ICANN Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Thursday 02 July 2020 at 03:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/x/jwBcC
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's get started.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, Cheryl. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Thursday, the 2nd of July 2020.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I will turn it over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Please begin.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Do let me know if my audio fades. I also have no ability to see anything in chat and I'm looking at a tiny mobile phone to try and read the agenda or anything on the screen, so all of those apologies in advance.

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.

Let's start with the usual administrivia. Is there anybody who has, other than Jeff who I believe has updated his Statement of Interest, any changes to their Statements of Interest that needs to be recorded for this meeting? And I'm not seeing anything coming into chat. I haven't heard anyone say, "Me, me, me," so we'll just note Jeff's change of SOI for the record and we will move on today's agenda. And if there's anybody who has any other business that they'd like to say it now, if you could let us know, we will call for any other business at the end of the call or towards the end of the call. But today's agenda is going to be primarily a reviewing of the "can't live with" which is comments that have been received on Work Track 5 and you've all got the attached document there.

I had lost my connection from my mobile phone so I now can't see anything. If you can bring that up on the screen. And I'm afraid I'm going to have to rely on who's running it on the Staff. Is it Julie or Steve's screen today?

JULIE BISLAND: Steve. Steve got it up on the screen now, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't know because I've got it blank saying "connecting". So let's get back in. Is it Steve's screen we're running?

JULIE BISLAND: Correct. Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. So, Steve, if you can help me here, I will greatly appreciate it. So you've got the link in chat I trust as well, and we did receive a couple of comments on the "can't live with" listing. So, Steve, can I get you to run us through those while my unstable Internet continues?

STEVE CHAN: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Remember, everybody, this is a very large Word document. It does take time to load. Over to you, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Cheryl, this is Steve from Org. I guess, first of all, I'd note that the document we're dealing with is actually a Word document case. That's what we utilize for actually developing Work Track 5, their Final Report. So you have to bear with me and Cheryl. I don't think either of us is expected to be chairing right now.

The nature of this document is similar to what we did with the last "can't live with" documents. The first one here is sort of an overarching comment that came from a handful of At-Large folks, from Justine, Yrjo, and Marita. I don't know if Justine is on the call. Yes, she is. I wonder if I could invite Justine to provide some commentary about this comment rather than me trying to read it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just before you do take over, Justine, please ensure that everyone understands the exact status. This is minority statement but it is not a statement of the ALAC and from whence it came and how many or otherwise if the CCWG did not feel the same way. Thank you. Over to you. Do we have Justine or is there an audio problem?

STEVE CHAN: I saw her mic go live for a second but then she was muted again. Well, I can just start talking about it for a moment and see if she's able to connect back. Oh, Justine, are you there?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I'm here. Sorry, I wasn't sure what I was supposed to speak to. So I was waiting a prompt.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Let me help you then. Justine, you and Yrjo and Marita appended to what we all received your own minority statement that was raising concern, and we were giving you the opportunity on behalf of your two compatriots to speak to that briefly. Can you take perhaps a minute or two to do so?

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Okay. Well, the first thing is I confirm that it is not an At-Large position. It is what I consider a dissenting view, not a minority statement because I understood that minority statements only come after a consensus call is conducted and, as far as I

know, the consensus call hasn't been conducted for the entire report anyway. So as far we're concerned, this is a dissenting view. I understood that the working group or all Leadership is a position to accept dissenting views at this point in time. So, it is a dissenting view from the three of us – from myself and two of my At-Large colleagues.

It just basically speaks to a disappointment that we hold in terms of specifically to the proposal to have notifications to parties who wish to be notified in terms of if an application is made for string which falls into a part of strings that are, I suppose, populated by stakeholders who are interested in getting notified if such strings were to be applied for. Unless someone has questions about why we're putting this up then I think it's sufficiently clear. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you very much for that. We just wanted to make sure that without us making, as the Leadership team, any assumptions on what the intent was and the purpose of this dissenting view and we now have the nomenclature agreed. I think the work group should know have that clear in their minds. It is not, as you said, a minority statement, it is a dissenting view, and therefore we shall receive it and none of us will be surprised to hear some of the things from you in the future as well.

Is there anyone who is wanting to now take any of the other extremely fine print that I have absolutely no chance of reading into discussion now we know the status of it? I don't know if there's hands, if someone can tell me.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. I'm sorry, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can be Cheryl if you want to, Steve. I don't mind.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks for sharing. You actually have Annebeth, Christopher, and Paul McGrady in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's take them in that order, please. Annebeth, go ahead.

JULIE BISLAND: Hi, Annebeth. We can' hear you. Try now. Okay. Annebeth is having some problems with her audio. Do you want to go to Christopher?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, let's move to Christopher. Christopher, I hope the audio is all right.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good morning, good evening, good day. Steve, I apologize for missing a couple of calls. I was offline in a hospital. I came out yesterday.

Just to say that I would wish to give my strong support to this dissenting view. As most of you have heard over in recent years, I regard just of this position an extremely important precondition of any form of political acceptability and success of Work Track 5's work and the PDP regarding geographical names. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that. Annebeth, would you like to try again?

JULIE BISLAND: Yeah, Annebeth. Your mic is open, Annebeth, but we still can't hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: While we try and work out with those audio, Paul, over to you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Just so that I understand, we're not meant to do anything with this, right? It just sits there. It's from the small group. We're not supposed to be going through and editing it and deciding whether or not we agree that it's factually accurate or anything like that. It's just a view from a small group and that's it, right? There's nothing to do, right? I mean, you don't mess around in other people's dissenting views even if you don't agree with things in it, right? So that's what this is. We're not missing an opportunity to tinker with it, we're just supposed to know about it, right? Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's how I see it. That's wasn't their intent. They're only to make it obvious in some way to the mailing list. And I believe we've now formally added Christopher's name virtually to the other three. Annebeth, let's see if we can get back to you again.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Hello. Can you hear me now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can. Excellent. Go ahead.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Excellent. I went out and tried to get in. So I thought it was something here. Hello, everyone. Justine, I think this perhaps has been said while I tried to get in once more. But what I wanted to ask is that is this point of view, Justine, been discussed with all your other colleagues? Have you raised it with the other At-Large colleagues or it's only the three of you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It should be [inaudible].

ANNEBETH LANGE: So I agree with the question from Martin. Reading the text, this sounds more like a comment submitted in public comment. So

yeah, Javier says that this Justine clarified this already. I'm sorry I didn't hear that because I was out. So, okay. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve, do we have anybody else online at the moment in the queue?

STEVE CHAN: Yeah. Justine raised her hand again. And Anne Aikman-Scalese is also now in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Let's take it in that order.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thanks, Cheryl. In answer to Annebeth's question, yes, I did say earlier that it's just a dissenting view of three people that have put their names to it. Obviously, I have the consent of my colleagues, Marita Moll and Yrjo Lansipuro to put this up, really. In response to this being suggested to be put in a comment, well, we can't do that. Obviously, there's nothing preventing us from doing that as well, but my understanding is when the Final Report goes out for public comment then it is important to have, where applicable, obviously the perspective of people, working group members to certain aspects. And we have been very careful to limit our comment or dissenting view to just one aspect of the report. So yeah, I don't see why this shouldn't be taken into account into the Final Report. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for that, Justine. I guess what we could do is have it as a preemptive comment and deal with it as any other comment will be dealt with. That's certainly I think in keeping what we have done with previous well-known decisions in other situations before. And to that end, let's see what Anne would like to say. Anne, over to you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Just very quickly, Cheryl, I would like to procedurally support the notion that dissenting views of working group members, even if it were only a single member with some support in some discussion should be provided in the Draft Final Report. I think that's where we've been headed and I thank Leadership for their willingness to, as Paul notes in chat, be in favor of the expression of those views because working group members just have a much more detailed knowledge of issues that have risen and have been discussed, and so I think it's only fair to raise those issues with the public so that they can be addressed in the public comment period. And so I don't honestly know anything about the substance of this dissenting view but I certainly support this approach procedurally. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for that. Is there any other hands up, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: You have one more form Christopher again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Christopher, very briefly, and run the clock, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. I would strongly recommend that the PDP discuss this position thoroughly and revise its position. It should definitely be maintained in the Final Report but vis-à-vis the outside world, I think you're doing this opinion of an injustice and suggesting that it is a small group of minority members of At-Large. I've known this issue for more than 30 years – no, I exaggerate, more than 20 years – but still, when this goes out and certainly when it reaches the wider world of local authorities and communities worldwide, I think ICANN will discover that this is an extremely important and relevant point of view and I think it should be incorporated into the PDP's position. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted, Christopher. May I just say now, I'll just put my hand up as the last speaker on this. I'll just see if I can make some summations. Are there any other hands up, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: I have one more. I wouldn't mind getting in the queue myself just to try to speak about some procedural terms.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to have it go on that. Who's the one more before we get to you, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: It would be Greg Shatan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Greg, go ahead, please. It's like I'm blindfolded. My apologies.

GREG SHATAN: I actually would like to put myself behind Steve because I was going to ask a question about procedure and so he can answer it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I love watching you two then. Steve, you first.

STEVE CHAN: I'll do my best. Thanks, Greg. Thanks, Cheryl. I think we're having a little bit of difficulty with terminology here. These dissenting views are not some formal part of the mechanism, generally. I think in this case, some working groups have felt strongly about inserting their dissenting views, which have been a part of essentially the record of discussions since other comment was received and considered. So in that context, the dissenting views in certain circumstances in the Draft Final Report are there I think to make I guess a richer record of the discussion since public comment was received and considered by the working group. So I think what's that doing, though, is creating a little bit of confusion with what is a formal part of the process minority statements. And then some minority statements from a timing perspective take

EN

place after the consensus call and which were clearly not at that place at this point.

So I think Justine has acknowledged that this is not necessarily something that needs to be a part of – I'm not sure if I heard that quite right – but the exemption that we made I think, the Leadership I guess has made, is that the dissenting views where it has been discussed after public comment has been received and considered and is therefore part of creating a more fulsome and richer record of discussions is where that exception I think has been made. Otherwise, it seems like dissenting views are generally there for the working group to consider but it's not necessarily something that needs to be built into the report. That's at least my understanding. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Steve. Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. That's helpful. My general experience has been at this point where views have been described in the record, it's pretty much been done by Staff or by the drafters of the overall report as opposed to having views that maybe one or two exceptions but by and large the idea that this becomes part of the report that goes out for comment I think, I don't see that that fits into our procedures. Obviously, it is a view that is held by some members of the group and there are obviously many other areas in which other members of the group hold different views about this and other things that may be at odds with where the report is at. So

that's kind of a larger question about how we deal with that or how that will be dealt with in the report. I'm just a bit concerned this is kind of pushing the envelope on what goes into a report and without denying that these sincerely held beliefs of at least the three people submitted.

I am concerned also with the language that I see about many At-Large members who participated in WT5 are interested in a tool that would fill the need of what could be described as an elementary courtesy, which I think is kind of high handed with regards to the concept being discussed. And if this is the comment of three people, they should speak for themselves and not for many members of WT5. If we're going to around characterizing what other people think but we're not attached to something. That is also a slippery slope that we should not go down. The few should speak for themselves or for however many are speaking but the few should not speak for the many. I know specifically that At-Large has not come to a position on this and it is an area of continuing discussion so we could also discuss what many others in At-Large believe that are along a spectrum of different views. So this opens up Pandora's Box of worms.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Greg. Thanks for that. Now, do I have any other hands raising up, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: You do have a handful of them now. You have Anne and Annebeth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead. Anne first, followed by Annebeth.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you, Cheryl. I think we may be making a bigger deal out of this than is necessary. It's really already been decided by Leadership that dissenting views can be summarized and these are not minority statements but that they can be summarized in the Final Report. It's definitely our understanding that dissenting views are to be included in the Draft Final Report in the manner that Staff summarizes them and they're part of the deliberations paragraph, if you will. We want to be utterly transparent with respect to the publication of the Draft Final Report and I don't think Justine would have any objections to Staff summarizing what's stated here. The working group members are very close to the work, know the issues, and we have several sections already at deliberations where Staff has summarized dissenting views. It's just isn't that big a deal but it should be done. I mean, it's not that big a deal as far as people saying, "Oh, this is out of order. This is out of procedure," or "This has got to be an Annex," or whatever. We already have an accepted practice with respect to various sections of the Draft Final Report in which we've treated these matters consistently. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Cheryl, if you're speaking, we can't hear you. You might be muted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. I had muted myself because I had put my headset down which has opened up the "you cannot turn the volume down without getting it through the mobile phone" problem, so my apologies. As I was saying, thank you, Anne. Next in queue.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Hi, it's Annebeth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi, Annebeth.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yeah, hi. I think that this is the same procedure that we have used for all other comments that has come in to the Draft Report. When we go on with discussing Work Track 5, we have several inputs from Christopher Wilkinson and that is from him, and Justine has written in is from three people. Christopher's is for one. So we have to have the same procedure for everyone that come with that kind of input because these are things that we have been discussing but it's not a kind of community view but we should have the same procedure for everyone, all comments coming in, whether it is from one person or from three as here. So it's clear for those reading the report afterwards what it is. So we have to have the same procedure for everything. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that. I'm now actually joining via my laptop so that will mean I should shortly have less difficulty

EN

managing queues and keeping up with chat. Okay, here's what I've heard so far and here's what I'm going to propose. It seems to me like most of you have a clear and unambiguous understanding of what the intent was of this dissenting view, that the intention of the dissenting view was to give everyone a heads up and that therefore nobody would be surprised, that nobody would be shocked and horrified when they find this coming at a later date from people who are part of the team.

So with that – and I'll switch to the other audio now so hopefully I'll be even clearer to be heard – what we should have is, as I have also heard from you, I clearly understood why dealing with this or any other dissenting view that may arrive, a dissenting view is not dissimilar is what I've heard from a piece of input from public comment and that there is no real reason why we can't deal with this in the same manner as we would if it had come in as a piece of public comment but this time it's being preemptively sent and with the courtesy of letting everybody know.

So from that, I'm going to suggest that we do the following. We have captured the chat as we always do. We will listen to the tapes and by "we" I mean in particular not just the Leadership team but the Leadership team in absolute lockstep with the leaders of Work Track 5 and we will come back to you in next week's call to let you know exactly how the administration of this piece of information is going to be managed. So there is the practice, we will make sure it is clearly written and understood by all, and we can now move on to, I believe, the next round of our agenda unless anyone appears to object.

STEVE CHAN: Cheryl, this is Steve. Can I be in the queue again?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. I guess I just wanted to provide a little more context of – it's not exactly a bright line and we actually had some concerns on the Staff side about I guess framing things as dissenting views like this because it sort of becomes a slippery slope of everyone wanting their issues and their frame of issues and their concerns included in the report. So I think why this one is potentially different is because this is actually an issue that was discussed by the Work Track 5. It was actually included, I believe, in the deliberations of the Work Track 5 Initial Report which had a much fuller record of the deliberations, whereas the Final Report from Work Track 5 concentrated on the recommendations and rationale for the recommendations made. So in that context, this is not necessarily new issue and that's kind of where we're trying to draw a distinction. I guess trying to avoid reiterating every argument on one side or the other side of every argument because then you just replicate the Initial Report.

So the distinguishing factor I think for why some of the "dissenting views" were included for a handful of other topics I think from Anne and from Kathy is that those issues were discussed anew and it was new information that was discussed in the context of preparing the draft final recommendations, whereas this one I think is I guess reiterating support for an outcome that was not

supported by the Work Track. Again, we're trying to avoid reproducing and recreating all the deliberations and have again another 500-600 page report. So hopefully that provides a little context in. As Cheryl said, maybe the Leadership can come back with an approach, but just a little bit of context why we're a little reticent about creating some process called dissenting views. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that, Steve. Hopefully based on that and what we've agreed we would do, nobody will be particularly surprised with what we come back next week with.

So that has taken far more of our timing today's agenda than was planned but hopefully [inaudible] for the sake of full understanding and better transparency, none of you feel it was time poorly spent. The distinction and discussion that's going on in chat, I don't think we need to read for the record that we will be capturing it and looking at that in the Leadership team meeting, and I would request that all of the Work Track 5 co-leads who can possibly join the next Leadership team meeting make sure they spend the time to do so and we might take an extended time. Staff, if you can possibly book that next Leadership meeting out for another 15 or 20 minutes longer than our usual time so we can give justice to this discussion and review today's call.

All right, if someone can take the screen – Steve, I'm assuming it's still you – back to the agenda, we can find out what we should be doing next.

STEVE CHAN: It is me. I did want to note that there was one other working group member or Work Track member that provided comments. If I guess I could just broadly – it was Christopher Wilkinson, first of all – but just to broadly note the nature of the comments I think is more about voicing his disagreement with the outcomes reached by Work Track 5, which I think in that context is more along the lines of a minority report at the time it's appropriate which is after consensus calls made on the final report and final recommendations. So I'm not sure if you want to go over those individually or take those as a nature of them and then suggest that maybe the minority report is more appropriate. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My personal preference and the working group can challenge me on this or I can have a go at it at least, is that we do treat it as we would any well-known and well-held view as a likely minority statement that we are aware of it and that should become a minority statement even at the end of the process rather than burden anybody who's contributed that amount of work and thought into something to repurpose it and rewrite it that we could, with their permission, just take that as writ and have it as a minority statement, if that's what they want to reclassify it as. We certainly don't need to work our volunteers any harder but also I don't believe that it would be a huge surprise now that of course Christopher has also coupled his views with that of the view we were just discussing that had come in under the signatures from Marita, Yrjo, and Justine.

So have we wrapped up our necessary time and energy on reviewing comments on Work Track 5? Which I'll note aren't actually necessarily we can't live with. Some of them were more process issues than particular recommendation commentary as well. Christopher, go ahead very briefly.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good morning again. There will be a minority report at this rate. I'm just giving you very clear advice based on long experience in this area as to what the outcome should be. I actually think that by the time the public at large and certainly public authorities of all levels worldwide [tweak] what's going on here, something very much like this will be the final outcome. My scoutmaster used to say, "I'm not asking you, I'm telling you that this is a major issue." And whatever you put into the Final Report in order to suppress these views, they will come back. So I'm really disappointed that Leadership and the membership of the PDP don't realize the extent of the political slippery slopes – someone has employed that term – that you're engaging in. Tonight I'm happy to leave it at that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Christopher. We've been so warned before. We stand so warned now. But the PDP process relies on the building of consensus where a significant number of the active work group participants and the parts of ICANN that they represent are on balance a view held, and your view has been side to that, it's run through, it's not swayed everyone else in the group as yet, and we certainly will be cognizant of it and appropriately warned by your

EN

concerns. But we are dealing with a group of well-experienced professionals in this working group and everybody's opinions, whilst varied, need to be valued and that includes all minority and dissenting views, which is what we're trying to do. So with that, can we wrap up discussion and discourse on our agenda item to do with the Work Track 5 part of our documentation? I believe we can. Christopher, I'm going to assume that's an old hand and you should be putting it down shortly.

All right, if I can read the fine print on my screen, I think we're going to finally get into private resolutions. There's a Hybrid Proposal 2+ as presented on May 7. Is there anyone here who is unfamiliar with this Hybrid Proposal? Do we need to do a detailed read-through? How would you like us to proceed? Justine, over to you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Cheryl. I was going to ask about the most recent proposal by Jim Pendergast. Are we going to consider that as well? If yes, how so? Would it be a Proposal 5? Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm just looking at the note that Steve just put in chat at the moment but there's another new one in from Paul. Can I ask Staff, are we in a position to have this on screen for discussion in any way, shape, or form, even if it's just a dump off the text from the e-mail exchange? Is that a possibility? Because it would be good for the remainder of today's agenda to devote enough time to looking at these auctions. Paul says that it's not a new as such proposal,

EN

just fleshing out the details for Proposal 4. So what we might under those circumstances, Paul, is get you to speak to Proposal 4 at the time we get to Proposal 4 – I couldn't get my words out there, my apologies – and see if there something that Staff can display to aid you in that introduction of it all and that we might see if Jim would like to take the opportunity to just speak to his proposal as well, which I believe will lead us the Hybrid, the Jim Pendergast auction and the 4+ which is the Proposal 4 as proposed to be modified by Paul to deal with. Is that correct?

Justine is asking about a switch in the agenda, move to item 3 to the next call. Well, let's ask the group. If you can pull the agenda up again? But it does need to get dealt with. Item 4 was to look at the predictability framework. I would think that that as unit could equally well be dealt with at the beginning of next call and we could take the remainder of this call to hopefully put item 3 substantially in the "we have discussed it" pile, providing Jim is ready to speak, which I suspect he possibly is with his ideas. Paul has his hand up. We'll go to you in a minute, Paul. I also see Donna. Donna, did you want you propose something processed files or another way forward on the agenda. If it's the agenda, I'll go to you now.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. More agenda, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please, over to you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. Just to Justine's point whether we could switch to predictability framework discussion, I'd actually like to hear from Paul and Jim just to get a better understanding of what's behind the intent of their respective proposals and perhaps not get into detailed conversation if the preference is to go to the predictability framework. Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Okay, Donna. Well, let's ask Paul and Jim. Paul has his hand up so we'll go to him first. And, Jim, if you can [inaudible] after Paul, we'd appreciate it.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Cheryl. Am I supposed to be presenting my additional details to Proposal 4 or are we supposed to be talking about whether or not we think we should push this conversation to next week? I originally raised my hand on the procedural aspects because Jim's proposal came in today, I was able to skim it but there's a lot to it. And so there are a lot of people in the chat who want to push this off until next week. I'm happy with that or I'm happy to move forward. Which would you like? Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd like to hear from Jim as well and then we will come to some sort of decision. Jim?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Cheryl. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay, great. I sent it around in e-mail. It's forwarded out so hopefully it's easy to digest. I'm fine with pushing it off until another call if people want to discuss it. But essentially, what I was trying to do was solve this Gordian knot of some people insisting on having private auctions versus others not having private auctions, and somehow figure out a way to make the process more efficient, more transparent, and more accountable.

So what I've incorporated are elements of the Vickrey Auction, which I think is in an ideal world would be my preferred option but as we're discussing, I realized that is not going to carry the day. But incorporate some elements of that into a hybrid proposal that does acknowledge the desire for some folks to have private resolutions that involve joint ventures and other creative mechanisms but also the desires by some to also have losers get paid for walking away. What I proposed does bring the sealed bid auction to the table. It eliminates the so-called private auctions in favor of a more transparent and more accountable process that ICANN would oversee, where there is a route or parties who don't want to proceed to ICANN auctions of last resort, to participate in an auction where the proceeds would be distributed to losing parties. However, as we struggled with as part of our deliberations on this topic, the data and the details of the outcomes of those auctions would be published for all to see. There's also an outlet for those who do want to proceed down the path towards an

ICANN auction of last resort. And as I mentioned earlier, there's also the ability for folks to resolve with its own venture. So that's basically it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that intro. Great summary and intro, Jim. I greatly appreciate it. I would take that material as well introduced and tabled. In the European and Australian sense of tabling a document, not in the typically American sense of tabling it where you table it to take something away, where tabling is to put it on the table for our view. Paul, back to you on the agenda question.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Cheryl. Since Jim gave his short commercial and this sounds like we'll take it up next week –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to give you ample time. Don't worry.

PAUL MCGRADY: I thought I'd give mine a short commercial. So basically, what we have here in 1 and 2 is what we've already talked about, with the terms and conditions the applicant will make a claim that they've filed the application with a bona fide intention to run the registry. If awarded, the examiners would be able to issue additional questions and the applicant would have to respond and assure the examiners that there is in fact that bona fide intention. That's all I'll talk about. I don't know what that's called but an additional term

EN

could be if people are looking for more comfort that the applicant would also certify that the application is not being submitted solely for the purpose of being able to participate in a private auction.

And then the question came up in the call last week. It's, okay, how would these be policed? And so I'm throwing out here for discussion that if an applicant does not actually launch the registry if awarded or sells it in the aftermarket within two years of delegation, that would be noted for purposes of any future rounds and could create a rebuttal presumption of non-intent for that applicant. Or if an applicant only sells applications and private auctions and does not actually proceed with any contracting, that will be noted and could create the same rebuttable presumption that they intended to speculate in gTLD registries. Now, of course, if the applicant has one application, they're a small fry, they run into a big fry, they're not going to get dinged for withdrawing. But if they have 200 applications and they don't bring any to contracting then that's obviously an issue.

And so my proposal basically is very straightforward. Well, it's not my proposal. It's the proposal that's been kicked around by the working group for the last week and a half or two weeks, but my additions here in terms of how to give it teeth are kind of straightforward. They don't presuppose malintent or frivolity. Instead the purpose of them is to give people a chance to break the rules before we develop what the punishments may be. So that's my short commercial for mine. Like I said, I just was able to skim Jim's but I think there are lots there to think about. So I really do hope that we can have both of these until next week and give everybody a chance to read everything. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Paul. And you only crept a little bit over the standard sponsored commercial timing, so well done both of you. Well, I have heard you both, I think everyone's all the better for those introductions. I've seen the chat. And what I'm seeing from the chat is it is the will of this meeting that the current agenda item #3, this part we'll continue to review private resolutions and the various proposals is now an agenda item for Monday's call and that we will now spend the next – I guess we will try for all 30 minutes of our 35 minutes or so left on the call, so up to 25 or 30 minutes just to deal with a review and the updated predictability framework. So if we can bring that up on screen now. And there were attachments to your agenda, I believe, that you should all have had the opportunity to look at.

Just before we dive into this as … My heavens, you're so fast. See, thank you. SPIRT is upon me so promptly. I couldn't help myself, people, if I can't have fun. I don't understand why we should do these things. Anyway, my apologies. No, I'm not really apologizing. I'm just saying it. But thank you for that, Steve.

Is there any other business? Because if there isn't any other business, we can take this through to the end of our time. I don't see anybody waving frantically at me or put anything in chat so I'm going to assume there is no any other business. We'll take the last couple of minutes of today's call the usual closing administrivia and we'll take the rest of this call to dive headlong into a thrill packed and exciting world of SPIRT and the predictability framework. Steve, you are most welcome to kick us off.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks, Cheryl. We were working on this document I think it was last meeting, trying to pull out what we seem to think where the concerns that working group members had with both I guess either the framework itself or the SPIRT, who is the body that is utilizing the framework. So we we're taking informal notes the last meeting. And so what we circulated with the agenda was essentially a cleaned-up version that was based on the discussions of the working group.

So the next step after having the clean-up this document was to make sure that all the things that were being claimed to be done as mitigation for the concerns raised by the working group members were actually reflected within, I guess, the report section itself, as well as the Annex that spells out the operations of the SPIRT. So that's at a high level what we attempted to do. Some of the things that were agreed to last time required some new either Implementation Guidance or actually think it's all Implementation Guidance, so adding things like the change log, for instance, required in addition in the report section. I'll see if I can find another one. So there is another one about the goal of during implementation to make the framework and the SPIRT, the implementation of those things as clear or simple or as feasible. And I'm not sure if there's another one but I think that's it.

So that's essentially what we tried to do. So with that ended up meaning is that this document – we made some changes to try to address some of the concerns that were raised and here's an example of one of them. So this is a new addition. This is actually in the Recommendations section of the report. So this is the

formal Draft Final Recommendations Report for this topic and it actually precedes the Annex that concentrates on the SPIRT. For instance, the line that we added here is to make it explicit that the predictability framework is not intended to be used to be able to develop policy because some of the concerns raises that perhaps the framework in the SPIRT could be used to circumvent or do and end around the policy process. So we thought it's judicious or smart to be able to make this an explicit part of the recommendation. And so that's the meaning or the rationale for adding something like this.

The other things I just touched on a moment ago or as a result of some of the concerns raised in a potential mitigation that was identified, this Implementation Guidance about the nature in which the materials are developed that they should be simple and clear. Just maybe not the easiest thing to do since we've struggled a bit as well. But that's the nature of that Implementation Guidance and touches back and has a connection with that concerns and mitigation document we're just looking at.

So I don't know if you'd like me to go through all these, but that's the idea. We tried to make sure that all those mitigation elements that we identified as a working group mapped back to this document so that hopefully this ends up being – it captures all the mitigation elements holistically. So I'll stop there for a second. But I can also keep going through each of the changes that we actually made which might be helpful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that. And I suspect that the will of the meeting may indeed be to go through all of those changes but let's find out by asking them. I know that's a radical way forward but hell, why not. I think what I'd like to do just as you're contemplating, how you going to respond to that inquiry I'm about to make of you is make a very public thanks on behalf of Jeff and I and the rest of the Leadership team for the very fast turnover and significant work that Staff have put into this to try and capture all of those discussion points and implementation guidelines and mitigation issues. It is going to be a worthy piece of work if we can all come to some agreement on it. So, if it is the will of this meeting, I would like to suggest that we do ask Steve to take us through it and that we take an opportunity for any comment or positive statements or minor criticisms of what they have managed to capture on your behalf. Remember it was your words and discussions that they have done the yeoman's task of weaving into this document. So let's check the weave and see how we go. Is there anyone who objects vehemently to that approach? Right. Then, Steve, take us from the top and we will pause between each section to seek the reactions from our working group members.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Cheryl. I am not going to start from the top. I'll start near the top.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Continue.

STEVE CHAN:	I'll continue from where I left off. So the one I just mentioned is about trying to make the framework for this, the predictability framework and the SPIRT, simple and clear. So that probably makes sense. Actually, just before I go into further discussion on this, at least the way that I kind of like going through these things is to make sure that the concept is correct and that we were capturing the underlying expectations of the working group, and then maybe after there's agreement on that we can actually start seeing if we phrased it in a way that you all agree with. So hopefully that is agreeable with you.

So this next one is something I had already mentioned, it's about adding in Implementation Guidance about Org creating a change log in particular about the changes to the program that are more operationally oriented. So that's the nature of this Implementation Guidance.

But the second down here is – we're actually now in the rationale section. So these are the explanations and I think taking into account the discussions of the working group to explain why those two new Implementation Guidance elements were added. One other thing that I would point out here is that we did not include an Implementation Guidance element for it, but it does touch on the need for – I think Paul called it a PR document, we described as educational and/or explanatory text to better ensure more complete understanding within the community, and that that's referring to the framework and also how the SPIRT operates. So that element of explaining how it works is captured here in the rationale.

Any questions or comments? I'm not intending to go through a full reading of this rationale but essentially it backs up why the framework and the SPIRT should be clear and concise, and then also about why change log is important for the community. All right, so no hands.

I think that's actually it for the formal draft report section. So we actually made a handful of changes to the Annex, which is about the framework and then, secondarily – not secondarily but subsequently, I suppose, the SPIRT.

The first change is – so the categories we had A and B are about operational changes. A is where Org is able to make the changes on their own and then B is where it's non-minor and consultation with the SPIRT may be needed. And so for both of these, what we added – well, actually for A where Org is making change on their own, we added the change log element to be captured here. That's at the bottom of the section regarding process for a type a change. Within the non-minor one, we also captured the change log element, but we also added in the explicit mention that for a non-minor operational change, there's an expectation that Org would inform the SPIRT of issues arising and that there's the option, but not necessarily the requirement that the SPIRT is able to collaborate with Org. So it's an option of the SPIRT, not of org as it's written here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So Steve, if we can just pause briefly. Anne, you must be psychic because the reason I wanted to pause was I was going to call on a few people. You were at the top of my list who have spoken at

length on these issues and I wanted to see what the comfort level was from you and some others. So, Anne, over to you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Hi, Cheryl, I think that it's correct that there's an obligation on the part of Staff to consult with the SPIRT regarding Category B. But I think stating that the SPIRT has an option to collaborate with ICANN Org to develop a solution is not quite within the limits of what we've said about the SPIRT itself because the SPIRT has the ability – when it's B and there's a material effect on applicants or other community members, there's possibility that it's a policy issue. I mean, at that point, the SPIRT makes a recommendation to GNSO Council of how to treat the issue. It does not independently develop a solution with ICANN Org. So I think this is not appropriately phrased but it would take me a minute to suggest different text. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anne, thank you very much. I'd love to see you have a go at that. If it's possible to pop something in chat before close of our business today, that would be greatly appreciated. But of course, if not, please onto the mailing list because I think if we can get more suitably and more comfortable text that everyone can agree to, this will be an exceedingly helpful document. Paul, you've been relatively wordy on this topic in the past. Can I drag you into this conversation as well?

EN

PAUL MCGRADY: I had a question in the chat just wanting to make sure that the change log would be published somewhere. It looks like Justin found the section that interested parties should be able to subscribe to the change log perfect.

I guess I'm not sharing Anne's concern about if ICANN Org informs the SPIRT and the SPIRT works with ICANN Org. Ultimately, it's going to go to the Council so I don't know why we would want the SPIRT and Org not to collaborate on solutions. If we didn't do that, then some of the solutions wouldn't necessarily be implementable. So I guess the way this is written, I like it much better. I think it's much more clear that we're not creating a new policy making entity that could be lobbied. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, I'm glad to see your level of comfort with that text. I know Anne's hand is still up. Anne, are you going to come back to that point then? You might be muted, Anne. Okay, Anne might have an audio issue. I'll read from the chat.

She's posted the following, "Just add the following to that sentence after collaboration." This is the additional text now, "In formulating its recommendation to Council." So Anne is proposing, as I understand it, some words that are not meant to alter what I believe Paul just articulated, but rather to make clear that the implementability aspects that would be benefited by some mutualism and discussion and collaboration could be picked up if it's in formulation of its recommendation to Council. So that's a proposed amendment to this text.

Paul, if Anne has her audio back, I'm going to ask her to speak to that if she wishes, but if not, if you and then perhaps Justine and Greg could prepare to respond to that, that would be great. Paul says he likes your language. Belts and suspenders. Excellent. We don't even have to deal with it. Anne, did you want a word now?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes, just very quickly. I guess what I'm trying to say is that talking about its recommendation Council essentially means, "Hey, it's not really up to just the SPIRT and staff to develop a solution and go away." You know, that has to be just a process where it's a recommendation to Council develop a solution. I see the point of the language and then that proposed solution would be reported to Council as a recommendation. That's what I'm trying to say and I may not have said it in the clearest way on the fly here, but I'm sure a Staff can adapt that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can, I'm sure they can too. We've got some skilled writers amongst our Staff. But we need to make sure that they understand what your intent is or what our intent is. Kathy, if you've got a microphone available, did you want to speak to that? I noticed you started to write something in chat.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah. Can you hear me, Cheryl?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Loud and clear.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Terrific. Actually, I agree with the language Anne wrote. Because I was going to comment something similarly that in this process paragraph, there was no mention of the GNSO Council, and she has now put it in. I did want to speak to a different issue, Cheryl, and it has to do with the change log. I can either wait until we're finished with this subject or talk about it now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you just hold for a moment, put a pin in that briefly. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to the matter of Staff incorporating some semblance of Anne's language which is clarifying that this collaborative process is designed to be in the formulation of its recommendation to Council? If there's no one objecting to that then – Steve, you're objecting to it. I'm glad to see you had a hand. I hope you had too. I was trying to just get marching orders for us to deal with this text as presumed agreed. Go on, Steve, and then we'll go back to Kathy.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. I guess apologies to Kathy for jumping the queue. I guess from a Staff perspective, we actually had a different understanding on the nature of these non-minor operational changes. It's written with our understanding is that these would actually not go back to GNSO Council because their operational and internal processes that you could argue are not within the remit of the GNSO Council anyway. So our writing was actually based on understanding that

EN

these do not go back to the GNSO Council. I guess, a fundamental misunderstanding ... I don't know if it's a different understanding than Anne and Kathy and others might have so it's good to clarify this. I guess I would just add before we go back into the discussions is that, I guess the concern that – I don't really speak on behalf of my GDD colleagues but the concern is that if every operational change goes through both the SPIRT and then also the GNSO Council, it's absolutely going to paralyze the program. I'll leave it there. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I hear what you're saying. I believe that probably Anne's hand back up also indicates she hears what you're saying as well. We're really linking these two things back to change log and the effectiveness of the change log, and the usefulness to ensure that regular reporting and updating of the GNSO Council of all activities on the change log is a critical part of the process, at least as I understood it. I too can be wrong. But let's see what happens when we go back to Kathy regarding the change log.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Perfect. Thanks. Can we go back to where he talks about how people can access the change log? I think it's above. Okay, thanks. The GNSO Council, we informed of updates the change log on a regular and timely basis, which is great. Interested parties should be able to subscribe to the change log to be informed of changes. And that's good too. I think there should be another way to access the change log and I think it should be available on a public website. The SPIRT almost by definition is going to be

EN

going on for a long time. And folks will come in and out who are interested in following what's going on. I don't think it's very controversial that you might want to subscribe, but that's going to be old timers or people who know that it's there. But from time to time, your people are going to come in, they're going to be interested, they're going to want to follow. Who knows, they may want to join the SPIRT at some point to help in its continuity. So I just think this should be available on a public website so that people who just kind of want to follow it on a periodic basis or get interested in one and see what's happening can see the history of what's going on. It opens it to a larger group. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Kathy. I'd be surprised if anyone argued against transparency. Sincerely hope they don't. And it shouldn't be a problem to have something as easily transcribed onto a public page as an issues log be exactly that public.

Paul is saying in chat, "Could the change log be a permanent fixture near the public comment section of the main website?" Anything's possible, Paul. We could suggest that the implementation of this makes sure that the subject stays to the change log is in a prominent position. I'm not sure we need to micromanage the exact location of it quite so much, especially saying the fashion in websites does change from time to time. But can we come back to the issue – and thanks, Jorge, for noting the concern and commitment to continue transparency that the GAC has also raised along with the At-Large Advisory Committee. Anne, your hand is still up. I am concerned so let me see if we can get you on audio.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can. Excellent. Go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Very good. I definitely think there's certainly a misunderstanding in relation to operational changes that are non-minor, given what Steve had said that it's his understanding that non-minor operational changes do not need to go to Council and can be resolved as a matter of collaboration between staff and SPIRT. First of all, the description of non-minor operational changes is that is changes that have or are likely to have a material effect on applicants or others. All along, we've discussed how one person's policy is another person's implementation. And at this level, we are speaking about B, not C. Okay, let's go back up to B. B says its process changes that have or are likely to have a material effect. I don't think we're seeing them on the screen. At least, I'm not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Non-minor. These are changes to ICANN Org's internal processes.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I'm sorry. My chat box is in front of me. They have or likely to have material effect on applicants or other community members. So the

concern of course is always said SPIRT doesn't make policy but here we're saying almost the opposite which is on these types of issues, SPIRT and ICANN Org can develop solutions even if there's a material effect on applicants or other community members, so that doesn't make sense to me. I think it would have to be either that they can collaborate together to develop a recommendation. I don't think that hamstrings people when you're talking about something that's a material effect on applicants because there's potential for it to have policy issues.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so how do we capture the –

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: The work might [vested] language, actually.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That works for B. There is no problem with meeting that need from B's point of view with that additional belts and braces language which Staff are going to polish up. All right? We agree on that.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I believe we did agree but then I thought I heard Steve say he disagreed and so that's why I brought it up again. But as long as we agreed –

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What I'm just going to remind everybody all is Staff are doing their best to interpret what we are saying. So we need to say what we mean clearly as possible. Now, they are, of course, and as Steve did point out, not wishing to have things grind to a halt for what is in fact non-operational, in other words. I'm sorry, not non-minor. Let me try that sentence again. For things so unrelated to having a material effect on applicants or community members, they may literally be recorded in the issues log. It brings us back to the importance of the issues log and the necessity for the issues log to be very accessible but also regularly reported to Council. So changes on that log can't just be unnoticed. I believe that's what I've heard from the working group as well. Karen, I hope we're going to find some way of keeping everybody happy on the important bits. Over to you.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Cheryl. This is Karen Lentz from ICANN Org. You know, obviously, we're very interested in this predictability framework and the discussions have been very, very thorough throughout the process. I know that this is concern to a lot of people and it really impact how applicants experience the program and how the community views the program and how it's operating. The change log suggestion I think is really helpful for providing transparency into some of this.

To the point that Anne raise – and maybe I'm missing something here – but I think the Category B is not an issue where there is policy or there are policy implications. I think lowered down, part of what the SPIRT is intending to do or is intending to do is to help

determine what goes in what category. So I think in the case that –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Litmus test.

KAREN LENTZ: Right. So I think in the case that Anne was suggesting, there may be an effect on applicants if form has changed or a timeline has changed but that still doesn't reach into the realm of policy, necessarily. If you agree that it does then that's not the process that we're following. But I think for things that are operational changes, while we would certainly expect that the Council would be interested in that, it wouldn't necessarily be something to consult and have the Council deciding if it's an operational issue. So that's my view on it right now. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Karen. One would assume from a Council perspective that they would at least be more than just interested, that at least in the B level things, they would be wishing to be not just passively receiving but actively note these changes are proposed. Is that not the case? If one of our councilors could step forward on response to that, Rubens for example. Do you have microphone, Rubens, or is it far too late? It's Maxim on the call then. No, I'm not seeing Maxim. Okay, Rubens isn't in a position at this time of night. Okay, Rubens, can you contemplate that question and get back to me because my guess is that the B category, Council would have an

interest in certainly noting, not merely having it put on a report but I could be wrong.

Heather, you've been in this position for a fair while and it wasn't that long back. What is your gut saying Council would like to know or not know about an operational non minor category B issue? If I can pick on you.

HEATHER FORREST: Cheryl, checking if it's me that you're picking on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's you I'm picking on, my dear.

HEATHER FORREST: Gotcha. Okay. I will confess, I'm a little bit ... I was only half paying attention on what's the concern about the GNSO Council in the background.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll save you here by giving you a brief. The question would be: is this something that is merely popped on the change log and Council are utterly passive about the fact that they receive the change log that all is an operational non-minor thing, something that we would expect Council to at least note? Not act upon, not necessarily receive advice on. Because after all, SPIRT has already said, "Yes, this is operational non-minor." But I would think my guess is they would like to at least be less than passive about noting it. What's your gut reaction?

HEATHER FORREST: You know what, Cheryl, I think we're in a new ... Thank you for the clarification. I appreciate that and I'm sorry to make you do that. I think we're in a new era. Of course, the introduction of the PCRs, the Program Change Request is in of itself a new thing. So I don't think we have a tremendous amount of precedent to give you, let's say, a definitive answer, and I certainly couldn't speak on behalf of the current Council. But what I would recommend here, I think the very best course of action and the one that I would have appreciated most were I on Council Leadership would be to channel this question through your Council liaison. I think that you'd get a fairly swift response that way. I do think when I think about the role of the Council liaison, sounding out this sort of question falls squarely within that person's role. I could give you my personal impression, Cheryl, and say I don't prefer death by procedure so I wouldn't be inclined to over proceduralize this but I think channel this one through your liaison is the best way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So there could be a little bit of implementation guidance that we could consider adding in here. I think it's an appropriate point to just take us back into chat. A little bit earlier, we have Jorge pointed out to us GAC's concern that whilst they appreciate the intent of SPIRT, that they were concerned about adding too much complexity and any risk of inconsistency. I'm hoping that sufficient transparency will act to relax some of those concerns but we certainly don't want to build something that grinds the process to a halt. It has to be sufficiently robust but sufficiently agile, and it's

finding that sweet spot that I think is where we're going to have to stop and contemplate where we go to next.

Heather said into chat and this may be the final word on this until we take it to our list, "Come to think of it, Cheryl, the role of Council liaison in the SPIRT is something to be thought out in greater detail and so we should take this conversation into that consideration." So thank you for that.

And thank you all. I'm not sure that we got as far through this as Jeff and I would like to have seen. Here we are, best laid plans of mice and men. I hadn't realized I'd be in two meetings at once while I was trying to cheer one either. So greatness comes upon us all from different ways. What we do have to do now, however, is take a little bit of time in our next agenda to complete this. I would like to propose – Steve, if you could just scroll a little bit further down now to look at C and beyond. This is a new procedure in C. That needs to stop. Just gently scroll through so everyone sees what's in front of them just in case I haven't had time to take a look recently.

STEVE CHAN: Can I clarify, not all of this is new, by the way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please do so. Okay. But there is some highlighted areas there that certainly need people, whether I have to go across that. Steve, this thing, there's only one more page on this if memory serves, is that correct? Or I've gone crazier than I thought?

STEVE CHAN:	Sure. So there's two parts of this, one is the framework that's about to end in a moment. But then there's the other part that's the SPIRT definitions and the changes there are primarily about reorganization that follows more along the way that Jeff laid it out in this comparison of the IRT versus the SPIRT. So it's structured in that manner. It's not really a change in what the word is saying, it's more just a change in organization, if that makes more sense.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	So that could be a reading homework assignment for everybody. So that part two can be our homework reading assignment and we will continue and finalize our discussion on this part one section as one of the agenda items in our next call, which is going to be on Monday, the 6th of July at 15:00 UTC for 90 minutes. I just want to note that Jeff has indeed returned from the emergency veterinary disaster that his family pet had been unexpectedly caught in and that both the owners and the puppy will apparently do okay after a couple of days. So we're glad to hear that as well. And that will be his belated apology, of course, for not having managed to get here as he always does in advance and run the calls far more deeply than I've managed to.
	Thanks, one and all. Thanks, Staff. Homework assignment for reading. Please take your discussions to the list and let's see if we can wrap this all up at our following call. With that, thank you one and all. There's a big homework assignment for the Leadership team. I will look forward with Jeff to seeing you on Monday at 15:00 UTC. Bye for now, stay safe, make smart choices.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Cheryl. Thanks, everyone for joining. This meeting is adjourned. Have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]