

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the IRP-IOT plenary on the 4<sup>th</sup> of June 2024. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name for the record. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. And I will turn the meeting over to Susan Payne. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Thanks, everyone. Okay. This is our IRP-IOT call, 4<sup>th</sup> of June. We've got the agenda there in the Zoom Room. I will just quickly run through it as usual. So we'll come back to the SOIs at the end, but in terms of our agenda items, we've got one sort of main action item that I'm just capturing on the agenda. I wasn't sure that there would be an update on that interim measures question that Liz and Sam are checking. But in any event, they have given apologies for this call because they both are tied up for different reasons. So I'm really just keeping that on the agenda just so that it doesn't get forgotten.

Agenda item three, I'll give an update on the public comments, and we can just do a quick review of fairly minimal changes to the introduction text as a result of the work that we've been doing recently. Agenda item four is to touch on the public session we'll be holding at ICANN80 in Kigali, which is on the 10<sup>th</sup> of June at the times there in the agenda. And in particular, just a kind of introduction to the draft slide deck and really checking in to see who, if anyone's going to be there on the ground and/or remotely, and so on. And then there's an agenda item for AOB but I will pause and just see if anyone has anything they want to put on the agenda.

---

*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.*

---

Okay. All right. Back up to the top of agenda item one then. Are there any updates to Statements of Interest from anyone? All right, I'm not hearing or seeing anything in the chat. I will take that as no for the present time.

Okay. As I said, action item two, I don't think we need to spend any time on this. I'm just keeping that on the agenda so that it doesn't get forgotten. It's something that Liz and Sam said that they wanted to look into just to make sure that the text in relation to interim measures is not in conflict with the Bylaws.

So on to agenda item three then. The public comments update. So we are very close. We have a sort of package of the materials to go out. Basically, there's a sort of form of template which is what I think gets published on the Public Comments site. Then in terms of the materials, we have the introduction that we originally looked at in January the text for that, and we have the versions of the rules there now, the versions with the legal redraft. So we have a redline version of that legal redraft against the current interim Supplementary Procedures, and that version also includes the rationales. Then we'll also have just a sort of clean version as well. Then it's also intended to make available to the community, just the set of the current interim Supplementary Procedures as well, so they have them to hand. I need to double-check. But in case we haven't made arrangements to do so, we're also, just for completeness, to give people a link to where the ICDR rules are. There's certainly a link in the introduction, but I think we probably ought to do it from the Public Comment page as well, in case anyone wants to look at what the ICDR rules say.

---

In terms of the timing, this has taken much longer than I thought it would, frankly. There's just a bit of sort of back and forwards. And then with me being at the INTA meeting, and then going down with a bug, and with Bernard has been really quite unwell with also something a bit nasty. So we're just a bit things where we'd hoped, I think, that we would get the documents through to the public comment to the relevant team in time for it to get published before the ICANN meeting. That isn't the case, but what will happen or what I hope will happen is that it will go live shortly after the ICANN80 meeting. So it's a shame, but there's not really anything we can do. It's just how it goes. And whilst I would have preferred it if we could have put the public comment out before we have that public session in Kigali, if we want to do a presentation to the community, this is the meeting where we need to do it, because otherwise, the next meeting in Istanbul is just much too late.

So that is the plan. I think it will be going out to public comment by about the end of June. I'm hoping no later than that. And the proposal is to give—well, there's a requirement to give 40 days for the public comment. I think we're going to give an extra week or two. So probably looking at closing it somewhere around about the 15<sup>th</sup> of September, really just to take into account that we are going into the Northern Hemisphere summer. But I think the expectation then would be that having given slightly longer periods than the standard that we won't be looking to grant extensions of time on top of that as well. David?

---

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks, Susan. This sounds good. I'm sorry, too, like you, that it won't go out before the Kigali meeting. I do think it is nice that there would be maybe an extra week or so. Is there a chance that we could send the package as it's finally put together, as what it's finally going to appear as to the members of the IOT two days prior to it going, just not for nitpicking but for any major things that somebody may notice. And the discipline on us would be—it has to be truly astounding to mention it—but just so we see what the package is like and we can advise our colleagues within our own companies or whatever. I don't know. I can't remember the complete text. But maybe we would add a sentence saying, "We beg your indulgence for bringing this out of a summer. That's why there's an extra week. But this is important. You really do need to take a look because it regards ICANN's uppermost accountability mechanism." That kind of thing. Anyway, those are my thoughts, as you mentioned, the timing and what's going to happen. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, David. I'll respond to you briefly, and then I'll come to you, Malcolm, if that's all right. In terms of the package, yeah, I don't see a problem with that. I've got what I think are the final versions that are just sitting in my inbox that Bernie sent me overnight. So I just need to give them a quick look through. I can ping that around the group as well. And then we can look to that getting submitted towards the end of the week. I don't think that's a problem.

One of the other things that Bernard and I talked about as being perhaps helpful for this public session, which we'll obviously come on

---

to, is that we obviously won't really have time to go through the specific text of the rules when we're doing the public session in Kigali. But what we can do is highlight to people perhaps the version that has the redline and the rationales that we can either post as meeting materials for that meeting session or direct people to our IOT wiki sites so that anyone who's particularly keen probably after the public session more likely than before, if they wanted to take a look at what it is that we're putting forward, they could already be doing that even if the public comment hasn't quite gone live yet. Malcolm?

MALCOLM HUTTY:

Thank you, Susan. I was just thinking largely on the same lines. If the document is ready or even almost ready, but not quite in a position, not quite capable of being formally published yet, on the same, if it were distributed to members of the IOT, we could use it to help gin up interest amongst our own community organizations, which might encourage for more public comments. So I would suggest distributing informally as soon as possible. And then if the formal publication and the formal opening has to wait, then okay, so be it. But there's no real reason why we can't try and get ahead of the curve.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, lovely. Thanks basically for those suggestions. I think that makes a great deal of sense. I can't see any reason why we can't do that. And as I say, I think we would do pretty much have a sort of final package now. There are a couple of the documents I just need to briefly cast my eye over. But other than that, I think it's pretty much stable.

---

One thing I did want to do now on this call was just show the introduction text and pull that up. Because although I don't think any of the changes are substantive, we have made like a handful of changes since the version that was effectively agreed back in January. And that's because, obviously, since January, we then made the sort of decision that we'd actually get the legal text drafted and this had previously not referred to the languages as being principles rather than sort of final text or proposed final text. So this is it. Again, it's not something that hasn't been seen. It is something that we all took a look at and had the opportunity to comment on. Indeed, we did, I think, have some discussion of this back in January.

In terms of the kind of the substantive changes—and they're not particularly substantive. The first is in the bullet that's called second public consultation, which is just at the bottom of the screen at the moment. You'll recall that when we talked about this, there had been a second public consultation, and whilst the public comments submitted by members of the community were available and published and could be read by anyone who wanted to, there wasn't a staff report of those comments. Since our discussion on that, you'll recall that Bernard did pull together a staff report which has been circulated around this group. And so that's just been edited now to remove that reference to the fact that there wasn't a staff report. And instead, it now refers to the fact that that staff report is also available with the comments. So that was the first one. Then the other sort of substantive change. Malcolm, I'm ignoring your hand in the belief that it's an old one, but I will just pause.

---

MALCOLM HUTTY:

My apologies. It is.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Perfect. Good. I just didn't want to ignore you. The other sort of substantive change, I think, if we scroll down a little further, please, Brenda. Well, again, it's not really substantive, but I think, at the time, we previously looked at this, we had the initiation of the IRP listed as Rule 2(a). So there's just been a bit of a renumbering gone on. Again, nothing turns on that, but I just thought I'd flag that.

Then the main one, I think, is, again, if we just scroll down a little further. Let me have a look at my version. I'm struggling to find where the right text is. Apologies. Sorry about this. Sorry. It's because it's now not a very substantive paragraph. Yeah, if you wouldn't mind just scrolling up a little bit, Brenda, I think it's here. It's that bit after the list of rules. We previously had a more lengthy paragraph that explained that we were putting forward sort of principles and sort of heads of agreement that would then be subject to a legal draft. So we were asking for input on the principles rather than the specific language. So that's been amended now to reflect the fact that we do now have the specific language. Therefore, now it's saying, "The IRP-IOT would appreciate comments on the principles and recommendations proposed to update the IRP Supplementary Procedures together with the specific language being presented at this time." So it's just to reflect the fact that we have had that sort of last minute change in approach where we have actually now got the legal text.

---

Then other than that, I think that is all apart from maybe the odd kind of typo change and slight rewording for sense. That is all that really has been changed in terms of anything of even remotely substance. So I just wanted to flag that just so that everyone has seen the kind of latest version. Obviously, it's been circulated just before this call as well. So there is an opportunity for you to give it a good read after this call. But as I say, hopefully there's no surprise in there.

So I will just pause briefly. And if there are no comments on that, or questions, we can move on to the next agenda item. Okay. I think we can move on then. Thanks, everyone. In which case, Brenda, would you be able to pull up the draft slides?

Actually, before we start, but while you're doing that, I'll just remind everyone that we have, as I said, this public session where we're going to present what we've been working on. That's on Monday, the 10<sup>th</sup> of June. It's at 10:45 local time in Kigali, which is 8:45 UTC. So for those joining remotely, my sincere apologies, really. I think for some people, it's quite an early time of the morning, I'm afraid. But it was actually really quite difficult to find a slot, particularly when we were trying to achieve a 90-minute slot, and I think that is what we've achieved. If not 90, it's certainly 75. But there were not many options. Yes, I'm so sorry, David, 4:45 in the morning. What could be nicer than to spend some time talking about the IRP?

Okay. So I think what we have is a room. I don't think that we're expecting so many attendees that we've got a sort of huge room with people on the top table at the front or anything like that. I think my expectation is that it's going to be set up as more like a sort of working

---



---

meeting room space. Those of us who are there in person, we'll try to sit in such a way that we don't have our backs to the audience. That means if there's a U-shaped table and there's a way of sitting, that means we can be facing the majority of the room, then I think we'll try to do that. But I won't really know what the room looks like until that Monday, I think.

With Bernard's excellent assistance overnight, I pulled together a kind of draft slide deck. Again, it's been sent around. If you like, we could quickly sort of run through it really briefly. I don't necessarily think we need to have me read every item on the slides, but I think I'd be keen to hear from people, either on the call or afterwards, if you think there's something significant missing from the slides or something wrong. But bearing in mind that obviously there's an opportunity during the actual presentation to cover items that may be in more detail or to give more nuance than the slides are covering. But the slides are just really meant to be there as a sort of guide for the content.

Maybe as we go—before we start, actually, maybe I'll just ask, I know there's only a small number of us here. I know Greg is going to be in Kigali in person. I don't know, Greg, if you have other commitments at that time slot. Malcolm, I'm not sure about yourself, will you be attending in person or are you hoping to attend remotely for the session?

MALCOLM HUTTY:

In person, sadly not. Remotely, I will try.

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Cool. Thank you. I know David is planning to try and join us remotely as well. So that's really appreciated. Greg, do you know whether you'll be able to be there in person?

GREG SHATAN: I'll need to check my schedule for that. That's 10:45 slot. I'm sure I have something conflicting, but I just have to see if it's more important. Of course, almost nothing will be more important than our presentation.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, it couldn't possibly be. No, joking aside. Okay. I think maybe we'll send a follow-up e-mail to the wider group as well after this. What I'm planning is to obviously do this presentation and allow time for questions from attendees from the community. To the extent that others are able to join the session, either in person or remotely, if anyone would like to take a section of the presentation and lead on it, I'd be very happy to have some volunteers to take part of this on. Alternatively, even if you don't feel you can volunteer for that, certainly my intent would be that perhaps there's a sort of introduction from whoever's sort of leading on the particular slide to intro on the particular rule, and then I think others from the IOT should feel perfectly able to chip in and raise anything additionally that they feel is appropriate to raise in order to brief the community.

GREG SHATAN: Excuse me, this is Greg. I've checked my schedule and I am available to be at the meeting on Monday, and I am more than happy to share the

---

burden or blessing of presenting parts of our results, unaccustomed as I am to public speaking.

SUSAN PAYNE: Perfect, brilliant. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Just let me know what you want me to do and I'll do it.

SUSAN PAYNE: I will do. Thank you. I'm not going to put anyone else on the spot. As I say, I'll send an e-mail around the IOT as well and see if there are any other volunteers. But I'm happy either way. I'm perfectly happy to present this, but I do want people to feel that they should chip in. Greg, your volunteerism is appreciated.

GREG SHATAN: I figured I should share the pain, so to speak.

SUSAN PAYNE: It's very kind. All right. And then in terms of the presentation itself, as I say, I think we can just sort of quickly skip through it, if that's okay with you all. Obviously, we can go on to the next one, which is just the agenda. So there's a bit about introducing of the group and our work, about coming public comment opportunity, a kind of overview of our proposals for the different rules, and then some practical information about the date of the public comment. Some of the other things that

---

are on our slate for this group to do, and then an opportunity for questions. So, if we can advance the next one, please, Brenda. Thank you.

In terms of the introduction, it's really just a bit of background, assuming that not everyone in the community is fully aware of what our group is and where we get our marching orders from. So I thought it was helpful to just flag right at the beginning that Bylaws 4.3(n) is the Bylaw that talks about the establishment of this group, and that our task particularly in relation to the rules is to develop some rules that conform with international arbitral norms, etc. And then a small amount of history in terms of just referencing the fact that this exercise comes out of the transition and the accountability work, that both of those made changes to the IRP, and therefore, the IRP-IOT was convened to revise the IRP rules, an explanation of why they're called IRP Supplementary Procedures. I probably won't use that term very often. The idea is that they supplement the ICDR rules, and then just brief highlights of the work that's been done. That there was a sort of first iteration of the IOT group that has worked on draft rules and held two public consultations, that we have a set of interim rules that were adopted by the ICANN Board in October. This IOT was then kind of reconvened in January with a new slate of volunteers to continue with the work. There's a bit more detail on the next slide about what that is. I think we'll just keep going.

As I say, this is a bit more detail, highlighting that we've prioritized updating the rules. And in particular, this sort of highlights that one of the things that was on our slate was to address the input from the second public consultation, and also that we have taken some feedback

---

---

from IRP users. So that's sort of practitioners in particular who've been using the IRP, whether that's from ICANN or from potential claimants, and some of the rule changes that we've addressed raised specifically out of that feedback. You know that we're showing our proposals and it's about to go out to public comment. And just flagging, at least as a starting point, that this has been quite a long piece of work, it's been quite challenging at times. We haven't always managed to reach a full consensus, particularly when we're talking about Rule 4 on the time for filing. But we did have support to bring it to the community in order to get input. Then also, just highlighting as an overarching comment that we've made a number of proposals on time limits, and that we will look at them for consistency but we would welcome input. Okay. Then I think we can again move on.

Again, this is just to summarize for people the rules that we've made some proposals on, and then as we move on through the deck, we've then got—I think it's just a slide for each of them then. I think that's how it's worked out. The text on the individual slides is largely pulling out sort of key features from the information that's included in the Rationale document for the relevant bit of the rule. So, in relation to panel selection, for example, it's flagging that the current Rule 3 is a bit brief and high level, and so we've tried to expand it for the clarity and readability. We've added some time limits to various elements. We've sought to address what happens where there's a delay in appointing a panelist. Then that would be either by one of the parties delaying on appointing their own panelist or the two panelists selected by the parties if there's a delay, and then getting together to find the third. We've also addressed the possibility that the Standing Panel might lack

---

capacity, and that's something that is referenced in the Bylaws specifically, which is why that we've addressed it. Albeit that we expect it to be a really rare occurrence, but we actually had quite a lot of discussion centered on that lack of capacity element that comes out of the Bylaws. Then we've expanded the provisions on conflict of interest to make it clear that there's a duty to disclose both our [appointments], and then it should be for actual conflicts and circumstances that give the appearance of a conflict.

Okay. Yes. Thanks, Brenda. So, 4(a), this is a new one. Obviously, this is about initiation. Again, it's flagging kind of highlights, really, of changes and items that are pulled out in the Rationale document. As you can see at the first bullet, I think one of the main things that in our initiation section we've really focused on is being much clearer about what costs are paid by whom and when. In order to do that, we considered the Bylaws language where it talks about the cost of the IRP proceedings. And we also looked at what some of the previous IRP panel decisions said when they were applying those principles, which is how we've reached the conclusions about, for example, ICANN covering the cost of the panelists, irrespective of whether they're Standing Panel members or not. And indeed, the filing fee as well, which is referred to in the next bullet. And that we make it clear that there should be a filing fee. The reason for that is that it's to serve as a gate to frivolous or vexatious claims, but not so high as to have a chilling effect. And flagging there this point that's come out of previous cases, which is that ICANN has been at the end of proceedings being ordered to repay that filing fee to the claimant because it's part of the cost of the IRP proceedings. Okay. Then we're also just flagging that there are some principles of initiation

---

---

that don't specifically have a rule but that we were proposing that they would be included in our output. And again, that's all kind of captured in the Rationale document. And again, this isn't everything that's in the Rationale document but it's trying to capture the highlights.

Okay. Then if we move on to 4(b), this one deals with the timing. The 120 days is not new. That's in the interim Supplementary Procedures for when you become aware or reasonably should have become aware of being materially affected. But what is new is the repose of 24 months because the interim rules have a 12-month repose. And just being sort of up front and identifying here that this was really the most difficult issue for our IOT group to agree on, and that including some of the public comment input interprets the Bylaws language is not allowing for such a repose because of the potential impact that a claimant might be out of time before they even become aware or are eligible to bring a claim. But others have argued that ICANN can't remain open to indefinite challenge on every decision it makes. So highlighting that we therefore sought to use the new rules, 4(c) and 4(d), to help give claimants some safeguards. Alongside that, having that adoption of a repose, which is now longer than in the current rules.

Okay. I think we can move on to 4(c). This one, first of all, as you'll all recall, this is just highlighting that we've included this provision that was formerly called fixed additional time for where someone uses the Request for Reconsideration process and it should not put them out of time. So that we've developed a concept of a minimum of 30 days in which to file your IRP after the former conclusion of your Request for Reconsideration, provided it was submitted in time and provided, obviously, that it didn't have the effect of resolving the dispute. This is

---

---

proposed, as it says, to address the community concerns that otherwise the deadlines for filing an IRP might dissuade potential claimants from using other accountability mechanisms like the RFR. Also capturing that we considered the notion of tolling the time spent on the RFR and concluded that it would be simpler for everyone if it was just a fixed additional time, and that's where that 30 days come from.

Then finally, just flagging that this proposal is really only addressing a Request for Reconsideration to the extent that there's delay caused by engaging in the cooperative engagement process. We haven't addressed that here in this Rule 4(c). But it is something that's addressed in the CEP rules currently, albeit not very satisfactorily. And it would be something that there would be an expectation. It's sort of revisited when we update the CEP rules.

Okay. Then 4(d) is this sort of—I can't remember what the term we're originally using was. But it's now called limited circumstances for requesting permission to file after the 24 months. So, this exceptional circumstance is opportunity for a potential claimant to be permitted to file late. It's where there are exceptional circumstances that will be on the claimant's control that prevented them from becoming aware or from becoming eligible to be a claimant or from being able to file a complaint within the deadlines. Flagging that that's a single panelist decision, and that there's an expectation that ICANN obviously would have a right to respond to any such request. Okay. I'm not seeing any hands or comments. So I will just keep cantering on. We're not too far from the end, not really.



---

On Rule 5(b), that's the one on translations. The slides are just capturing again some highlights that these requests should be determined by the IRP panel. Unless there's been sort of agreement or some kind of exceptional circumstances that it's the panel decision to determine whether the claimant has a need for translation services in respect of what. One of the main changes that we've made is that rather than limiting it only to the official UN languages, which is what the rules currently say, we have proposed that, where possible, the translations should be to and from UN languages. So where a claimant has the ability to adequately understand one of the UN languages, then that would be the case. But it doesn't exclude other languages where that would be necessary for fair participation. I think that's quite an important point that was worth drawing out. And then just highlighting again that the translation services are coordinated through ICANN's own language service providers, and that it's an administrative cost of the IRP. So it's picked up by ICANN unless there were a later order from the panel, which would be to do with conducting the proceedings, not for some other reason.

Then finally, we have Rule 7, which is consolidation intervention and participation as an amicus. Again, one of the main changes we made was this elimination of the procedures officer. Because that concept and the role of the procedures officer was poorly understood in past cases. So this was one of the areas where we reacted to feedback from previous cases where it did appear that there seemed to be really quite a lack of understanding, including on the part of the panelist as to what their role was. Also flagged that just for the avoidance of doubt, I think, really, that in cases of consolidation, it's the kind of first commenced IRP

---

whose panel are tasked with making the determination, and that's the panel that remains in place and gets consolidated into. Also, again, it's something that I think is in the current rules, is this idea that a third party directly involved in the underlying action should be able to petition to join in some way. I think that is actually already in the current rules. We have made a change on page limits where the current rules envisage that there's a single page limit applies to multiple claimants in one of these consolidation or intervention cases, which seems, I think, as we discussed, was unrealistic.

Then highlighting that in the case of a challenge to a consensus policy, we have at the moment a provision in the rules that the Supporting Organization can intervene as a claimant. So just highlighting that we've made a change there, which is largely one of termination, just simply because the Supporting Organization doesn't meet the definition of a claimant. So we've made an amendment to reflect that. Then just generally kind of restructured the rules to try and make it a bit clearer that if you're seeking consolidation, that there's a section of rules about consolidation and you don't find some of the information that you need under the rules heading for intervention, for example. So really just a bit of a tidying up.

Okay. As I say, that's a sort of quick canter through the information that I pulled out from the work that we've done. The next slide talks a bit more just about the public comment, when we're expecting it to open and probably close, the fact that there will be a slightly longer period for the public comment than the minimum because of the Northern Hemisphere summer. And identifying what we're sort of making available, which, as I said earlier, is the introduction, the current rules,

---

the redline of changes as against the current rules and the clean version. That we will have a copy of the presentation and the redline version with the changes. It says there it could be found on the IOT's wiki site. I think that's fine. I suspect we might also be able to make it available on the Meetings page for this session at ICANN80. I don't quite know how that works. But I think if we can, we probably will try to.

BRENDA BREWER: Can I ask a question about posting to the ICANN schedule. Do you want that posted before the meeting or after the meeting?

SUSAN PAYNE: Is it possible to post it before?

BRENDA BREWER: I believe so, yes. If this is ready to be posted, I can get that posted today.

SUSAN PAYNE: In terms of these slides, do you mean, or the document?

BRENDA BREWER: The slides.

SUSAN PAYNE: I think perhaps give it a day or so. But noting, I am aware that you're traveling soon. When are you traveling, Brenda?

BRENDA BREWER: Friday. I will look at e-mail Friday morning briefly. So Thursday would be best if you could give it to me by then.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. I think that's what we'll try and do then, which means if anyone does have any points that they feel really do need to be changed, then there's a couple of days for that to be flagged, but hopefully there's scope for additional information to be given during the session. So the slides, as I said, really are only meant to capture highlights. Yeah. Thanks, Brenda. I'll look to giving you the go ahead on Thursday.

All right. Then on the next slide, I think probably is question... Other tasks. Sorry. This is just highlighting that we do have other tasks besides the rules. Some of them are the cooperative engagement process to propose rules regarding appeals, provisions on IRP Standing Panel conflicts of interest if we want to make any recommendations on that. It says Rules, but I think it's meant to be Recommendations. Also input on educational briefing materials for the Standing Panel, which actually we've already done. But I thought it was quite nice to include something on there that I think we've sort of put to bed. But that's just to flag some of the other things that we will be working on. David?

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Susan. Well, on this slide, with respect to the second bullet, where we say proposed rules regarding appeals, I think it should be

---

proposed rules and/or limitations regarding appeals, because I think we can put limits on appeals under the Bylaws.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, cool.

DAVID MCAULEY: And we talked about doing that for the non-binding. It's possible, it's not something that's beyond the realm of possibility.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, that sounds good. I'll make a couple of tweaks there. All right. Next slide I think probably is questions. Yeah. So there's an opportunity there for questions. And then we've got a final slide which just has some useful links, so things like our wiki and our mailing list, and so on.

That is the run through. I am just going to pause. I appreciate none of you have really had much of an opportunity to look at this yet. I have been, like everyone, just sort of working towards a number of deadlines as we come into the ICANN meeting, and so we're sort of pulling things together at what feels like a bit the last minute. But we still have a little bit of time before our session next week. But yes, I think if people would have the time to review, if you'd like to, then please, again, I don't think we really are looking for a kind of redraft at this point. But if there is anything that you feel is inaccurate or sort of misleading or something that really needs to be added to the slides because you feel it's missing and important, then there is a sort of short opportunity to do that. And

---

then Brenda can get the slides added to the ICANN schedule meeting slot before she starts traveling on Friday.

I think from me, that's all on the slides. I will just pause and see if anyone has any reactions immediately, but I'm not particularly expecting that. Okay. I'm not seeing any. And in which case, I think that sort of more or less takes us to the end of our agenda, really. We have time on the agenda for AOB if anyone has anything. I will mention an AOB, which is that I am supposed to put out a call for people for subgroups to work on appeals and CEP. I realized that I have overlooked in that, so that's on me and I will do that. So that's not exactly AOB but just to flag that that's something that still needs to get done. Malcolm?

MALCOLM HUTTY:

Yeah. You asked for reactions to the slides and so forth. As we're coming up to what's really a key milestone here, both in publishing and in publicly presenting this, there is one reaction I would like to give, and that's to thank you, Susan, for all your hard work on this.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you. That's very sweet of you.

GREG SHATAN:

You've really been amazing.

---

SUSAN PAYNE:

I will say, it's been a lot more work than I thought it was going to be. But no. I must say also, I've got to give credit here to Bernard who pulled together the first version of these slides for me overnight, and it was just a tremendous help. It really, really was. I was sort of looking at, kind of working until quite late last night. So it was really appreciated. And particularly, as I say, Bernard has not been well. I think he's getting back on his feet now. But he's done sterling efforts on this.

Okay. Thank you very much. All right, then I will just again pause and see if there's any other business. And if not, we're a little early in wrapping up but I don't think that's a problem. We've all got lots of other work to be doing. And for some of us, we've got some traveling to do towards the end of the week.

GREG SHATAN:

We're a little early but we're also a few years late.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, gosh. It's been a bit of an epic, hasn't it? I probably shouldn't say this on the recording, but it's easy to think this is the end of the work. But of course, we will get public comment input and we will then need to address it. We, unfortunately, are not at the end of this task, but hopefully we're nearing the finish line.

GREG SHATAN:

That will be the sequel.

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, yeah.

GREG SHATAN: A public comment period of ice and fire.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. I think that's right. Okay. All right then. Thank you very much, everyone, and I really appreciate you joining. Apologies for having to reschedule from last week. Yes. I'll give Brenda the go ahead on Thursday for the slides. So please shout before then if there's anything you want to highlight. All right. I think we can wrap up then, and I will go and feed the dog.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, everyone. Cheers. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**