SAMANTHA MANCIA: Hello, and welcome to the second meeting of the subsequent procedure implementation review team on 23 May 2023 at 2000 UTC. My name is Samantha Mancia, and together with Kimberly Kaufman and Michael Karakash, I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this 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 aloud during the time set by the facilitator of this session. If you would like to ask 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 are done speaking.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom session using your full name, for example, a first name and a 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: Thank you, Sam. Welcome everyone to our second session. I think it's Tuesday 23rd 20 UTC. First call on the agenda item of the agenda is a question on SOI updates. If there are any, please raise your hand or post it in the chat. And for those of you who have not yet added an SOI

to the wiki page, please do so. At some point, we will take people off the mailing list. There will be a myriad of reminders and follow ups and bothering that will come into inboxes if you don't submit the SOI, but there will eventually be in the maybe medium range horizon cutoff line. Just a very mild threat at this moment or maybe just a head up. It's really not a lot of work. It should be taking just a couple of minutes, and if you have any trouble with that, feel free to reach out to us and we'll reach out to you and work with you to get this done, I think, very painlessly.

Good. With that, we move on to-- Cheryl, thank you for that, and noting Justine's apology for the call. I just saw that in the chat. Thank you, Cheryl. Good. With that, the implementation plan that Michael just added here for a link as well. Michael, do you mind? Whose screen am I seeing? Kim. I'm not sure, Kim, whether we communicate there. Is there a chance you could pull this up? Otherwise, I can share my screen too. Thank you so much, Kim. So, we didn't provide slides for this. I hope you don't mind. There's a document out there, the link is in the chat, and it was as part of the agenda as well, those on the wiki, and I already noted there's a lot of communications on the list.

Jeff, I'm going to be honest with you. I saw your email come in. It was quite lengthy, and I've been on calls for seven hours now nonstop. So, it's my second to last call of the day so I did not have a chance to read that in detail. I apologize. So maybe we can have a constructive discussion here on the call. If you don't mind, I'll take a couple of minutes to walk us through the document just to make sure I've got the participants up, so I see if there's any hands up there or not. And then

maybe we can somehow have a discussion. If you have any questions, obviously, feel free to ask at any time.

So, the document here, the work plan, I think does essentially a couple of things. It talks about generally what the purpose of this group is, of the IRT is, of the implementation process is, delivering a draft of the key guidebook for the next round of new gTLDs. It provides an overview of the sequencing of topics as defined in the final report, SubPro final report, and it gives some general idea of how we think these fits into the modules of the African guidebook. Which in itself is based on the 2012 version, obviously, and also gives a high-level timeline estimation around this. I don't think it's a big surprise. We talked last week about our estimate about 24 months. There was already a lot of concerns around this raised in this group, and we appreciate that very much.

Jeff and others commented as well on the list as well and we did have some more thoughts around this, and I have to share that on this call, and then we can say where we take it from here. The only other thing I would like to add is that this is a-- And I hope that you'd be able to better in mind. I don't think it's a surprising statement to say this is a very big and complex project. I'm not sure we ever had a PDP with this much output. I also don't think we have had an IRT that finished in two years or less. So, this is a challenge for everyone, Org and community, I believe.

And so, I think this work plan should really be seen as a working document actually, so that we especially, when it comes to time line and to sequencing of things that we don't think we can plan this out in the manner just detail correctly now on, and then we shouldn't touch it

again, but that as a group, we can revisit this at appropriate stages to see whether we are in line or we need to change something. We need to change the order or adjust the tie line in one way or another. I think that is for this magnitude of a project, probably not a bad idea. Also, it'd be key to hearing any thoughts on that, obviously, from you guys.

Very good. So here, a quick overview on the project, and I don't think there's anything surprising on this. Entity, [inaudible - 00:06:50] mindset strategy. This the function within ICANN that is headed by Theresa Swinehart and the Project B department in ICANN. I don't know if you know this. I only know this frankly recently. We have functions, and then they are subdivided into departments and the department that is responsible here is the policy research and stakeholder programs, which is headed in fact by Karen Lentz.

The deliverables in a non-surprising twist is the applicant guidebook which is going to be based on, obviously, the 2012 version. The board adopted outputs of the final report, and then also, either as part of or probably as separate document, we can talk about that in more detail. the rule and guidelines, let's say, around the applicant support program and the RSP pre-evaluation process as well. Both of these were obviously topics within the SubPro final report as well.

If you can scroll down a little bit further, please, Kim. Thank you so much. This is the outputs that we are eventually will have to transpose into AGB language. I'm not sure whether I already said policy language. I know I said that last time, and I was rightfully told off, so I apologize. When I say policy language, what I mean is a picking gap of language, and I will do my down list to be better about that. The final report has a

total of 136 recommendations, 98 of those were adopted in Cancun, 38 on those are pending. Quick side note. The council and the board had what I thought was a productive session yesterday around those 38 recommendations. So, things are moving forward.

And then we also have implementation guidance, 165 piece of implementation guidance which I'm going to pair a paraphrase this slightly or fully in fact, which is not something that the board adopt per se, but it is information and guidance from the working group to the implementation team how to implement the recommendation. There's also a lot of additional context around much of the recommendations that reflects the thinking and the discussions in the working group. So, all that information will be taken on board or is being taken on board as we work on the applicant guidebook language, but for obvious reasons, implementation guidance doesn't have the same heft, let's say, as a recommendation. Nevertheless, it behooves us to take it into account and to transpose it, if you want, into AGB language as well to the extent possible.

The document then goes a little bit about the responsibility of implementation review team. I don't think that's any surprises here. We talked about this last week as well. So, I'm going to move over this unless there's any questions or comments on this, obviously. If you can go to the next slide, Kim, please, or the next pages I should say? Then we have the summary of the plan here. If you can go a little bit further down, Kim, just so we see all the modules? Thank you. So, we've got those modules here as we see them at the moment. This is based on the 2012 Applicant Guidebook with two additional modules here on applicant support program and RSP pre-evaluation program.

It's a good question, Jim. I want to say, if it's a clarifying question, maybe we can do it on the spot and if it's a longer question that you think probably warrants more discussion, hold them to the end. Does that work? I know it's not maybe the best rule ever. Okay. Thanks.

So, the modules here, as we see them are now. Well, I'm going to talk about this moment. The timeline here, I spoke about this at the top of the call as well. Sorry. If you can keep it on the timeline. Thank you so much. It's perfect. Thank you, Kim. Okay. Very good. I noted Cheryl here had poised comment. Cheryl, do you want to go now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No.

LARS HOFFMANN: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you. So, the plan for now assumes 24-month timeline, [inaudible - 00:12:07] AGB. This is based on a variety of factors. The amount of work that is ahead of us is obviously one of them. We also looked a little bit on reasonable timelines from other IRTs. Hasting to add the 24 months is a lot more aggressive or faster than other work would otherwise suggest. We don't think we should, in any way, drag it out any further than this. By drag it out, I mean, we should work our hardest to make sure we meet that deadline, if not beat that deadline.

The other factor here is, obviously, we spoke about that last week as well, the number of dependencies that are still out there, not just the 38 recommendations. Some of them on very big topics, obviously. Picks

them up as we cease for a start, but also, other work on applicant support, SCGGP, GNSO guidance process that's happening. The IDN EPDP needs to be wrapped up, recommendations go through public comment and board approval, council approval, board approval. And obviously, the close generics of framework discussions are ongoing and may result into the PDP as well. So, all that work will feed into this IRT and be reflected one way or another in the Applicant Guidebook.

Yeah. Jeff, what I said in the beginning, I think I saw you join a little bit late. I noted that you send me an email and I suggested we go through the document first and if there's any clarifying questions, please raise your hand immediately for longer comments, and I think I suspect your comment here will be a slightly longer comment and lead to some discussion. Maybe we can hold it to the end, if that makes sense. Okay. Perfect. Thank you. Thank you, Jeff.

Right. Kim, if you can go a little bit further down? Sorry. We can say that's fine. What I also want to say about the timeline is that, you'll see this later. We check this up into the modules and put some timing against that. Last week I spoke about the team as well that is part of the implementation process and the work that's working in the background and I speak about the allocation a moment, but I think what we also think is that we don't know yet how long discussions with the IRT may or may not take, right.

We spoke about this last week that the process needs to be as streamlined as possible for obvious reasons. But if you think about this, this is 40 topics and even if you say, well, five or six of those are really not big topics at all, it's just confirming what happens anyway, but you'd

still you have 30, 35 topics. If you say you only talk about this for three weeks per topic on average and something like PIX or something like applicant support or and I think you can easily imagine options that will take more than three weeks, you're looking at 90 weeks. That's 30 times 3.

I know we can mitigate this with—we thought about this as well—more meetings, etc. So, there's ways to do this, but we thought that we should also revisit the timeline probably the first time after three or four months or so once we have discussed a couple of topics and we can see whether are we really breathing through these quite quickly? Great. Let's change the timeline and be more aggressive or more optimistic. And if it goes not any faster than anticipated, maybe for then, we stick to what we have. So sorry. That was a second thought. I think it is in that paragraph from the timeline, but I just wanted to call that out.

We have the milestones here. It's a very broad brush, again, for obvious reasons. We didn't think it would be too wise to plan all this in minute details this far ahead on the specific modules, but this is the average time that we think it would take in order to get this within 24 months. The dependencies below here, I spoke about these as well. There's the NCAP study, but there's just about one recommendation really and I think the rest I've covered above that the timeline as well. Sorry. Number 6 here, I didn't speak to that. There're some workstream, two items, and I think also some specific review recommendations that pertain to SubPro and that will have you be picked up by this IRT as well. So, this is on top of the recommendations that the council has approved.

A bit further down or the next page rather? Thank you, Kim. So, yeah, you can go to the next page, Kim, I think. The methodology, we talked about this as well. This is a very helpful. Thank you, Kim. I don't think we covered that last week, so I'm not going to talk about this again. I don't think there's anything new in there. This is the process. We'd talk about this as well next week. And then is there anything else at the end, I think we have the topic areas. I just want to say one quick note here. Jim, sorry, do you have a question on this? Jim, you're--

JIM PRENDERGAST: Hi, Lars. Sorry about that. If you can just scroll back up? I think it was page 9. It was a note in there about the board wanting to launch this within three years of the start of the IRT. What's the foundation from that? Was that in a board resolution and do you know exactly what the board means by when they say launch?   Is that like complete the Applicant Guidebook, or is that the opening of the actual window? Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Where does it say that? I just don't see it at the moment here. Which paragraph is that?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Page 9, it is the paragraph that's-- Hold on.   "The board desires to launch the next round by May 2026." It was actually document I was just looking at head on page 9. Maybe this is a different version.

LARS HOFFMANN: So, I mean, what I can speak to is that I don't think the board has--There is certainly no resolution in the timeline from the board yet or the timeline, I think, is part of the deliverable that ICANN always is working on for the first of August for the board to take a look and then spec resolve on this, I guess.   I think what was in the ODA is my understanding from my colleagues that once the applicant guidebook is completed, so once this group has finished the work and the document has gone to public comment and is now being sent to the board, I think then there's still some operational items that need to take place before the one can open, in addition to obviously the four-month period that is required after the board has approved the AGB before the vote can open per recommendation.

And so, I think maybe there was some internal discussions on if we say 24 months with this group, then nine months or if you didn't just do the math, right, of the public comment, board approval, four-month period, that's probably another eight, nine months on top of that.   So maybe that's where that came from, that's my guess, but there's certainly nothing on the board yet and nothing has been decided.   So, if that's been in there, it shouldn't have been, and I'll make sure that we'll trace that down on the version that you have, Jim. I'm sorry about that.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yeah. I grabbed the link from something yesterday, so maybe it's a different version of the work plan.

LARS HOFFMANN: Okay. It's still strange. Here it is, yeah, May 20. I see it. Yeah. Very good. Thank you.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Maybe just a formatting change and then slip to the next page.

LARS HOFFMANN: There you go. Thank you, but I'll get back to you on that. I will update the document, and I can let you know on the record that, to my knowledge, we have not spoken to the board about a specific timeline for the overall, but what this would indicate in my view, the 36 months, how I would read this is where to be the opening of the round so we would take applications at the moment. Of course, Jim.

Good. If we can go-- Yeah, just very quickly. We've got these modules here in the meetings and the topics and I want to spend a lot more time here. I know that we're all keen to speak and discuss this. We had an internal-- Not that you really care, I might be oversharing, but then we had some time together as a team to do two things on the various topics. We looked at how complex are they, and how much work is likely required for each of these topics to get from recommendation plus 2012 text plus lessons learned from last time to a new applicant guidebook language.

And so, kind of back up the envelope calculation for all of these to get a sentiment of how complex the various topics are. Then we looked at who on the team has worked on some of these topics either during the ODA or otherwise has worked on this when they were shadowing or

following the separate working group to make sure that the right people sit on the right topic and then we looked at which topic need to be dealt with first so that the operational aspect of the program has already an idea of what the AGB language will look like. So, they then system design and anything else is not being held up, but can work in parallel to the work that we're doing with this group. And so based on that, this is the list of topics and the sequence we came up with.

Having said that, it is obviously nothing here is set in stone. I think the predictability framework is something we'd like to bring to you first and I think there's also a lot of value for this group, and we can talk about this later, to do work on the chartering questions around the spirit and how that group is composed and will work. There's a lot of information already in the final report, but I think it's not quite all there yet. But also talk about the predictive framework in itself, which is more or less a standalone topic. So, there's not a lot of dependencies around this, but it's complex and has been approved by the board. And then after that, really go into topics that pertain mostly to the first two modules so that we assure, as I said, that we get those done as quickly as possible.

And you see here as well, we have put this as meetings. We see this as essentially a meeting per week. So that's why the random number at the end maybe seems a bit strange, but this is essentially what would bring us to ICANN78 if we continue the sequence starting in the first meeting after ICANN78. So that's some context around the listing here in this table. I won't go through all of this. I think that's the bulk of the content of the document. And with that, I'm opening on the floor, and I see Cheryl, smart as she is, has smelled the end of my monologue and put up her hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I also had to switch to the mobile phone because Zoom was being very flaky on my laptop. So, I missed just tiny little bit of an answer to one of the questions, but I'm sure I'll catch it all up. All right. Let me see. Where to start? First of all, I'm speaking on behalf of both Justin and myself. We have discussed from our perspective where we stand on a number of things, including the very useful contributions made to our list today regarding how we can all work together and find mechanisms to make this experience as productive, as efficient and as short as humanly possible.

So that being said, Justin and I want to make it very fear that from this perspective that we're taking, and yes, like many of you, we are somewhat seasoned professionals in this area of SubPro. We lived and breathed it for an awfully long time. So, we need to recognize a couple of things. So, we all seem to have a great deal of intention to get this done as effectively and as efficiently as possible and we all seem to be willing to run with 24, but for heaven's sake do everything possible in the design of how we do it to be bringing it in well under 24 with parallel work or whatever it takes. Because this is not an IRT that can be simply compared to other IRTs.

Now I'm not denying the complexity of it all, I'm not denying all of the necessity of it being done in particular orders and done with as much due diligence as possible, but we do in fact have an enormous amount of foundation work even in the report. That is why there is such a large amount of implementation, recommendations or suggestions and proposals within the SubPro report. We were well aware how complex

and how large and how unscooped, therefore, how large the work that SubPro did and the length of time it took. So, we've got those foundations to work on, but from our perspective, we certainly hear and agree with the desire to get this done well under the 24, but still do the job properly. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Cheryl. I appreciate that. Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thank you. This is Jeff Newman. Hopefully you can hear me. I'm actually in my car in a parking garage. So hopefully you can still hear.

LARS HOFFMANN: It's okay.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks. I sent around a note earlier today to make a couple of points. Work plans are extremely important, as you know, because they set expectations, and they set the tone of the group. They are also something that's supposed to be agreed upon by the group as something to work towards. But the issue with this work plan is it doesn't seem to be based on an analysis of the actual topics and the modules, right? Maybe the first module which is in here. Maybe there's something to that. But modules 3 through whatever, seemed to just be a flat three to four months without any kind of recognition as to

the amount of new implementation work that needs to be done or what the recommendations say.

So, in an analysis of modules 6 through 8 and in the analysis, you will see that there are very few recommendations for new implementation, and I keep saying new implementation because you've got to remember we've done this before, right? So, it's not like we need to start from scratch on any of this stuff, right? It's really the question should be, okay, well, how does this recommendation change the guidebook if at all? And so, you'll see that what was listed as for each module as being three to four months, could probably be reduced to two weeks for modules 6 through 8.

Now maybe that's three, whatever, the point is that when you look at the amount of work that has to be done or not done in this case with those modules, you'll see that it comes out very different than this work plan actually sets forth. And so, the problem is that because the board is going try to get a comprehensive timeline in August, and it's going to announce that to the community, and the community includes would be applicants or would be people that review applications or whatnot, an inaccurate work plan or one that is not based on the actual work is dangerous, right?

Because if we do fantastic and move much quicker than what the work plan says, yeah, that's great. We could pat ourselves in the back. But we've now caught people off guard that assumed well, they said it was going to take two years. And oh, shit. Excuse my language. Sorry. Oh, no. Instead of two years, it only took a year. Now we got a scramble. That's not a good thing either. To go too quick or to go much quicker

than the community expects or much slower than the community expects, both are equally as bad. So, my request is that, in parallel, with actually working the substance, we go back and really do an analysis on these modules. There's also a lot of overlapping topics, and I point that out of my note and others. So, I would really love for us to drill down the work plan before we say it's delivered to the board and we're operating by. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Jeff. A couple of points, if I may. So, the point that you made about the work plan, it needs to be based on an estimation analysis of the amount of work that is likely to be required on the various topics. This is on my cap. We've done that work at least internally, and just checking the background, we'll be able to share I think that quite easily with you guys. I appreciate your point on the three to four months. This absolutely a blanket assumption simply because something going to take a month or something going to take four months. So, it's roughly the amount of time left that we have on average for these eight, so that's absolutely true.

The point I think I'm making is that, I'm going to be honest, there's two points here. So, I see your point on the board expectations, and I'll get back to that in a moment. The other point, I think, is also then about the work plan being something to set expectations for outsiders. So, I'm going to start with the second one, and I think they're both actually kind of together. The implementation, the opening of the next round is obviously dependent on the applicant guidebook being published. I guess without saying, it's integral to all the applicants. Implementation

obviously requires more than that in order to receive and process applications successfully.

And so, these processes have to work in parallel and are dependent on one another. The stuff that my operation colleagues do and that we do with you guys here is intricately related. And so, if were to finish the applicant guidebook next week, we're not going to have a round that opens in four months and one week. So that's one thing to bear in mind. And so, the timeline of the board is not going to be determined alone by the amount of-- by the time that the work plan here suggests.

I also believe that you're quite right, that there's a good chance that some of the modules might go a bit faster. I think there's a similar argument to be made that some of the modules may take a lot longer. I think to figure out the way how we're going to resolve probably resolution of contention sets is something that we can't deal within two weeks. And the question is whether we can deal with it in two months? And maybe the answer is yes, we can do it in two weeks. Maybe we're going to take 6 months. Who knows? What I'm trying to say is that there's some topics that are very complex that require compromises and where there's also quite a diverse view in the community around us.

And so, while setting a time and it is unrealistic and very long, what is the view of many on this call, I appreciate that. That is that we don't want catch people off guard or set wrong expectations for the board. I understand that. The same is true for the flip side as well. The same is true also for the effectively say we're going to do all this in nine months. In the end, it's going to take us longer than that. And whether it's just

the applicant guidebook or the other implementation or combination of both, that's neither here nor there. And the danger is always there.

So that's why our proposal was to see this work plan as a best guess, and we adopt it and adapt it as we see. So then in 3 months, when we see that we move things very quick, yes, let's treat like [inaudible - 00:36:21]. We can wrap this up in a year's time. Of all of us on this call, I'd be the happiest. Then let's adapt the work plan. There's no concern about that.   And that kind of makes sure that outsiders have an expectation around that as well.

I think that's the other thing I will say, I'm happy to share the information and the expectation about the complexity of the topics with this group. Absolutely. We will do that. And we can include that into the work plan as well. Also, no consent at all around that. But I will say is that let's drill-- Like, we also do we want to spend another three, four weeks—there's an ICANN meeting coming up—with this group on the work plan? We can certainly do that. I have no concerns about that. But it takes time away from the other work obviously as well. And I think it's just something of balance we need to all be comfortable with, and then we'll deal with it however you think it works best. I have a long queue here. Martin, Cheryl, Roger, Jeff, in that order.

MARTIN SUTTON: Hi, Lars. It's Martin Sutton. And that's a good point. Your latter point there is one that I'm focused on is what does go into the ICANN77 meeting as a result of the board decision at the last meeting, which I asked for a plan to be presented?   I must admit, I'm really

uncomfortable putting something like this forward as a plan, mainly because of the points already raised. The other point here is something that seems to have been bypassed from conversations at our first meeting which is where some of the activities could be completed in parallel. So, we could structure the work so that there are different work tracks operating.

So, if from your last meeting, there were indications that it was staffed up and there had been already quite a bit of groundwork done, we could already be in a position where we are looking at text examples for certain sections of the AGB and actually progressing this work fairly efficiently. So, [audio glitch 00:38:54] definitely see there is scope to reduce the time frame. I think we've not even included the thought yet as to parallel activities in work tracks which would potentially be half the timeline because the AGB is the fundamental piece, the jigsaw puzzle, to get everything else in motion.

Now there will be some complexities that will work in parallel to that, but let's face it, we've got a good core product that is already there that we are manipulating and working through with some of changes that were recommended through the SubPro work of five years, which was completed two years ago. So, again, as this all accumulates, we're not in a good position. So. I would very much stress the point that we need to be consolidating a lot of this time frame and working out ways of being far more efficient. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Martin. Just a couple of thoughts on this. I appreciate your sentiment there on the two years. It's difficult for me to comment on that. What I can say is that I think the ODA was delivered in the time frame that the board requested, and the call for the IRT was sent out weeks, if not days after the board has resolved on the final report. On your comment regarding the parallel work, we do hear that, and I appreciate that. What I will say is that we have and we are working on language for the AGB. We have started that work. And as I said, we're going to share the predictability framework as soon as possible at the very latest, the week after or the first meeting after the ICANN77 meet to start with working substantively on issues.

We have a number of staff that is working on these different topics. And so, that's why also for the first swath, if you want, of topics until 78 more or less, we can't have more than one person working on more than one topic at the time. And so, if you want us to produce things in parallel in the first three months of this working group, I'm going to be honest with you, that's very difficult. I don't want to speak for anybody else, but I want to speak for my team, and I know that they're working incredibly hard to get things to you as fast as feasible as possible. And what I can tell you is that we will bring you topics as fast as every other week very, very soon. And if we can move through them as quickly as we think that we can or should, which is one or three weeks. For the predictability framework, we have two weeks planned, right? It's not that we think we're going to spend three years on that. Then I think that's a good sign.

And then if we can move into a parallel framework where we can get different topic at the same time because maybe we do need to take

predictability on for like five or six weeks, right? So, then that goes into a subgroup, and at the same time, we're going to move to the next topic because it's ready. I have no concerns about this. The plan at the moment sees just two weeks per topic, one after the other. I understand that it's not realistic for some topics, and then the parallel work will come into that, but there's two things about this. We can hypothetically all plan that out in minute detail and make it as accurate as we think it will be. But my guess is the reality will change this on the ground anyway, because maybe, miraculously, on resolution of private of contention sets, we get an agreement after two weeks and everybody is happy with what we propose, and we can move along. We don't need to spend more time on that.

So, the parallel work I would like us to use once we know we need more time on a topic, not to start out in the beginning. That is not helpful at least not until 78. And the plan, I absolutely agree. Oh, sorry. This from the readings. I'm going to stop here. I saw Jeff's comment. I was going to comment on that already, but I've got a queue and Jeff is in that and so is Cheryl, I think. So, I'm going to move ahead. Cheryl, your hand is actually down, it seems.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. That's because I put it down assuming you were going to have a brief intervention, Lars, but you didn't. It's all right, my friend, we all get carried away on these topics that we're all passionate about. And in fact, it was a good segue for me and what I wanted to say. So, I appreciate what you were saying, but that's why I put my hand down. I was not withdrawing.

Right. So let me tell you what I'm hearing and what I'm going to suggest maybe a way forward.   Because everybody is saying things that are absolutely valid. You're seeing thinness to proceed and progress on all sites.   We're seeing and recognizing various limitations, logistics and sheer human availability. But you've got a willingness in the IRT team to make the magic happen as best as we can. So, this point in particular where I was responding about managing expectations and that goes to the beyond us and ICANN community, but those potential registrants is a really important thing.

So, if we put our support in this current plan as the to be-- Now when I say tabled as an Australian, I mean actually presented, not removed. Everybody seems to have different views on that. So, when I say table, I mean, actually do be dealt with during 77 is, I think, a reasonable plan. And we all know that 24 months is aspirational, and we don't know which side of it may end up in.   But can we make sure that what is clearly understood is that even with this plan, it's not just an adoption and therefore that's what how it will run, but that adaption aspect that I've heard mentioned several times.

Now we need to be very public with those adaptions when they occur because we're all keen to get them to occur. So rather than look at just milestones perhaps in the pure way we've got them in this project plan to date, can we also assure the community and those interested parties beyond our existing industry players that at least at every ICANN meeting, an update on our progress and any adaptations to our timeline will be really publicized? And that might help manage expectations. So, if we get there faster, everyone knows we're getting there faster, and indeed everyone should be able to know where we're up to.   Perhaps

that will assist us and help us not spend so much time talking about how we're going to do things and get on to the actual doing those. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you, Cheryl. And just a quick comment, which is that I appreciate that input. And just to note the clarification, nobody's adopting the work plan, right? It's information that the board required to look at the overall timeline and how feasible that is. It's one component of that for the opening of the next round. And I just want to make-- No. No. That's fine. I'm going to leave it at that. Time is running out. Thanks, Cheryl. So, I think advertising the adapting the work plan, there's no concerns around that. And I think the board, in fact, I speak to the caucus on a weekly basis, I think they would be very supportive of that as well and would welcome that. Roger and then Cheryl.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Lars. It's Roger. I think, Cheryl, because it's Cheryl dropped that idea in chat and it just managed expectations. And I think that that's the key is not setting expectations, but managing it so that as you just said, Lars, adapting over time, and as Cheryl mentioned-- And I think Jeff's idea of asynchrony should be driving this. To me, that's going to happen continuously throughout. I hope that's going to happen continuously throughout the process. Six months from now, we should be asynchronously looking at our schedule and saying, is it right or not and letting people know. So, I think that's great. And, again, I support Jeff's idea of that. And again, I supported ongoing. So, I think that's great.

To Jeff's point, and I saw him respond to my email as well is, yeah, I think we should be pushing each other here to get things done as efficiently as we can. So, I don't expect anyone here not to be doing that. So, I hope that as whatever date this again, it's a set amount of work. However fast we get there, we get there, but I hope that everybody's working to get to that spot. I just want to say I support Cheryl on that. And again, I think I support Jeff. I think we're all just trying to say the same thing, and let's just get working. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Roger. Jeff, please.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. So, in the spirit of moving. Sorry. It's Jeff Neuman for the record. My question to you or a couple questions. First one is what is your expectation of us? I'm still not 100% sure. So first, just even on this work plan, what is your expectation that we do? Right? Do you want us to approve it, say we agree with it? I'm just not sure. Then number two is and this gets into the future work. So next week is meeting 3. There's a topic. What is the plan? What is your staff going to deliver to us? What are we going to have to review before the meeting? And then what exactly do you mean when you say a reading?

I'm hoping it's not literally you're going to read it to us during the call and take up the entire call just reading it. I'm hoping that it should be expected of us that we should have read it all prior to the call and start at the first minute going, okay, section one of this whatever, any comments or questions. So please help me understand what your

expectations are of us and what is your expectation to deliver stuff to us. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Jeff. I'm glad you asked that. That's not clear. That's not good. So, I'm going to start with the IRT plan because Cheryl noted it as well in the chat. I'm going to be honest with you. I don't know. It's the answer on the work plan. We're not a PDP where I think the work plan is approved, voted on, some way or another consensually supported. I don't think that applies here that. We have no community-based chair or chair team here that is chaired by Org, for better or for worse.

I guess my expectation is that we agree consensually, clearly not today, that we are fine with the work plan as it stands, and then probably with the understanding that we review this at any necessary moment and update it and inform not just this group, but others as well that it's been updated. I think that's what I would be looking for here for this group, essentially. Maybe a non-objection is maybe the argument here. But I also think that we all need to be comfortable with what's in the plan at the very [inaudible - 00:52:16].

The second point, Jeff, on the work methodology. So, as you know, the implementation is an all-driven exercise, again, for better or for worse. So, our current understanding is the methodology. I spoke to that at the council as well in Cancun. I think I briefly touched on it last week. Is that as I said, we're working on AGB language and have been for at least a couple of months. That we bring that language to you in a way that it essentially could go one way or another into the applicant guidebook.

And that by reading-- It's a term I think that we borrowed this from the European parliament here in Brussels. No. I'm not going to be reading this. I've got a beautiful voice, obviously so I'm sure you will be pleased to hear me for an hour. But, no, the understanding is that you will get the documentation beforehand, review it beforehand and then I think if there's any question, we go through that and then we go through the document.

Good for bedtime. Jeff, I thought were friends with one another. I'm not sure this going in the right direction here. And then I think there was one other question, the working, methodology, the readings. Oh, yeah, the plan for the first topic next week. And as I said, we're going to work on the predictability study document. I now feel that we also need to spend a little more time on the work plan. So maybe what we can do next week, I don't think we're going to have the whole of the predictability framework ready. So, what I wanted to do next week actually is take up the offer that was already come up a couple of times this call, which is use the expertise of this group to focus the first few weeks while we also continue to work on the spirit team and the chartering around that and how that team would work, come together and operate.

I think it's an important group, and I think it would benefit also from the people that were devising the idea around that and maybe the PDP participants to help us put that into shape. And so maybe that is something that this group can get their teeth and duck into as of next week. We'd be happy to support that work, and then we can share the predictably framework itself, the document or the text around that

itself, as I said, the first meeting after 77. And that's currently our thinking. I hope that makes sense. Thanks.

And I'm going to say this very quickly. We say meeting 3 here. Just we're clearly about that. We didn't think we're going to have a meeting next week. It's prep week next week where normally there are no other or few other community calls, and then we are traveling to ICANN77 the week after that. But I think after the work plan discussion today, I'd like us to have at the very least a meeting next week to go over the work plan and then maybe start thinking about how this group can work on the spirit chartering. Martin, I'm sorry, I took longer than needed. Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you, Lars. It's Martin Sutton, [audio glitch 00:55:47].

LARS HOFFMANN: Martin, we can't hear you. I don't know if it's me, but I cannot hear you. It's very bad radio voice.

MARTIN SUTTON: Can you hear me now?

LARS HOFFMANN: This is great.

EN

MARTIN SUTTON: Okay. Thanks. Lars, I was just thinking of a couple of points there. One is that still, I think we probably need one more cycle of a week before something gets pushed out into the public domain for especially the board in terms of work plan because I think that does set actual expectations and that is the starting point that will be referred to. So, I think there is another cycle based on the feedback you've had last meeting and this meeting that needs to be teased into this document, and it would be worthwhile going through that next week before anything is submitted to the board.

I know what you're implying is that there is no sort of approval that's required by the board, there's more information giving, but this important. So, we need to manage that really well. And I for one, would potentially expect at this stage more of a range rather than explicit time frame until we really start plowing through the work and see how that progresses. Hopefully, but we'll devise ways to make that really efficient. In terms of the work ahead and as you've heard today and the last meeting, we're here ready waiting to go. So, if there is delays in getting the predictability draft out, is there something else that can replace it that we can do in different sequence so that the rest of these groups can start to provide some productivity towards the endgame? Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Really quick, Martin, and then Jeff. I know we're top of the hour, but I have a little bit of time. So, on the working document, no concern. So, I suggest we add some more data points to the doc. I very much like your idea of the range. So, I think that's a good idea. On the topic, as I said

last week, I think where we think where we take a blank page approach with this group as opposed to maybe some of the other documentation is, as I said, the spirit charting. So, I think that is something we can maybe spend half an hour on the work plan next week and then look around the kind of work that's required to get this spirit group set up as a first starting point. So, I have no concerns about doing that next week. That's amenable to everyone. And with that, I'm going to go over to Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. So, can I recommend then for next week if we're going to start a discussion on the predictability, that perhaps your team could send around the final report language from that section, send around a list of questions you want addressed during the call, and maybe even we could start discussing those asynchronously? And making the point that we're not revisiting any of these issues. So, it's really just discussing whatever elements you need to help you do the implementation work. But the more specific the questions, the better and the more in advance, the better so that we can start thinking about it and come productive as opposed to having to review, or what did the final report say, and then all of a sudden, we have five minutes left. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Yeah. We're not going to do that, Jeff. Whatever happens, I would tell you. There's no time for that. Yes. Very good. I like that. We will try to get it out as soon as possible. We will also try to get the work plan

updated. I suspect that will happen later this week, I can be honest. I think the question around the spurt and what the report says and the question around that that we can share that probably in a couple of days or so. I don't want to overpromise, but we'll get that done. The team is across different time zones, so that means we're working mostly around the clock.

Good. Right. It's three minutes past the hour. People are going to get ideas. Jeff already is making I think about bedtime, which it is incidentally for me right now. Thank you, everyone. This concludes the second call. I think I summed up what to expect next week. It is prep week, so this will overlap probably with a call there. But I don't know if the invite is out yet. It'll come otherwise tomorrow, my time tomorrow, Cheryl, later today for you, presumably. And thank you, everyone. That's right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will progress.

LARS HOFFMANN: That's right. Thanks, everyone. Have a lovely rest of your day, morning, afternoon, evening.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye, all. Thanks a lot.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: This ends the recording.