full list of the members. It's published on the ICANN wiki page. And as many of you will know, we'll get to the Roles and Responsibilities in a moment. But each IRT has a GNSO Council liaison attached to it. I believe my later information is that the Council is on the process of deciding who that will be. So that's TBD. You'll see that though from the Roles and Responsibilities, the liaison's role is not the equivalent of a working group chair. IRTs are chaired by staff. So they're really only pivotal when there are areas of disagreement between Org and the IRT, and then the liaison will play a role to liaise to the Council to help resolve that. So we don't think, especially in the first meetings, there will be any such issues. In fact, personally, I hope there won't be any of such issues throughout the lifetime of this IRT. I'm pretty sure we'd be able to work very amicably and productively together. Elisa, thank you for posting the link to the wiki as well, and the chat as well to the wiki.

Good. Let me just double-check. I noted that the Council has two candidates and likely to discuss this in the meeting next week. Good.

Obviously, if you have any question at any time, raise your hand. If you are remote and you're not in the Zoom Room, just on the phone, just find a moment to cut me off and just interrupt me. It's no problem at all. That goes throughout the lifetime obviously of this IRT. Very much looking forward and encouraging you to speak up and wanting to hear from you. Good. The next slide, please. Thank you so much.

Oh yeah, quick overview. I'll talk about the representatives and members in just a moment. This is kind of a breakdown we provided. People have signed up from the different SO/ACs and the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies as well. An overview again, that's also on the wiki page. The next slide, please, Leon.

There is material or list to the various materials on the wiki space. You will see that in an orderly fashion and we'll keep that site obviously updated throughout the work of this IRT. The next slide, please.

The work, a little bit of context. Justine and Cheryl just confirmed and point obviously that many of you have worked for a long time together during the lifetime of the PDP. I have to admit, I only personally adjoined that efforts passively from the staff side towards the end of the PDP. I know many of you, obviously, from my time in ICANN. This group here has come together now, the IRT, following Board resolution during the ICANN meeting in Cancún where the Board adopted 98 recommendations. The 6th of March that happened and directed ICANN to form an Implementation Review Team, the IRT. We published a call for volunteers in early April. And voila, today is the 16th of May and we have our first meeting. Thank you.

Yeah, Jim, I was just starting about the paper URL. We might be able to do something there with a shortener. We'll work on that. It's a good point. Thanks. Good. The next slide, please.

For those of you who have not worked on an IRT, some reminders. All this was shared, obviously, in volunteers. This is from existing documentation. So for those of you who come prepared, this should not be any surprise. We have two kinds of documents in the ICANN world that guide or set the procedures around IRTs, speak about both purpose and role for community members. For IRT members, I should say, for the Council, for the liaison, for staff, for the Board, etc., etc. So the IRT itself serves as a resource to ICANN Org on policy and technical questions with regard to the recommendations that we are implementing. In this case, these are the Board-approved recommendations from the SubPro Final Report. It also serves as a resource on background and rationale of the policy recommendations in the Final Report. Noted many of you have been taking part in the PDP. In fact, Jeff Neuman, who's in the chat here as well, and Cheryl I think were the co-chairs of that PDP. So the rank and file is part of this IRT, which is great. The IRT is also there to assist ICANN Org in developing the policy implementation details to ensure that the implementation conforms with the intent of the policy recommendations as detailed in the Final Report and obviously also as adopted by the Board.

It's true, Cheryl, yes. Avri was also an original co-chair. She has moved on to the Board and is now in fact the co-chair of the SubPro Caucus. So she certainly has not let go yet. Very good. The next slide, please.

EN

The previous slide was really a general overview of IRTs in general. This is a bit more specific to this IRT. We have a lot of recommendations to go through, and the Board and I'm sure many of you as well, and for us for that matter certainly, anxious to move through this work that's before us as effectively and efficiently and quickly as possible, while obviously making sure that all the necessary and procedural steps are taken into consideration as efficient input from the community consultation as appropriate, and so on, so forth. But we have a lot of work to get through. So there was a sense from the Board, if you recall, maybe some of you, the language in the resolution notes that the Board would like to see a working methodology for the IRT at ICANN77. So based on that, we consulted with the GNSO Council and we're trying something—we want to say very slightly differently, which hopefully may help to streamline the work and make sure that we essentially don't get stuck. I think that's really the biggest concern.

There's a couple of things so that applied to this IRT. Here we ask you kindly to agree to a Statement of Participation. Maybe Elisa or somebody could link the URL directly into the chat as well. This is really just to make sure that members understand the commitment that is required to work effectively with the IRT, time commitment, understanding of roles and responsibilities, etc., etc. It's something we borrowed from the GNSO. I think they use that for different work efforts as well in the past. So it's not something completely new to the ICANN world.

The IRT is not here to reopen policy issues, neither is ICANN staff there to reinterpret the intent of the recommendation. The IRT is there to make sure that in fact when ICANN Org implements that we do that

according to the original intent of the PDP. There is no voting or consensus designation during IRP separate to a PDP. There is a moment—I'll talk about in a moment—when the liaison may gauge the consensus level in an IRT and when really there's a disagreement. But otherwise, really, it's about providing input and interacting with one another collegially and hopefully moving through the recommendation and work as constructively as possible.

So what we did here—and you know that but I think it's helpful to put this on the record, and obviously, if there's any questions—we proposed and the Council agreed to kind of an open and representative model for this IRT. This is based again on the GNSO 3.0 PDP model. The difference here between what representatives do, there's only two class system. Representatives are simply there to hopefully speak to the extent possible on behalf of the SO/ACs, constituencies, stakeholder groups of the community, groups that they have sent them here. So we hope that that's a good exchange between representatives and their groups. Groups are being informed by what happened, and similarly, we hear via the representatives about viewpoints as appropriate from the various community groups.

Then there is a moment when there really is disagreement between the IRT amongst themselves possibly, or the IRT and ICANN Org about the actual intent and purpose of a recommendation. We can't reach agreement on that then the Council liaison, per the guidelines, is asked to gauge the consensus level of disagreement among the IRT, and then liaise with the Council about a possible way forward. In that moment, the liaison will take into account the view of the representatives simply because when they indicate their view on that issue, we would very

much ask them to speak on behalf of their community group. If for whatever reason they can't speak on behalf of them because they weren't able to consult or the group couldn't come to a viewpoint on this, then we expect in fact the representatives to just speak on a personal basis in that case. That information was also obviously shared in the various calls for volunteers. There was a blog as well I think we posted, so I hope that that is helpful. Thanks. The next slide, please.

We have also added a couple of points on the Roles and Responsibilities. I foreshadowed that for the Council and the liaison. The liaison is nominated, selected—I'm not sure about the exact right word. I know the Council doesn't vote on that—by the Council, support Org's effort to resolve disagreement with the IRT. I talked about that just a moment ago. And should there be any disagreement, as I just said, on the intent or purpose of any of the outputs between ICANN and the IRT, the liaison then in consultation with the IRT expects to make an assessment of the level of consensus and raise the issue with the GNSO Council. ICANN Org will also consult with a Council liaison in case there is a timing concern. For example, need further guidance or misalignment between ICANN and the IRT regarding the implementation work and methodology. All this is based on the existing guidelines that are in place.

The Council, which is obviously the body that approved the recommendations and sent them to the Board, is therefore also an important resource for this group. But really only in cases where the liaison deems that to be necessary, it will be up to the liaison to consult with the Council, it's not for staff to do that. So the Council, the extension, serves also as a resource here, as I said, via liaison, and the

Council obviously may continue to provide input on the implementation of a policy, for example, if the Council believes that the implementation proposal is inconsistent with the policy that was approved. Thank you.

I spoke briefly about the work methodology that the Board wants to see how we think we can move through this very quickly. Phil, yeah. I think Becky in the chat also noted that hopefully we're not going to spend another five years on the IRT. I second that hope, Phil.

Another item on the methodology is on the following slides. I also shared this already with the Council during the Cancún Council session. So whoever of you attended that will have seen this already. So we're also trying to streamline the interaction with the IRT. As you know, the implementation process lies with ICANN Org. The outcome of this effort is going to be a new Applicant Guidebook. The Applicant Guidebook language will be based on the recommendations that have been approved by the Board, previously by the Council, and drafted by the PDP Working Group.

So the methodology that we are proposing I don't think is any way groundbreaking. But what we want to avoid is—we have about 150. Once they all approved, 140 or so recommendations to go through. And if we meet once or twice a week, you do the math, how long that could take if we spent several weeks on every recommendation. So the methodology we want to use is that we have a team that is working on the various policy issues. They have started working on this a while ago. Obviously, many of them also worked on these issues during the ODA period that preceded this IRT. So they're familiar with these topics.

As a first instance, ICANN Org will draft a policy language. What I mean by that is essentially draft strawman AGB text that we will then share with the IRT for a review, a first reading, if you want, it sounds a little bit more formal. Then ICANN Org will see what the IRT will provide, incorporate the input as appropriate, and then we'll circulate the updated language for a second reading, explain what language or what changes we have made and why, why maybe some comments we did not take on board, and then we can discuss the appropriateness of that or not. Then, really, we think that, in principle, we move that policy aside and say, "Okay, we had two readings of that, we put it aside." And at some moment, when we have a useful amount of draft language, we put that out for public comment, receive feedback, go through that feedback with the IRT, update that again, and then again put it aside until we have a draft Applicant Guidebook. Then the Applicant Guidebook itself, once completely draft, will also go out at least once for public comment as a whole to allow everybody to see how it all fits together.

But we want to do those intermittent public comments kind of at opportune moments. You recall, the last Applicant Guidebook was structured in different modules. We very much want to use the same structure, no need to reinvent the wheel. So for example, one could think if a certain module is completed, we put that module out for public comment. That way, it allows the community to give input at several moments and hopefully shortens the amount of public comments that are required at the very end. Maybe we can just do it with one. Obviously, if there are more required, this is something we'll discuss at a time.

EN

Just going to stop here for a moment, have a little sip of tea and see if there's any questions. If that's not the case then—Phil, also to the point about the five years, you will know that—oh, Anne, your hand is up. Please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes. Thank you, Lars. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese. I'm a NomCom non-voting GNSO councilor. My question is about the decision that there will be one IRT, I think Implementation Guidance for the Final Report indicated that there would be an IRT for Applicant Support as well. Jeff will correct me if I'm wrong, and Cheryl. Where does that stand at this point? Will there only be one IRT or will there be two?

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Anne. I can give a straightforward answer on that. I think I discussed that with the councilors or at least mentioned it. The plan is from our end to have just one IRT using this methodology that is on the screen still for all of the topics, including Applicant Support. We did note, and you know during the ODP, that specifically an Applicant Support, there were a lot of asks for the IRT to do, which did not really align with the usual role of an IRT during implementation, which is not to devise new processes but to in fact just review the work that ICANN Org has done to make sure that work that we're doing aligns with the intent of the recommendations. So there was a little mismatch. And the Council, as you probably know but others may not, has since launched GNSO guidance process on Applicant Support. So that group, I think, will

do a quite a bit of the work that the Final Report had foreseen for an IRT to be done.

In addition to that, in ICANN we talk about a lot about resources. This project is certainly a priority within the organization. I'm not the most senior member but I think I'm on solid ground to say that. So we decided internally that for now we have one IRT. If there is need for subteams to focus on specific issues, we will certainly do that. We will create subgroups. Or if this group comes together and meets two or three times a week, we extend the meeting times to two or three hours. We think that is a more efficient way to run things rather than having actually the additional administrative work of having two or three IRTs that are kind of separate. I hope that that makes sense. I see Anne in the chat that that was helpful. Jeff, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I was one of the co-chairs with Cheryl, who, I believe, is still on this call, I hope. She's much more of an expert on the Applicant Support than I am. Yes, the Implementation Guidance was a separate team. But I think the goal was really to have separate people work or more experts in that kind of area work on some of the implementation issues than most of us who are just more generalists. So is there a plan, Lars, for having different staff members maybe deal with those issues that are more well versed in those kinds of rant type or support type issues? Because the team that you introduced here are great. I mean, you're all great. I've worked with a lot of you before. But I didn't notice whether anyone had any kind of expertise in that kind of

area. I think if we have that kind of expertise, I think that sort of gets at the heart of the recommendation from SubPro. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Jeff. I think the question there was maybe of whether we have the right expertise on the staff side. I think that is the case, I have to say. We are, I think, very conscious about, as we said, the need to move through this as quickly as possible. I don't think that we should mess too much with the overall IRT Org methodology. We have a team that is already working on Applicant Support that is engaged with the GGP, is aware of what is happening there, and is working in the background on that. And as soon as we have any draft language that can be shared, we will share that as soon as possible with this group. If then there is a need to have separate meetings with certain members from this group, have a subgroup with experts that want to participate, engage more, more closely, certainly that's something we can look at the time. Absolutely.

I also see Annebeth comment in the chat about the IRT meetings. Annebeth, I sent you a direct message as well. We'll get to that in the end. There's, at the very least, one more meeting most likely to going forward. Elisa, correct me if I'm wrong. I think there's already an invite out for next week.

One other thing on the next slide—if you can go there, Leon, please. Thank you—is kind of a poll I wanted to do here. This also goes to Martin's point from earlier about nobody wants to spend five years. You may not know, but the Board also asked for a overall timeline for when

the next round most likely can open. That's part of the detailed implementation plan that ICANN Org is working on and it's due on the 1st of August. Obviously, I don't want to bore you too much, there's different implementation streams. But this one, what we call the policy implementation stream, the output of which is going to be the new Applicant Guidebook, is a key aspect of that. I will say here that we've been thinking about an IRT. How long does an IRT take? It takes as long as it takes, I guess. We obviously have great amount of resources dedicated to this so we hope to move through this as quickly as possible.

But I wanted to gauge this group. I'm really just curious about what your thinking is, how quickly we can work together to get an Applicant Guidebook into a draft version, considering we may do some public comments in between. You're all volunteers, as just been mentioned the chat as well. So if I can ask Elisa to share the poll with me. If you can just indicate in month how long do you think, what is a reasonable timeline for us to aim for overall? I'm going to tell you once we close the poll, what our thinking is. But I don't want to influence anything. So I hope you forgive me if I don't say anything. I'm not trying to spike the answers. First, we're going to do boxes of different time possibilities. But we also felt that that might be leading, so a free box, which will mean the actual answers of this will take a moment to aggregate that in the background. We'll share that, looking at the time, probably after this call. Once the poll is closed, I'll let you know what our current working timeline is as well so you know that's uninformed by what you've all put in.

I see there's a question from Martin. Yeah. Thanks, Martin. I'll get to that in just a moment. I'll give everyone another minute. We have 24 answers right now. I think we have more people on the call. 27, very good. All right. We get to 30 answers, 29, 30. There we are. Going up to 32. Good. I think we can leave this actually open. Elisa, can you close the poll at 20 minutes to the hour? That will be great. In the meantime, I'll answer Martin's question and go through the rest of the deck as well. Thank you. I've got two screens here which is a pain to go across. Apologies for oversharing.

So Martin spoke about the homework and the IRT. That's a good question. Yes. So I talked about the working methodology earlier on the chevron slide, slide 13. If you can go back one, Leon, just very quickly. So we have different teams in place at the moment. We're working on different topics and working on policy language on all of these. They did not start yesterday, they started several weeks ago. However, many of the team have worked on the ODP as well. So there's obviously a lot of prior knowledge on this. So our hope is that we will get something to this IRT in two weeks' time, the first topic. That would be the meeting before ICANN77. If we don't manage that—and we're still hopeful that we do so we're working on this very hard—then the first substantive text will come to the IRT in the first meeting after ICANN77. And then our goal is, if you see this here, first reading is meeting one, we go through that, we get input on list or on a Google document from this group. We go through the topic again the following week, so step four. Then the week after that, we'll move to a new topic. So we have different teams working on different issues. So we hope that possibly before ICANN77, most certainly afterwards, we'll get into a good

cadence of bringing a new topic to this group policy language for a new topic every other week or so. I hope that make sense and at least somewhat reassuring.

Khaled, you just asked in the chat about the slides yesterday on the wiki page. Elisa, if you could maybe just put another link to the wiki page onto the chat. I was not sure, Cheryl, whether it's been sent already but it will come. There will be a meeting next week. I'll get to them in the next slide.

Elaine is asking how long ago was several weeks? Roughly what percent is written so far? Elaine, I don't know the answer to that, a percentage. I don't know is the answer. Several weeks means after the ODA was finished and after the Board told us to start implementing. Since March, we've been working on that. We continue to do that. It's a big operation. I think getting started and getting into groove maybe takes a little bit longer than we would have liked. Ideally, we would have had something next week. We didn't quite get there. But we'll do our best to get into the rhythm as soon as possible, and certainly after 77.

Good. Thank you, Elisa, for sharing the poll.

Yes. Justine is asking about a list of topics we can look forward to, indicate the order of topics. Absolutely, Justine, we have that. We are finalizing that as well. We're working on a work plan that will contain that information as well. We will share a draft of that during the IRT call next week as well. So you should have a draft work plan next week that has the information in there as well, Justine.

EN

Elisa, if you can close the poll, if you haven't done so. I just see it on my screen here still. But that might just be a Zoom situation. I want to say that before this goes out that our current working assumption—and I actually did share that with the Council as well, that is kind of what we're working on—is that we think that the IRT would take about 24 months, about two years, to get from today to an Applicant Guidebook. If we can do it more quickly, all the better. But that is currently our working assumption subject to, I guess, see how it goes. We're certainly working internally at a pace that we believe we can get everything drafted in that time and share with the IRT with appropriate time for feedback with that methodology still up the screen. Good. Leon, if you could go to slide 16, I think.

Jeff, look, what that would mean, if we do take two years to get an Applicant Guidebook, then that probably would mean that, I guess, is the math. But I mean, if we work more quickly, we work more quickly. We certainly will try our best to do it as fast as possible. I know the Board and the executives and the whole organization, in fact, would like to see this work completed as fast as possible. So I think this is an undertaking we're doing together. If we see that there's ways to make this move forward more quickly and we see that it's taking too long, then I think we are very open and hopeful to wanting to do that.

Yeah, that is something we can also look at for the work plan for next week. I'd like to say it's 40 topics. If you think that we discuss—even it's just 35 topics, maybe 5 or so, not a lot of work to be done. But if it's 35 topics and we discuss these for two weeks each topic, that's 70 weeks without ICANN meetings, without holidays, without anything else. So I don't think two years is a very, very long period of time considering

that. We also looked at other implementation projects that have taken considerably longer than two years. So that is our starting assumption. It's not that that is what we want, and that is what we're thinking is the only way possible, but we think it's a reasonable assumption to make that. If we can do it more quickly, obviously it's something that we will most certainly aim for.

I see your hand, Jeff. Let me just very quickly go through the chat here. Meeting four will be held online. Yes, Steve, absolutely. It will be face to face at ICANN77 but there will be remote participation. Thanks. Good. Jeff, your hand's up, and then Susan as well.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. So with respect to the work plan, obviously you're going to reveal it, I guess, in a couple of weeks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Next week.

JEFF NEUMAN: Next week. But is there consideration given to starting on topics that will need to be resolved first or implemented first, I should say. So like starting with the RSP pre-approval program, because that needs to take place before a round opens? Obviously, I see here we have some overarching topics. So that may need to be kind of early as well. But is that your kind of philosophy? So RSP pre-approval would be done real early. And then we can finish that part in theory and then start that

process because it's really independent from the rest of it. Are there any considerations like that?

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Jeff. Yes. So the RSP Pre-evaluation Team has already started coming together and working on that. Applicant Support, I think it's another program that needs to be in place considerably before the opening of the next round. As there are many other topics but there are specific teams working on that as well. We will plan to bring that to the IRT as soon, as I said, as policy language is ready. We certainly have in mind that these have to be ready considerably earlier than when the application window opens. So that is factored in. We expect those topics, in fact, to be completed first. But we're not in a position where we have ready policy language or AGB or program language on these topics ready yet to do that straight out of the gate. These are very large and complex issues. Applicant Support has still the GGP going on as well. So that is something that has to be borne in mind.

Then we also spoke too in detail when we worked on the work plan and consider the sequence of the topics. We set together with our operational colleagues to look at what topics they require to have finalized first so they can build systems and—I want to say back office but I'm not sure that's right, you know what I mean—to operationalize the program. So again, those are probably going to be modules one and two from the last Applicant Guidebook. Those are the topics we're working on first and we'll bring to the IRT first. So there is certainly sequence on that.

One other item—I want to say, Susan and Anne, I see your hands, I'll get to you just a moment—on the overall timeline, I also want to remind everybody we don't have all recommendations approved yet. The 24 months timeline is obviously, as of today, we have still 38 recommendations outstanding and they need to be resolved. The IDN EPDP needs to be concluded as well, as needs to be the GGP obviously for Applicant Support, and there is an ongoing process for closed generics as well that will feed into the Applicant Guidebook once completed. So there's also something to bear in mind overall.

I was going to say before going to next slide, but I don't need to go to the next slide. I just need to call on Susan. Susan? And then Anne, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Lars. I think you in what you were saying in response to Jeff, you've kind of covered why I put my hand up. But I think I'm surprised that you're talking about a kind of 24-month timeline in relation to the AGB but I think maybe it's because kind of my expectations of how this process would be structured in yours and are maybe similar but I would describe it in a different way. I'm understanding from you that when you say to have the AGB done, you're thinking about absolutely everything finished and all of the systems built and whatever needs to be done after the AGB, whereas I had been more thinking about we could have most of the structure of the AGB done with perhaps a few sections that still say something like we're still working on Applicant Support. So there's some placeholder text in here because there's some other work happening somewhere else that still needs to be finished.

And so that we could have a large proportion of the AGB done in a much shorter timeline. But maybe we're not good to go. We're not ready to launch a program. Does that seem a reasonable assumption on my part?

LARS HOFFMANN: Absolutely, Susan. Yes, absolutely. I'm sorry if that wasn't clear. Yes. For the program launch, a lot of things have to happen, right? Let's Applicant Guidebook, that has to be not just completed with this group, it has to go for public comment, we have to review the public comments, the Board has to approve it. And then there's a four-month gap before we can open the round according to the recommendations from the Final Report. But, as you said, we want to put out stuff for public comment as soon as possible to have not just to give everybody out there an understanding of what the Applicant Guidebook will look like and have more certainty that the community is supportive of the text as we devised it—by "we" I mean all of us—but also to allow us to build the systems in the background again, we need certainty about what the final policy language will look like in many cases. So absolutely, we will build on this as an iterative process. As you say, I think big chunks of this will be completed much earlier than that. This is an overall time for everything to be completely done. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Lars. I have one comment and one question. The comment relates to the 38 pending issues, just so that everyone knows these are being worked through between Council and the Board, and there's a

meeting early next week. The goal there is to have a plan and a way forward on those 38 pending issues that have been flagged by the Board in time for ICANN77. So there is an understanding about the need to resolve these things quickly.

The question relates to the work plan in that I'm wondering whether given the ample staff that's being assigned and the different issues that each staff member is to take responsibility for, if we could, as a working IRT, adopt a work track approach to some degree where the staff member assigned to a particular issue with the work could be divided up in order to be accomplished more quickly?

LARS HOFFMANN: Sorry. What do you mean by that?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: For example, during the SubPro Working Group, we have work tracks. That way, the work can be done in parallel, and there were leaders for those work tracks. And we're very appreciative regarding the staff members who are assigned and be handling certain issues, for example, Applicant Support, which you mentioned, and other things that are in specialized categories. Could the IRT itself take a work track type of approach where there were smaller groups from among this group of 68 that could work on issues in parallel in order to accomplish the work more efficiently and quickly, rather than creating a bottleneck of everyone all the time?

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Anne. I think when we do get to a situation where we have so much policy language available, whether it's the amount of topics or whether it's the depth and the complexity of the topics, that we can deal with a topic in one or two weeks with this IRT, then absolutely, I think creating subgroups to make sure that there is no bottleneck makes perfect sense. I think that's a good suggestion. Jeff, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Just a quick comment. You keep saying policy language. I think I've seen some people in the chat get a little confused. I think what you mean is implementation language or guidebook language, not policy language, because policy is what we all did already. I understood that but it's just important to be clear because there was some confusion on the chat.

LARS HOFFMANN: Sorry, I missed that on the chat. Yes. Thank you, Jeff. I appreciate that greatly, yes. I use policy language because we're taking policy recommendations and turning it into Applicant Guidebook language. And as opposed to language that we would use that describes procedures or other mechanisms internally for the operations of the system, this will be the policy. The AGB is going to be the policy that guides the program. That's why we use policy language. But you're quite right, Jeff, I should just say AGB language and that is straightforward and everybody knows what's meant by that. Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: AGB language is what I'm trying to talk about. I think it's really important to note also that this is not the first AGB many of us have wrangled out of a process. It's not like we're "What is this thing we're trying to create?" We've done that. We did that 2012, as painful as it was for some of us. What we don't want to have happen is "inadvertent," she says, and unintended consequences and drifts from the intent of the policy somehow coming into the guidebook, the guidelines, the care and feeding of an application, that those that haven't been entrenched for ridiculous amounts of their life in all of this. So our job is as much oversight and ensuring that the intent is still accurately reflected in guidebook language. It's not, as you've said in a number of your slides, a relitigation or a rethinking. So, when I start hearing about subject matter expertise and individual bits of experience and getting into work tracks, it seems to me like there's too much fiddling being planned and not enough "This is what was writ. Does this reflect it accurately an almost editorial process?" So I know which side of the options I fall on on that, but I also thought we might be able to get to a fair shape of an AGB in about nine months. But hey, I can dream. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Cheryl. Good. I don't see any more—actually, I don't know because I don't have the right pane up. I don't see any more questions. I think this is the end of the presentation. It's the top of the hour as well. You see the final slides here have just some links and reference materials which will not be overly handy on screen. Elisa sent the link to the wiki into the chat earlier where you can see the slide deck and access to all the links. We will meet next week and share and discuss the

work plan. We will try to share that with his group before the call on list. If we can't do it—and I apologize in advance—then we'll share on the call. But my hope is that we get this out. There's a couple of holidays in some countries this week and early next so that doesn't make it a lot easier. But we're trying our best.

With that, I thank everybody for participating in the call. I'm glad to see that everyone wants to get this done in 12 months. It would make my life a lot easier. With that, thank you and have a lovely day, afternoon, or evening. Please end the recording. Thanks all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]