
PETER EAKIN:

Procedures Implementation and Review Team on the 30th of May, 2023, at 1300 UTC. My name is Peter Eakin, and together with Andrew Chen and Elisa Busetto, I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by 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 aloud during the time set by the facilitator of this 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 are done 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 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:

Thank you, Peter. I appreciate that. We had a quick note in the chat from Justine that Cheryl may not be able to join, but I think she just did, so no need to add her to the list of absentees. We have nobody who phoned in as absent or send a note. And with that, I welcome you all to our third call, I believe. I threw up the agenda here. It's a very brief slide deck, just a glorified agenda slide deck. We'll walk you through the different documents.

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.

We've got a couple of agenda items first. The SOI update. Obviously, if anybody has any updates to the SOIs, please let us know by raising your hand or posting in the chat. If you do not yet have an SOI, please make sure that you get one onto the record. This is a standard ICANN document that is also applicable, I think, to all, I want to say, working efforts certainly within the GNSO, I believe. So, there's nothing in addition to that. If you have that on file, there's nothing for you that you need to be doing. If you have any problems or questions around that, please get in touch with the email address on the screen here, nextround_policyimplementation@icann.org, or reach out to me or anybody from the Staff support on the call. Elisa Busseto, who just posted in the chat, will also be able to help you with that.

Very good. Just checking. I see no hands. Oh, and then the -- sorry, I forgot about that. Because there was another item -- the Google Doc. So, we had some problems with the Google Drive, and I apologize for that. It's the first time that our team is teaming with an external Google Drive, and we thought we had set it up, but I think there was a couple of glitches. I believe you need a Google account of sort. You don't need a Google address but a Google account to access the Google document, and you need to be signed up to this group to access that folder. So, it's a public folder public to this group. Not just anybody can access those files. It needs to be email address that registered with us.

Again, if you have any questions around that, please reach out and we will always also post the documents as PDFs onto the wiki page and share that with the group as well for those that cannot access Google documents for now. And as I said, if you have any problems or questions, please reach out and if we need to revisit access or other

platforms around this, then we're very happy to contemplate that, but this is, obviously, the means or the tools that we're using for now. Thank you.

Good. Just noting the chat, that Marc has an update to it. So, I thank you for that, Marc. It's noted and I'm sure all the technical issues are resolved. You'll do that on the wiki as well. If you have any problems, Marc, as you know, reach out to us or anybody of the policy support as well. Thank you. Good with that. Work plan, updated work plan. I'm going to try to push this in here. Somebody from my team could post the wiki link or the PDF link into the chat as well. And I will, in the meantime, pull this up. The work plan, we updated this following last week. Yes, Sebastien, that's coming. That's linked to the PDF. I hope that's helpful.

We updated the implementation plan based on the discussion last week. So, I'm going to quickly walk you through that. As with last week, could I ask you to hold questions until the end unless there's something really that just needs to be clarified on a specific item that I talked through? The status of this document, nothing has really changed or nothing has changed. The project implementation overview, the same thing. The work plan overall for those also who hadn't joined, who weren't on the call last week, the work plan while it is posted and it will be public and it will be updated on a regular basis, we talked about the timeline last week to great extent, so we'll talk about this again, I'm sure today.

If there's changes to the timeline, that will be updated, but for start, the Board still has to resolve on 38 recommendations. There's still an EPDP

out there and the framework group that may also both of these result and recommendations that will be on top of these 98 plus 38. So, if and when the Board resolves on those, these also will be integrated into the work plan. But for now, we have 98 recommendations or outputs, I should maybe say, from the final report that the Board has approved.

The deliverable of this group or of this effort, I should say maybe, is to draft an applicant guidebook. Again, nothing has changed from last week. What will also come out of this, just as a quick repeat, are documents for the applicant support program and the RSP pre-evaluation process. Both of these have to obviously be not just finalized, but also in working conditions or launched, I should maybe say, prior to the opening of the next round, quite considerably, prior to that, to be efficient and effective. And therefore, we put them as separate. While they are derived from the final report, these will be released and you see this later in separate modules that will be essentially part of the overall applicant guidebook, but these will be produced earlier to give applicants an opportunity to apply to these with plenty of time before the application window opens.

We then added here move things around a little bit to make it maybe a little more logical, the dependencies with the timeline. There's kind of six that we highlight here. I spoke about this a second ago, the pending recommendation. Timing on that is for now unknown. Our working assumption internally is that these will be resolved by the end of the year, but that is just based on the assumption. I think the Council and the Board will talk about this in the coming weeks.

There is the GNSO Council guidance process for applicant support that is ongoing. Their current estimation to submit a document to the Council is December 2023. Obviously, if there's any recommendations in there, that would have to be then also approved by the Board subsequently before our group can take it into consideration. If there are no recommendations, but "just guidance", then the process may be different.

The third one is the closed generics process. This is a framework discussion going on, but the timeline whether or not this may include an EPDP or a similar policy development process, a decision for the GNSO Council and the timeline also not yet known. The IDN EPDP is another dependency. I believe they have just updated their timeline. So, they have two timelines to be completed. The first normal working pace timeline would bring them to the end of their second phase by October 2025. That's over two years from now. They did say that they can probably reduce that time by about 40%. My math, someone else's maybe different, but my math suggests that this will bring it then to October '24. This would include face-to-face meetings, etc.

So, if the EPDP is completed by October '24, just a reminder here, obviously, for those of you familiar with PDPs, this is no news. The timeline here for October is the final report from the EPDP. After that, the Council needs to consider an adopt. There's a public comment before the Board then resolves on that, and we think those three; Council adoption, public comment, Board adoption, maybe four to five months after that before that can be considered, the recommendations can be considered by this group for applicant guidebook language.

The name coalition study 2, this is in fact the dependency for one of the recommendations that the Board has deemed as pending. I think the current forecast for that to be published is around ICANN78. So, it should be of no concern for our overall timeline. And then there's advice items, review recommendations, and work stream 2 items that pertain to SubPro to the next round of new gTLDs. These are detailed also in the ODA, in the operational design assessment. And they also will be picked up by this group over time, but it should not have any impact on our over time.

Before we move on to the timeline, we put the remit and the effort that is required here for the work. There was some ask last week about more data around this so we hope that what we provided here is sufficient. This is the outputs that have been adopted, the ones that are pending. I talked about this implementation guidance as well. It's here. This is the modules of the applicant guidebook, how we organize this, or see this to be organized for now. With a caveat that if logic that takes later on, the things would be changed around, then there is absolutely possible. I think we all agree that we need to be flexible. That doesn't mean that any recommendations will not be implemented, just that maybe content resolution will become Module 4 in the end and dispute resolution Module 5. That's the kind of changes I'm talking about.

Then we include a very large table that lists all the topic, 40 of them. Topics, I should say. Also indicates where for now, we see in which module these topics would belong to. These are the modules. Obviously, there's eight modules plus the two that I spoke about earlier. Then we attached on this our own planning purposes, a rough estimate of the complexity of the topic from turning it from the outputs from the

final report into applicant guidebook language on the scale from 1 to 5. It's not overly scientific, but we did spend quite some time on this to align this and make sure that whatever is designated aligns to one another at the very least.

And then also, again, based on the complexity of the topic, but also on the, I should say, yeah, maybe how we expect whether that it's a topic that will require more discussions or fewer discussions with a group depending also how much has changed from the 2012 round. We then gave a rough estimate of the amount of weeks that we think the IRT will likely or could spend on this. I guess, I should maybe be precise, should spend on this considering our overall timeline ambitions. So, this varies from 0, there's no recommendations here as well. There's very few recommendations. And so, whether that's one or two weeks, that doesn't mean we're not going to share any draft text with you, obviously, we will. But it should be so straightforward that not a lot of discussion of any needs to be had.

On other topics, you see the C on PICs, and I think this is the highest number we included here is four weeks. So, this brings us to a total-- I'm going to quickly scroll through this. I don't think we need to do this line by line. You have the link to the document if you want to take a look yourself. This brings us to an overall of 91 weeks. And again, this is an estimation to make to see how this would fit into the 15 to 24 months timeline that we included here at the end. That we discussed last week. This is just a summary table of the individual items that looks at the accumulative complexity and IRT weeks from above module.

I'm just checking the chat. Then we provide an overview of the topics between now and the ICANN78 meeting. I hasten to add that this here, a predictability, while we're going to start talking today about the SPIRT chartering, this here is then the actual framework as well, which is different to obviously what we will discuss today about the SPIRT group. This is really about then about how the predictability framework will be reflected in the applicant guidebook. We included here the same numbers from above, just as a reference guide. You see we started with relatively easy or less complex topics. It's about eight topics. This assumes a topic every other week, a new topic to be submitted to the IRT starting after ICANN77.

And, yeah, I mentioned this before, we start this next week, we talked about a range of timing. We left this at 15 to 20 or we didn't leave it at. We left the upper limit at 24 months. We moved the lower limit to up to 15 months. What I will say is that the EPDP extended timeline, as I said earlier, at this moment is for the time being October '24, plus Board approval, etc., brings us to early 2025 under the accelerated timeline. So that would already rule out the 15 months lower limit, but we'll leave that in there for now. As we said, we will address the timeline as we move along, and if we can be quicker, we certainly will be.

The methodology. Sorry. I see Elaine here has a question. In a minute, I'll get to that. I'll go through the document first if that is okay. And then finally, we fine-tune as well the working methodology. So, what will happen is that we will provide text, similar to what we've done with the SPIRT document last week, provide text with comments and questions. For the topics that go directly into the applicant guide book,

it will actually be draft language that we propose to the IRT based on the outputs. And then we have a first reading.

With materials being submitted to the IRT, as I said, the assumption is that the working group or the IRT, I should say, will have reviewed the documents beforehand. If needed, ICANN can then provide clarification rationale on the call. And then during the call, we will walk through the document and have a discussion with the group about what looks good and what may need to be further improved. The document will remain open for comments after the call for no fewer than three days. This is done really, I think the minimum number, I think, it was useful, I think, to include that. If it's just a week of reviewing, then this allows us some time to take those comments on Board in preparation for the next week call.

In those cases where there is, which probably will be more than most or most of them, where the discussion will not be completed during one call, the discussions will obviously continue as long as they need to. And then once the discussion is completed, the IRT has ended the discussion and the feedback, the document is closed as well for written input, and then ICANN Org will review the comments and produce a red line and a clean version of the updated text. And then going into the parallel work effort here in a moment, and then, essentially, the second reading is what we really just call for ICANN to share the red line and the clean version and provide rationale about what feedback has been taken on board and how. And then the topic is going to put aside until it goes out of for public comment.

I spoke above about the fact that we are planning to get about a topic on average to the working group every other week, every two weeks. So, it's 40 topics. Some of them have very few if any recommendations, so let's say 35 topics. So, with there's some holidays, there's some ICANN meetings, so that is also will get us to more than 50 months if that's what it is. Jeff, already, I think, I saw on my side here on the chat about the parallel working group and parallel efforts. So, what we say is that even if the IRT needs, let's say, five weeks to discuss topic a, or topic access this document here, then still every other week, we'll bring a new topic to the main group and then subgroups will be formed to continue discussion on topic a while topic b is fed in as previously foreseen to the main group to start the discussion on the new topic while the previous topic is continued to be discussed in a subgroup.

Very good. All of this is summarized or gives an overview and is shown here in this diagram as well. First reading and second reading. And then we talked about the public comment last week as well, is included here too, that we plan to put out parts of the applicant guidebook draft, applicant guidebook for public comment, if and when they become available. If and when the IRT has reviewed an amount of recommendations or topics that make sense to put up a public comment, we can discuss that the time. And then, obviously, the applicant guidebook has a whole will go out for public comment as well once that's all done. And then below, this was included last week as well, some information on some of the ongoing vendor outreach that we've already done around auctions and about CPE, something that's also been mentioned in the ODA.

Right. Very good. I'm going to quickly go through the chat. I see there's been quite a bit of discussions. If anybody wants to raise their hand and talk rather than have me read it, obviously, please go ahead. Otherwise, it'll take just a moment.

Jeff. "It's helpful to have levels of effort, the number of person's hours it takes, but what is not the most helpful is the assumption that everything is done serially as opposed to in parallel tracks." I don't think that's what that says, Jeff. I think what it says that we'll bring everything sequentially to the group, and then the discussions will continue in parallel when need be.

Elaine. "Does the plan incorporate the expected timeline for completion on the 30th depending on [inaudible - 00:23:40] as well, or will those be added as they are resolved?" Elaine that is not included in this plan. It's just noted that these are outstanding plan for when they're going to be resolved and the timeline is actually a deliverable for the Board and the Council for ICANN77, if I'm understanding. Jeff, you have your hand up. I'll go to you in a minute then.

Susan Payne, "Some of the recommendations from RPM's Phase 1, we expect to be presented by this group. Are they included in the timeline?" Susan, they are not yet included to the timeline, but these will fall under on this example, for example, on, I think, post-education dispute resolution. And so, we expect to have those be delivered when or be part of the applicant guidebook language that we produce when we come to those topics, which will not be at 78. Internally, we are aware of these. And so, the SME who's dealing with this topic will take

care of those recommendations as well and incorporate that into the draft language. I hope that makes sense.

Very good. Sam. This is the team members. Jeff, give me one second. "Most likely, the IRT will have to incorporate and address additional components as delivered by the Board." I'm not sure about the additional components, Elaine, but obviously the topic-- I mean, yes, there's more to come, right? So, there's the pending recommendations and the output of the IDN EPDP and the possible closed generics and the applicant support GGP as well. Good. With that, Jeff, please.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. Hopefully, can you guys hear me? I'm in a different place.

LARS HOFFMANN: Yes, we can.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay. Yeah. And I don't want to spend too much time on it because I think we should really get to the substance. But I think my comment was if you're delivering things to us sequentially, then we are limited by the timing in which you deliver stuff to us. So, if it's going to take 50-something weeks for you to get to deliver to us whatever is in that time period, then obviously we can't incorporate that into our work until 50-whatever weeks until after you deliver it or until you deliver it to us, that's what I'm trying to say. So that is serially.

So, it's not worth spending time now, but we should try to brainstorm in ways that this stuff could be delivered to us in a faster way than sequentially. And it really should be because there's a lot of sections with no changes and then there's a lot of sections with changes. So anyway, I think we should just move on to substance.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thanks, Jeff. And yeah. So, the only thing that I can reassure you is that we are also constantly internally looking at or we can make sure that we can bring everything to you as soon as possible and in as bigger chunks as feasible as well. I think what we did here is that we put on together a plan that looks feasible for the timeline in sequential way. I think the amount of parallel calls and efforts that we can have will also vary for different people on this call. For some it might be easier do a lot of parallel work, for others it may not be so much. And from a Staff perspective, we can obviously support two or three parallel efforts after that. That also might become an issue.

And so, I agree with you, instead of maybe trying to over-plan this right now, I think we can all agree that we want to complete this work as soon as feasible and that we're going to be limited by two facts. By the speed by which ICANN Org can deliver it to the IRT and by the amount of time that it takes for the IRT to review and discuss and align on issues of controversy. And so, I think if we both make the best possible effort to do the work as efficiently as quickly as possible, I don't see any danger of us missing the deadline. Martin, please.

MARTIN SUTTON: Hi, Lars. And thanks for the documents. I did manage to get in briefly before the call just to check. I could add some notes. And I've put some in relation to this document in there. I would suggest that give everybody a chance to add any other comments and perhaps we come back to this briefly or just during in between the calls, there can be comments and replies added into the document. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: I'm asking, the question was whether or that people should do it? Did you ask whether that can be done or did you [CROSSTALK - 00:28:51] to do it? I'm sorry. I missed that.

MARTIN SUTTON: Lars, I was just suggesting so we move on. The good thing is it is working for at least me, and hopefully others will be able to access those documents and annotate those with any comments or questions from now on.

LARS HOFFMANN: Okay. Appreciate that. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks a lot.

LARS HOFFMANN: Very good. Thank you, Martin. Good. Okay. I see no more question. Nigel, thank you for the question here on the timeline. So, there was a

reference to the timeline in the document last week that I think stem from an internal discussion that the Board has not seen. So, we took that out. And as I said on that week as well just to give some caveat if you didn't listen to the recording, it was that if we have 24 months' timeline, if you think that through to the produce an applicant guidebook, once the applicant guidebook is in draft form and ready from the IRT and no more comments need to be made, and we are all happy with it, then the documents goes for public-- that goes for public comment. Then we need to review it again between us to see what we take on board and what we don't take on board.

Then we need to cross our fingers that we just have to do that once. I think in 2012, it happened several times, but there was no IRT, so hence let's just do it once hopefully this time. Then the Board will approve it, and then it needs to be at least four months until before the round can open per recommendation. And so, if you add that all together, public comment, review, Board approval, four months, it's more or less almost a year, maybe not quite. And so that was the internal timeline that was based on the 24 months document. And three work streams. Yes. There's also internal work. Obviously, they need to happen in parallel as well. Mike, from operation perspective, it's determined the ODA as well.

Anyway, Nigel, so on your question, the Board will get the information on the operational aspect. We'll get the information from this work plan with the range that we have included here. It will also get the timeline from the GNSO Council about EPDP, GGP, close generics, and the resolution on the pending recommendations. And based on all of those informations combined, I think then the Board will work with

ICANN Org on a timeline, which I believe is expected to be released no later than 1st of August per the Board resolution in in Cancun.

Okay. Thanks. From Nigel. Yes, Jeff. Public comment stages. It's actually in there. I spoke to that earlier, that we will do public comment in stages as they become available and when it makes sense. Something we'll discuss with this group. Certainly, I think modules make sense. And we do believe that there is a need though to have at least one public come up with the whole document as a whole so everybody can see everything in context. But it shouldn't be the first time that any text in itself has gone up for public comment.

Okay. Good. With that, I'm going to move on to the SPIRT chartering document if that is okay. Last check. Looks good. There we are. I see now, or let me just close this, it's a little smaller. Very good. So, this is SPIRT document that was included in the final report from the PDP working group. So, the document, the purpose is of this charter is to establish, I believe, and Jeff and Cheryl, obviously, please jump in if I mischaracterize this, is to set the rules, procedures, and processes around the functioning of this SPIRT group itself. And the SPIRT, I should say this, stands for Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team.

The purpose of this team is to take part in and be an important part, in fact, of the predictability framework. The predictability framework itself will go into the applicant guidebook. And to Martin's comment here in the text, that was part of the ODP and I think there were also a couple of questions that we did post to the Council around that. On the SPIRT group itself, that is not something that will go into the applicant

guidebook and has also very little operational impact on the next round. And therefore, as a community group, it was not part of the ODP assessment. I don't think it would have been appropriate for ICANN Org to design what a community group looks like.

And so, the hope is that with this group, we can go through the document, see whether maybe some gaps that need to be filled. We added some questions here that the group may want to discuss and then we can hopefully put together a complete and comprehensive chartering exercise around this group. I would like to add to that that the SPIRT should be in place by the time that the applicant guidebook is approved and that the role of the SPIRT really-- Because that's when the SPIRT will, in fact, jump into action to assess or work with ICANN Org around changes to the program once the applicant guidebook is published and the program is in operation.

So, I think from a methodology perspective, I suggest that, obviously, if there's any immediate comments, please raise your hands. Otherwise, I don't think our time is well spent for me to read through the whole black document. But the very least, I think maybe we can talk about some of the questions and then we have some reactions from this group, that would be good here. Specifically for this document, as I said, it's going to be a community group. I think it's appropriate for this group to provide details in the first instance on how they or how you see the SPIRT should be organized.

We didn't think that since this will not go into the applicant guidebook per se, it's appropriate for Staff to take the first step at this. Obviously, if that is something you would like to see differently and you want us to

take the lead on this, we could do that, but as we said, we didn't think that would be appropriate. At least not without confirmation.

I see a question from Phil via Elisa. Does ICANN Org have staffing plan for the sub IRT? Is there any slack in the budget to recruit additional staff? Clearly, if ICANN was able to do this, it would need to speed up the time to completion. This is for this IRT, Phil, or for the SPIRT group? On this IRT, I'm not sure that I have seen any special requests on the staffing for now. Jeff?

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks. This is not on Phil's question, so I don't know if you were finishing that up.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Yeah. Just to say that, Phil, if you can ping me that separately or send me an email around this. The budget is obviously has been out for public comment. And I think the staffing around the drafting of the applicant guidebook, we're in a decent shape, somewhat to say. Yeah. Thanks. Please go ahead, Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Sure. So, these set of questions I think because the group is supposed to fall under the jurisdiction of the GNSO, according to the final report, I think these are questions specifically the mechanics of how the group is set up and how you join and how you leave, I think that's really an issue for the GNSO and should probably just be sent as a request from the IRT to the GNSO to work on these issues outside of this IRT process. There

are questions in here, obviously that are more for the IRT, but I think these questions of mechanics of the formation of the group and the operations of the group itself is for the GNSO.

And I say GNSO, not meaning to exclude other SOs and ACs because it is mentioned in there that there should be participation from all of the SOs and ACs, but that overall, because the GNSO is responsible for the development of policies for generic top-level domains, that this ultimately would fall under the jurisdiction of the GNSO, but involve people from other groups. So, I don't think we should spend a lot of time on these questions here and on the mechanics of the group, but more the issues and how those things get dealt with. That's more for this IRT. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Jeff. As I said, I think last week as I said we will bring the framework itself to the group after 78, and so we want to spend some time on the SPIRT before then. I understand that the group does fall, but at the very least, has to report everything to the GNSO, but since the-- I didn't realize that the Council or anyone in the GNSO was starting this as project. For me was something that this group would be responsible for, and then obviously refer that back to the Council for their consideration as well, and the other SOs and ACs as appropriate. So, anybody else has any thoughts on this group around that?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Sorry, Lars. Can I just clarify quickly? GNSO hasn't started this work. I was saying that there should be a notice to the GNSO to start this work. Sorry. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Well, the GNSO sent the report over, right? I don't think we should send a note back, right? If they're doing it, then I guess they're doing it. I know you're just liaison, Jeff, but you're on the Council and obviously as well. Do you know what the expectation is then? I see that Greta has her hand up as well.

GRETA STOJANOVIC: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify. I didn't quite understand what Jeff was saying. So, I'm interested to hear a little bit more about it. My takeaway is that there are a lot of timelines. I'm happy to contribute to the document. I'm a data scientist, and I can help with optimization of this and making it better for people to understand. I'm happy to contribute and grateful to be here. I didn't quite understand what Jeff was saying, so if anyone can give me a summary of what he was getting at, that would be awesome.

LARS HOFFMANN: Jeff's hand is up. I think he's probably best based. Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, sure. All of these sections that this document contains in the black text is from the final report, or at least on that page. I'm assuming

it's the same for the rest of it. And the final report does make it clear that this was intended to but there are several components to the SPIRT section, or it was predictability section. The composition, the reporting structure of who this group reports to, how the group works operationally is really something that falls under the jurisdiction of the GNSO according to the report. And that report was approved, and the Board, I guess, approved it.

So, what I was saying was that these questions of operations, how people join, what are their qualifications specifically, how people resign I think it was one of the questions in the page before. Those are mechanics that are probably best discussed within the GNSO environment but again, just because it's under the GNSO jurisdiction, it doesn't mean that it's only GNSO members that could talk about. It means that the GNSO should run a process that involves other SOs and ACs in the discussion of these issues. So that's all I'm saying.

And the note back, Lars, is really just I think the GNSO obviously was waiting for the Board to approve it, which it did. And I think a note is just to remind them that this falls under the jurisdiction of GNSO and that they should do the work. But we have counselors here and liaisons. I think we have liaisons. I think that was finalized at the last Council meeting. Anne and Susan. So, they can bring it back to the GNSO if we think that that's the right thing. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Okay. Good. I mean, if this is the thinking of this group, I mean, I see Jeff obviously spoke to this, Susan, Elaine. I see a thumbs up for Cheryl

who's not on the GNSO, which I think it's good to hear from people who are not on the GNSO. My understanding was, I have to be honest with you, from the report that once the group is in place, yes, it is, reports to or makes recommendations to, is under the hospice of the GNSO Council. But setting up the group and how it works and who can participate and how that functions, seeing it's across community group, my view was something for this group to do.

I have to say and I didn't see anything contradicted to that in the final report. But, obviously, I'm very happy not to have the discussion. We'll send a note to the GNSO Counsel for clarification, and/or in fact if we have the liaisons, Anne and Susan can take it back and see what we hear back from them. Roger and then Jason, please.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Lars. It's Roger. Actually, you just said what I was going to say. It sounds like Jeff had the idea that Counsel would do this, but it to me, Counsel is going to put this out to a working group somewhere. So, I assume, just like Lars just assumed, that that work was going to come back to us for us to do. But it's a good question, I think, from Jeff and the liaison can take it back and confirm that the Council was expecting this group to do this, or Council was expecting to take this work on somewhere else. So, thanks, Lars.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Roger. And then I think I have Jason in the queue and then Jeff.

JASON MERRITT: Good morning. Thanks very much, everyone. Just maybe a bit of clarification from my end. I'm understanding this like we're saying the same thing here just differently. I sort of understood it the way Lars have characterized it where here in this IRT group, we could probably not spend a whole lot of time on this issue, but we could certainly come up with some of the broader sort of framework issues like around composition of the group, some of these bigger things, and then the GNSO Council would deal with all the mechanics of how that works. I think that's the point Jeffrey is.

So, my understanding from the discussion is that we're saying the same thing, but perhaps what's the expression? Two planes passing in the night or something like that? So maybe just some clarification on my end. But I do think that given the composition of this group, it could be done fairly quickly to establish some of these themes upfront and then send it over to the GNSO. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Jason. Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. Let me try again. So, what I'm basically saying is if we're trying to look for things that we could process in parallel, this is one where technically we don't need ICANN staff to do for us, right? ICANN staff runs the IRT and that's great and that's awesome and that's their role. I think with the mechanics of the SPIRT, we don't need ICANN staff or at

least GDD, I'll definitely need help. But we don't need them to spend, GDD staff to spend a lot of time thinking about this, whereas the Council can work with other SOs and ACs in establishing a process to put together.

Because this is our community group. The SPIRT is our community group. It's not ICANN Org's IRT, and maybe that's a problem with how we named it. So, all I'm saying is the mechanics, the operations, let's push that off and let's go to the other issues for consideration, which are in here, and that we should spend time in this IRT talking about those. Hopefully that's better. And if not, I'll just shut up and let others go.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thanks, Jeff. I'm going to give it one more attempt here to explain why this before you because what Jeff said, I agree. I think with everything you said, maybe just some of the conclusion, which is this. Yes, it is very much a community group. It's not very much not something that is part of the applicant guidebook. Therefore, we have not answered all those questions the way we think they could be answered as we would have done otherwise if it was a -- by we, I mean GDS staff.

But we believe that or we believe before this call that the time that we have until the first topic is ready, the predictability framework itself for this group to review shortly after ICANN77, that the time is well spent to go through some of these questions with this group as this is something that, yes, can be done in a parallel, and that we as Staff don't think that we should run this, but the community should run it itself and the IRT

seems to be the most obvious group to do this for a variety of reasons. But if there is no appetite to do this and clear this with the Council first, then we can obviously do that. I'm afraid it will not lead to the predictability framework being ready to review before the first session after ICANN77. Martin, please.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Hi, Lars. And, yeah, I appreciate Jeff's inputs there because I was wondering how this would fit into the AGB in the first place from the basis of the IRT process that was outlined. We would be reviewing text to go into the AGB. This kind of stands to one side as it's formed and created and worked through with GNSO and other parties. But therefore, we do need to come back to what text will be going into the AGB, which helps explain the processes and under what circumstances the SPIRT will be called upon for the predictability framework. So, looking forward to that. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Yes. And as I said, we're absolutely working on that, Martin, and we will discuss that with the group as well as soon as feasible. It is planned for the first meeting after ICANN77 to discuss the framework itself and how the SPIRT feeds into that. Thanks. Justine notes that SPIRT will need Staff support. This is actually something that is one of the questions we have in here as well. Nigel agrees that we should go through these questions as otherwise that we'll be discussing them again after the GNSO Council work, and agrees with Jason. Interaction between staff and SPIRT is what our folks should be. I don't think that's what Justine

meant there, Jeff. Quite technically, I think Justine was talking about Staff support, just support for the group rather than I think the interaction with in the work of the SPIRT as part of the predictability framework. That would not be part of this document.

Very good. Well, what I hear from this are two things. I'm afraid, as I said last week, the predictability framework itself is not quite there yet to share. We will share that as soon as we can. We have only eight minutes left. So, we had some views that this group should not be dealing with the chartering of the SPIRT, but this should be something that we should ask the Council whether they want to take it on and work with the other SO/ACs or whether they believe we should do it after all.

Sebastian, I saw your comment around the possible two liaisons. Question is if they are not confirmed yet, just a protocol question, should Staff reach out to Council with that or can Anne and Susan do that? In the meantime, I'm happy to do it, but I just want to make sure about that if somebody can put something in the chat. We will do that. And then maybe I can encourage people to-- No. Absolutely. Susan, I'm just talking about the chartering, right? I think all this document is around the charter of the IRT. The predictability framework itself, obviously, is a separate document that is unrelated to this. Well, it's related to this, but it's very different from this. And that obviously will go to this group 100%. And that would not be included in the outreach to the Council. It's really just about the charter of the SPIRT, how it works, and how it functions, and how it's composed. I think that's what this exercise is about.

Good. In that case-- Okay. Sebastien is asking that Anne and Susan do take it to the Council. Anne and Susan, if you need any support from us to write anything up, please reach out through means feasible, email address. Email is probably easiest. And what Jeff said there is I think what we should have the Council confirm. So, we're clear about that. The second part goes without saying is really just about the first part.

Good. Very good. Then we have just a couple of minutes left. It's a SPIRT document. For the ICANN77 session, Anne and Susan, I don't know if it's feasible to get feedback from the Council before ICANN77. I'm saying this because we had, as I said, we plan to submit the predictability framework itself to the group for discussions in the first session after 77, and that's when the topic sequence when we think our pipeline is in a state where we can then bring topics every other week to this group. We're still having our heads down and working hard. Well, we continue to work hard for that matter even when the topics are out because there are more topics.

For the public session at ICANN77, we assume there's going to be a lot of interest from the wider audience, not just members of this group. So, we will get a review and revisit the work plan. Everybody is aware of that and knows about it. And also talk about the chartering. If that is not something that we cannot should do, then I think it'd be good to know from the Council around that if we can get that beforehand. And then otherwise, we continue the discussion on the work plan, and I will work see with my colleagues if there's any chance to get the predictability framework ready for ICANN77, but I don't want to raise hopes. We will try, and I will keep this group posted with a definitive schedule or agenda, I should say, for the public session next week.

There's no IRT meeting next week. People start traveling as of Tuesday or Wednesday. Usually, no meetings in the week before an ICANN meeting. And so, with that, I don't see there's any more hands up. I see the confirmation of the coordination from Anne. I appreciate that. And with that, we finished three minutes early. Thank you, everyone. And for those who'd travel to DC, safe travels and see you there. Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

PETER EAKIN: Please end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]