

---

**ICANN Transcription**

**New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group**

**Monday, 18 May 2020 at 2000 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 are posted on the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/xYPsBw>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Call being held on Monday, the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, 2020 at 20:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room.

If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Also, I do show a guest who has the last three digits of 850 as their phone number. Can you please let us know your name? Thank you. Hearing no names for participants on audio, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

---

*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.*

---

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Jeff Neuman. Please begin.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thank you very much. I'll notice that there is someone on the list call that we can't hear or see anyone. I'm not sure who that is, but probably I'm going to assume that's not your name. But if I'm wrong and you have changed your name to that, let me know because it's an interesting one.

So welcome everyone. It's May 18<sup>th</sup> for, at least, many of us and today's agenda is to go back to the subject of predictability in the hopes of drilling down on some of the more specifics and the predictability model that we started going over two meetings ago, so a week ago today so that we can make some progress on that.

I also do want to go through the work plan before we start that, but first let me ask if anyone has any updates to any Statements of Interest. Okay. Not seeing anyone and no longer seeing the... We can't see or hear anyone, I think we've gotten that issue hopefully taken care of but there is still an unidentified person that's got that 424 number and ends in 850. Paul. That was Paul McGrady. Okay, cool. Welcome, Paul.

Okay, so why don't we first go... If you could pull up the work plan, I just want to remind everyone of where we are and where we're going. So while that's coming up... Okay, so today is the 18<sup>th</sup> and you'll see there, there's predictability. The next call, we're going to go through the set of comments that we have in the, that we got

---

from the first three packages of “can’t live with” stuff and I’ve had to look through some of those and if you have time, please do review those. The good news is there is not many subjects in there which is great and the other good news is that some of them are not major things in terms that would require extensive discussion, I don’t believe, but really some are more clarifications and so I’m hoping that it shouldn’t take much of the time on Thursday to go through that.

And that’ll leave us then time to go through another issue which we have been, we have touched on a couple times but haven’t really gotten to any sort of concrete position, and that’s what to do with the GAC advice that we got way back when during Round 1 and category 1. This is especially important because we’ve... In our GAC advice section that we’ve been going through in early warnings, we’ve certainly made it clear that our preference is to have all advice on “categories” prior to the round opening up, which means we can’t ignore the fact that we have gotten advice on categories in the past that we should action in some way, either adopt, not adopt, modify, whatever it is. So that is of increased importance.

And then we’ll probably most likely be continuing that discussion next Monday and then get into some leftover community applications and application queuing issues. And then a week from Thursday, on the 28<sup>th</sup> of May, go through some of the GAC comments on outstanding issues on global public interest DNS abuse. Also during that time, hopefully we’ll get out – I’m hoping by tomorrow, Wednesday – get out Package 4 and then Package 5 next week so that we can then review those on June 1<sup>st</sup> as well

---

as close out applicant support. And all of that said, we'll also leave a few sessions to finalize the report, the draft final report to put out for public comment. So I think we're doing well in terms of progress to put this out and so I know it's going to be a lot of work over the next month or so, but appreciate all the time that everyone's put into this already.

Jim is asking for calendar... Do you mean calendar invites, Jim? Or are you talking about specific topics? Oh, calendar invites. Okay. So Julia's responded that should be out soon. Okay, yes. That's good. We'll get those out as soon as we can.

All right. Oops, I'm at the bottom of the list. Jim's got a question. So Jim, go ahead.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yeah. Thanks, Jeff. Real quick. Where do you envision that we will pick up things that we haven't completed, such as auctions and [closed] generics? Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, sure. So those will be in the June 1<sup>st</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> timeframe. Luckily, there's not a huge... Well, all during that timeframe where we finalize the report. The reality is all the text is pretty much there to go out for the, for public comment through what we've been working on. So those four sessions, those couple of weeks should be really honing down on those. Any other questions? I also want to note that Cheryl is trying to join. She's having some Zoom issues, so we'll have her on shortly hopefully, or maybe actually

---

she might be already on. But there we go. Good. Any other questions on timeline?

Okay, then why don't we go then to predictability? While that's coming up, I think we had an interesting discussion, a good discussion last Monday. I think there is still some details as to categorizing the different types of changes and when the SPIRT team comes into play. We'll get to that towards the end. We'll come back and review those because I think we can spend a lot of time talking about that and I really want to start drilling down on some of the specifics and then come back to just show what we've updated since the last meeting. So I want to start with the governance section. So that's a little bit... There we go, on page eight of this separate document. Now you will have noticed that you did receive a merged document, or at least a link to the merged document, through e-mail. I believe it was towards the end of last week. But that document still does not have this section in it. This is one of the few sections that's not in that merged document yet. After we finish today's call, we'll put that into the fully merged document so that we reduce the number of documents that we have to look at.

Okay. So the first issue is one that we've talked through a little bit already and I just want to... Again, this is sort of a repeat of the last call but this is we're going through in this new format now, which is the basic of who can raise an issue to the SPIRT team. And I think where we've come out is that, essentially, from three different sources, the ICANN Board, Org, or the GNSO Council.

And again, I think the rationale there is as we've discussed where the SPIRT team is under the general supervision of the GNSO,

---

and so obviously, the GNSO can refer things to it and the SPIRT team, we also want to avoid lobbying efforts. So limiting it to the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board and Org seems like it should do that. There was some discussion during the last call of whether the SPIRT team could, on its own, raise issues but I think through our discussions, that seemed to indicate that it may give too much important to the SPIRT team in terms of lobbying and so we don't...

If the SPIRT team does notice an issue, then it would seem logical that to the extent they want it addressed, they'd bring it to the attention of the GNSO Council and/or the Board or Org, and then get them to formally raise it if it's agreed that that really is an issue. Again, this is in light of the comments that we've had about not wanting too much lobbying.

So I see Paul and Kathy in the queue. Just remember the next question is... I think it's the next one. We haven't scrolled down yet, but it talks about how the GNSO Council would do that as one member, multiple members, or whatnot. So if that's your question, please save that. If not, please go ahead, Paul and then Kathy.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. I still think we're missing "only" in front of "can be forwarded". Such issues can... Actually, I said it wrong. As such, issues can only be forwarded by the Board, Org and Council, we had talked about on the last call. I just don't want to give them this impression there's wiggle room here. Thanks.

---

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Paul. We actually made that change above, but it didn't make it in this section. So thank you for pointing that out, and yes, there should definitely be consistent. Kathy, go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Can you page up just a little bit, or whoever's running this, just to the title? I'm still observing the content, Jeff. The title, "The Governance Structure of the SPIRT" I think is ambiguous because this is really about how things get to the SPIRT and come out of the SPIRT. That's my understanding of what this section is. Governance structure can also be how the SPIRT runs itself, which I don't think this section's about. So I just want to flag that I think we can come up with a better title and that this is a really interesting section. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Okay, thanks, Kathy. If you have any recommendations, let us know but I think you're right that this does address who can raise the issue, what things come out of it, what's the implication of things that come out of it. It does a little bit go into whether experts and sort of some things about the structure, but I take your point that it is broader than that. So if you do have a good title. It's more like... Donna says, "Sounds like a charter." I think it's more of an outline of a charter. It's not the actual. There you go. You put it there, elements of a charter. So absolutely I think we can work on a different name. So there are a couple good suggestions there in the chat. If anybody listening in likes any of those, thinks they're appropriate, just weigh in on the chat or

---

otherwise. Kathy, your hand's still up. I don't know if there's a follow-up to that, or...

KATHY KLEIMAN: No. Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Oh, okay. All right. Great, so then let's scroll down to the second element. Okay, so the first... Sorry. So then the question... No, no, you're right. Scroll down. Sorry. There you go.

So this one, so now that we know that those are the only three groups to be able to refer an issue or to forward an issue to the SPIRT team, then it becomes, well, how do they do that? The ICANN Board, we put in here and have discussed that it should be from a letter from the Chair of the ICANN Board or applicable new gTLD Board committee since in theory, it's possible that the Chair of the Board may be conflicted out at the time and so if they set up a new committee, that would certainly have the effect of the Board from ICANN Org.

What we put there is by letter from the CEO and/or the Head of Global Domains Division at/or his/her designee, I think the recommendation to shorten this would be just from the CEO and/or his or her designee. This would eliminate the need to revise this if they call the division something else or a new CEO comes in and just merges everything together, creates a new name, who knows. But either way, does it make sense to just say, "From the ICANN CEO and/or her or his designee"? And yeah, so Paul has a plus one and others agree too. So okay, so we will...



---

Absent anyone that strongly objects, I think we'll make that change.

Here's the bigger discussion. So this third one is... Remember we said from the GNSO Council? We have a couple options here. We can designate the threshold or we can just leave it up to the Council which is not presented as an option here yet. But in theory, you could just say, "The Council shall decide how it will refer things to the SPIRT team or we can make a recommendation as to one of these" or even something different. So the different options that we've talked about is it should be one councilor. It could be a constituency or a stakeholder group or just say that it's the same threshold as what it takes in a GNSO operating procedures to raise an issue. Or we could say it's the same threshold for initiating the GNSO guidance process and so those standards are set for there. There is certainly not a lack of threshold in the operating procedures. So what do we think? I mean, if we are concerned about lobbying one individual member, it seems a little... It doesn't seem like a big enough threshold for one councilor. That seems a little... That may seem a little bit too easy to raise issues to the SPIRT team. There's one constituency raising the same issues, maybe one stakeholder group, but obviously, for the registries and registrars at this point, there really only is one constituency within their stakeholder groups. So what are your thoughts? Let me just open it up.

Okay. Anne, go ahead.

---

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, Jeff. I don't know if we've done this yet. We just have to cross-check this against the ways that councilors can raise issues under the annexes that are available to councilors to use that are not the SPIRT team because there are some situations, and I don't recall under which annex, where one councilor can raise an issue under those annexes, at least at the GNSO Council level. And so I don't know whether you're talking about here one councilor can ask the SPIRT to look into something or one councilor can ask the Council to ask the SPIRT to look into something, but the thresholds need to be checked against those annexes.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So this... Thank you, Anne. This is the Council as what would empower or let me ask it a different, or say it a different way. What would be deemed an issue forwarding to the SPIRT team by the GNSO Council, right? Because we said the GNSO Council can refer issues to the SPIRT team. What does it mean by the GNSO Council referring it? And so what we have here, we do have two of the thresholds here, including what it is to raise an issue in the GNSO operating procedures and then we have a threshold for raising, or sorry, initiating the GNSO guidance process. Those two seem like the most relevant ones. But it is to forward an issue formally to the SPIRT team, not just a discussion item for the Council. I hope that makes sense.

And so then I got... Anne, do you want to follow-up on that? Or I think Paul's in the queue.

---

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I guess what I'm trying to figure out here is if you have an issue and one group on Council says, "Let's send it to the SPIRT team" and another group says, "No, that's got to be GNSO guidance," or what's your other threshold here? Is it...

JEFF NEUMAN: Just the raising of an issue for an issues report.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: So yeah, what happens when you have folks on Council where there's a competing idea of, well, if somebody says no, that's an EPDP and other people say, "No, that's... Let's send that to the SPIRT team," and how do all the votes shake out depending upon what order the motions are in? I'm a little confused about how the competing remedies to resolve an issue can be raised in a logical manner, whether they...

JEFF NEUMAN: So I'm hope...

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I think... Yeah, Anne, that's a good question. I'm hoping that the Council would have a strong enough leadership team in the Chair and Vice-Chairs to, if they knew that there was a potential issue, to organize it in such a manner to make logical

---

sense so that you don't have those competing issues and that that would get discussed at a Council level. Ultimately, at the end of the day, if the Council wants to initiate a PDP, then that is most likely going to take precedent over everything else. So I think it's an issue of the Council itself to manage the process. I don't think we can, other than recommend good governance by the Council, I don't think we're going to be able to solve all of that. But maybe Paul, do you want to weigh in?

PAUL MCGRADY:

Sure. So I think that, again, we were at a point where we can recommend things to Council, right? And ultimately, I think the way that the rest of this works is that if it comes up through the SPIRT, something comes from Council down to the SPIRT, ultimately the SPIRT will send something back up to Council to act on. SPIRT can't make its own policy, right?

And so I'm not as bothered by the last two bullets as I normally would be because so long as the SPIRT can't make policy for the community. I would essentially say to the Council, "Hey Council, you guys need to decide for yourselves what the process will be for you to send something to the SPIRT and here are some ideas." I think the second... I'm sorry, the last two bullet points are reasonable ideas. I think we're missing another bullet point that says "by majority vote of the Council," whatever the GNSO Council guidelines are for when a majority vote works. There are different voting guidelines depending on the nature of what's being voted on.

---

I think one, the first three bullet points are just inviting chaos and especially the first two are inviting chaos. But I like to see those scratched as ideas because I don't think they're particularly good ideas. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Paul. I seem to... I think that's logical that having one individual group, whether that's a council or constituency or stakeholder group is susceptible or could be susceptible to abuse – maybe abuse is not the right word – but could be overused and I think you're right. Having the check of whatever the SPIRT team does or recommends is always subject to, is going to go back up, as you said. Then I guess the threshold may not be as concerned – right? – with a lower official threshold.

Donna puts on there... So Maxim's saying the Council manages the process. Totally understood, Maxim. And the Council could... This is just a recommendation from our group to the Council. Obviously, the Council could override that when it adopts the report of the PDP. So this is just a recommendation, so totally understand that.

Donna says in the chat, "Rather than the Council, could you just have an issue raised directly to the SPIRT by a GNSO entity?" So that's, I think, what we've tried to cover with the constituency/stakeholder group. I think that's what potentially could... That's the question we're asking, right, is whether we think it would be okay for one group to do that to avoid, as Donna says, to avoid the situation.

---

So Donna, do you remember? So here's the other check, right? So if it truly is an issue, and let's say it is only one group like the Registry Stakeholder Group and we don't have that as the threshold, well if it were that big and important, you would think that the Registry Stakeholder Group could either convince the Council or convince ICANN Org or the Board that that's an issue to raise if, for whatever reason, the rest of the Council didn't feel like it was an issue for the SPIRT team. So I do see that as sort of a check on it. So I see Kathy... Actually, Kathy if it's okay, if I can go to Donna because I'm responding to her point?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sure.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jeff. So what you're suggesting is that the Registry Stakeholder Group, in theory, has other [mechanisms], they could go to the ICANN Board and say, "We think this is a problem. Can you raise it with SPIRT?" Or we could go to ICANN's CEO and say, "We think this is a problem. Can you raise it with the SPIRT?" But that's, again, it's adding another layer and there's a subjective or objective test there that the Board or Org would have to agree. And I'm just thinking that for 2012, it was the end tag which was an interest group of the Registry Stakeholder Group that raised a lot of the issues that has resulted in this or caused a lot of the problems that the SPIRT is trying to overcome. So I just... I'm a

---

little bit worried about the GNSO Council option because of what Anne has pointed out. It's quite possible that you would be in the situation where the registries have an issue but it's not supported by Council so it can't go forward. But similarly, if the Board and Org also hold, don't see the registry perspective, then you've got the same situation. So I'm just... It's look a little bit arbitrary at the moment and if it's clear what the scope of the SPIRT is then it shouldn't take too long to funnel a request regardless of where it comes from. Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Donna. Kathy, go ahead and we'll come back.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'm happy to wait for your response to Donna because it's a back and forth and my issue's a little different.

JEFF NEUMAN: Oh, okay. Thanks, Kathy. Yeah, so at the end of the day, obviously my view is not going to prevail. I want to hear from what the group thinks is the right answer because I see each of these as a viable option. Maybe you change it to one GNSO entity. I think that's how you called it, right Donna? But then maybe you give right to object to other groups. I don't know. I guess trying to find a balance between something, between lobbying efforts. You don't want this group lobbied and also, you want to make sure that the group is prioritizing the issues that certainly the Board, Org and the Council feel like are the important ones. But completely take your point that many of the changes could have a more of a

---

significant impact, at least initially, on applicants before they might be realized by those other three groups. And Donna says, “Right, the Board, the Council, and Org can also be lobbied.” Hopefully though, there is more people to convince, right, that it’s not just one person or one group. But yes, take your point, Donna.

So Anne says, “It seems like Donna is saying that it would be simpler to allow constituency or stakeholder groups to raise an issue and then you don’t have so many channels to go through.” But then it’s not really from the GNSO Council either, so then we wouldn’t say GNSO Council or we’d put a fourth option. The GNSO Council maybe would send something through whatever process it decides is appropriate and then you separately list a GNSO constituency or group. That seemed to elicit some comment. So Kathy, if you want to comment on this, let me know but otherwise, I’ll go to Donna and then Christopher.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I’ll stay in the queue. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Jeff. I mean, the GNSO Council is a separate entity on its own, right? So if there’s something going on that the GNSO Council happens to be discussing and have concerns about then they are a GNSO entity of its own right, just happens to be made up of GNSO stakeholders or constituencies. So the GNSO



---

Council would remain as an entity in its own right. And it also strikes me that perhaps ALAC would have some challenges with some of the things going on, maybe SSAC. So we have, and each of those organizations have their own internal structures so it wouldn't necessarily be just one person whose got a problem. It would have to go, filter up through whatever mechanism it is within the STLC. So I don't know. It just seems that requiring GNSO entities to come back through the Council, as Anne has said, could be very difficult. And as you said, if they have to go back through Org or Board, it's the same problem. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Donna. So on the last call, or maybe not the very last call, but when we previously discussed this topic, we specifically ruled out other SOs and ACs simply because, as Paul puts it, yeah, in the chat here, basically, you don't want to overburden the SPIRT team with work and you want it to go through... The reason you have the Council on there as kind of a stop gap is that the Council... Remember the Council is going to see an issue and the Council is going to decide whether it wants to handle it through a PDP or through another process it already has. So if you let the ALAC do it or SSAC or GAC, then you might have competing efforts because now you could have a GNSO Council or community effort and also an ALAC SPIRT team effort. So I think we intentionally excluded the other SOs and ACs to avoid some of that conflict.

But again, so Paul had said, and it seemed to get support during the last call that we had only three sources of inputs to the SPIRT team, the Board, the Org, or the GNSO Council. We could just

---

leave it at that and not get into any more details and let the Council work out how it wants to refer an issue to the SPIRT team. That would be easiest for us and wouldn't require us to come up with an exact answer here, but leave it to the Council. So that is an option too.

Christopher, Kathy, you're in the queue but again, for another issue so Christopher, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: All right. Good evening. Thank you, Jeff. Well, your immediate exchange with Donna has, in fact, illustrated the problem that I had already identified. To some extent, this discussion has been increasing [inaudible] of the GNSO and your own cooking. But that won't do anymore. Since the transition, we're dealing with a different composition and structure of the ICANN community and specifically, from what I've picked up from this discussion, I confess I had to come into it late because the Zoom security protocols are rather difficult to navigate nowadays. But I picked up from the discussion that in effect, a house of GNSO has greater priority vis-à-vis the SPIRT than the whole of ALAC or the GAC. Come on. That's not going to fly. I suggest we reconsider this. And I certainly... And Jeff has been very explicit. I didn't expect him to be such, but Jeff, you can't exclude from anything in this whole caboodle, you can't exclude the SSAC or the GAC or the ALAC. No can do. Thank you.

---

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Christopher. So I guess I don't see it the same way you're looking at it. I think this is more like someone from the GNSO cannot recommend that the ALAC Policy Committee, and I'm sorry if I get the terms wrong, take up an issue, right? It's got to come from within the ALAC. Because we're pretty clear that this is a GNSO supervised, sorry Council supervised group, I think saying that it's got to come from within the GNSO Council, I think it's not a statement saying you want to exclude others but it's more just a recognition that this is a GNSO entity. The ALAC could always form its own groups and refer issues and advice directly to the Board or ICANN Org without involving the GNSO. So I guess I'm just not looking at it that way and certainly didn't want to, didn't mean it to sound like we're trying to keep other groups out of it. And I probably just said it too much in a shorthand way.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Yeah. Well, I accept your temporization. Look. I'm not at all, well, by now, this PDP will know that I am significantly skeptical of the extent to which the GNSO Council can represent the public interest. You must build into all your procedures and entities factors which will protect the public interest and as things stand at present – and it's not the idea that I had 20 years ago – as things stand at present, the GNSO Council is not credible as representing the public interest. You depend on the GAC and At-Large and other communities to help you understand what is the public interest. And I do not accept that SPIRT should be an entity under the supervision of the GNSO. No, you can't do that. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. So based on the discussion and some of the comments in the chat, I think the best thin for us to do, the easiest thing for us to do is just say the GNSO Council pretty much we could just say the same thing we say for the Board, right? By letter from the Chair or his/her designee can forward an issue to the SPIRT team and then leave it at that and have the Council take it up as to how they want to do that.

But Kathy does have input, so Kathy go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks, Jeff. It was interesting to listen to. I think the ambiguity here is what an issue means. Who can raise an issue to the SPIRT team and then how can each of these groups forward an issue to the SPIRT team? And I think what we're all... I think the issue that we're talking about and I've been reviewing, I've been spending the time I was in the queue reviewing the upper part of the document is we're talking about operational minor issues and operational major issues. We are not talking about policy issues because, of course, the GNSO Council does not have to refer a policy issue to the SPIRT, in fact, really can't. It has its own policymaking processes. So if we define an issue as operational minor and operational major, I think a lot of the conversation changes. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Kathy. And I think that's a good point and it's also, as we talk later on, the GNSO at any time, if it thinks that it is, that

---

---

the issue is now starting to morph into one that involves policy, the Council could always take back the issue too. So it's not...

KATHY KLEIMAN:

I think we have to be really clear here, Jeff – and especially as we're starting a new section – to define what an issue means because it can mean everything under the sun, and way broader than we think. So I think we have to be really, really clear right here in the section. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

So if we do this right, it's the section above it that will define kind of the types of issues. So... But referring back to it is not an issue, so we could... And you're saying it'll get separated. Okay. Well, let's move forward and then take a holistic view after we kind of go through these questions. But your point is well taken in the sense that this is only a subset of issues.

I do want to point out though, that the Council may refer an issue to the SPIRT team to get some input from the SPIRT team before the Council is itself certain that something rises to the level of policy or not, right? So it could be there's an issue that arises, and frankly, the GNSO Council may not have the expertise at that moment in time to know whether this implicates policy or not and so one of the issues that it refers to the SPIRT team is, "Hey, can you give us your thoughts as to whether there are any policy issues that you see as experts that arise out of this that maybe we don't see at the time?" So I think that that, just wanted to point out that little bit of nuance as well.

---

Kathy, do you want to respond to that?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Yeah, because that's exactly what I think a number of us have been concerned about over time is that only the SPIRT group would be consulted as to whether something is a policy issue. At that point, it seems to me you really do have to go a little broader, talk to your stakeholder groups. You want to talk to the ACs as well. The SPIRT group, we've decided, does not get to unilaterally decide whether something's a policy issue. Once it's on that line, it doesn't just go to the SPIRT team. What we're talking about here is stuff that's being funneled directly to the SPIRT team. And in that case, I think we're just in operational issues. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Kathy. So we're not saying nor can we say, I think, that the SPIRT team is the only entity that gets an issue. The GNSO Council is free to put it out to the community as well. There's nothing in here that would prohibit that. So I don't think we're saying conflicting things. I think your point is that it may not only be the SPIRT team that things should get forwarded to, and that, I think is a legitimate issue or a legitimate question. But I think that's more for the Council than for our documents, I would think. But I may be missing something.

Maxim says the idea of Council not understanding what policy is, is [inaudible].

And Susan says, "If something is being considered by Council, then surely, the reps on the Council are already taking the views

---

of their constituency stakeholder group. Otherwise, they aren't doing their job." Thanks, Susan.

Okay, so let's go to the... I think just as a reminder, I think the way we're going to handle this section is just make it very similar to what we say for the Board, which is by letter from the Chair of the GNSO Council or his/her designee and this way it'll be the Council that will determine what the threshold is to send something over and they have enough thresholds to work through that they can decide which one, at that point in time, is most appropriate.

Okay. So now we get to the third question, which I think we've also kind of indirectly talked about, which is, okay, so once the SPIRT team has done its work, whether that's advice, guidance, I don't want to get hung up on the term of the output of the SPIRT team, only the result which is that all advice, guidance issued by SPIRT should be delivered to the entity that forwarded the issue under Section 1 above. So if the, where an issue is forwarded under Section 1 by someone other than the Council, so the Board or Org, then Council should be provided with a draft of the output prior to that output being delivered to the Board or the Org that forwarded the issue. So it's basically going back to the party that gave the issue or forwarded the issue, but of course, the GNSO, [if] they're not the ones that forwarded the issue would be given a copy of that prior to the advice, guidance, output, whatever you want to call it being delivered to that party. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. And here's where I start to get nervous about lumping the Board, the Council, and staff all together because I'm worried. We

---

want to make sure and I don't know where to put this or limitations on what can be considered by the SPIRT. We don't want the SPIRT to be empowered by, to be empowered to stop [inaudible] or to delay around significantly [inaudible] or target classes of applications or target specific applicants. And if something comes in from staff and then the SPIRT decides to react to that by stopping the next round or stopping the current round or taking out a particular application or class of applications, and that basically then goes up to the Council and they do nothing for 60 days, then something staff-driven could be... There could be significant effects on the community. And I still think that staff, as much as we do appreciate everything they do, they're different from the Board and they're different from the Council in terms of their role in these kinds of things which could be quite policy-driven, turning, not doing the next round is a change in policy, right? Even if it's just considered operational.

So I do think we need to parse out staff from Board and Council in this process because I just see, I see us handing off too much of the community's power to staff here. Sorry this was so long. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Paul. No problem. Let me bring everybody else up to speed with you because you sort of went ahead a little bit, which is good. [Sorry.] But I want to make sure everyone's on the same page. So Paul started to talk about, okay, so what we had just said before Paul's question was that a copy needed to be delivered to the GNSO Council prior to going back to Org or staff that forwarded the issue. And then the next bullet with the sub-



---

bullets are what does the Council do with the advanced copy of this? And the Council could either approve the delivery of this guidance output directly to the party that forwarded it or it could raise issues of concerns to the SPIRT team to address prior to giving that output to the party that initiated it or it could elect to remove the output from the SPIRT team and say, "You know what? We're just going to have our own PDP advice." Sorry, PDP guidance process, whatever the GNSO wants to do with it, and therefore, it basically blocks the output of the SPIRT team from formally being delivered to the party that raised the issue.

And so I think Paul, we do say in here that it should do one of these within 60 days. I don't know if we create a default situation, as Paul sort of mentioned. Well, what if the Council doesn't do anything within 60 days? And I think Paul's assumption was that if you don't do anything within 60 days, then it just goes straight to the party and then the party could, that [authority], they could implement whatever it was and then that could overtake the role of the community who may have a different view in what is policy.

So now I think we're up to where Paul was and Paul has expressed a concern that there may be certain things that Council in action could create the misperception that it's not the Council doesn't consider important or consider it a policy issue. So then Paul says, "Let's create a default that if the Council doesn't do anything in 60 days, it's deemed rejected." Kind of harsh. It is one way we could go. Kathy's saying, "It could always come back." So I don't know if we want to deem it rejected. It's just not deemed approved. I'd rather say it in that way. In that case, rejection seems to imply that there is some thought or intentional, there's

---

an intentional rejection of something as opposed to something that just wasn't approved. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. So if we're worried about saying it's rejected, why don't we just say that if Council doesn't approve, take any action within 60 days, that it is, that no further action by the Board or by staff will be taken until... I don't know. Until what, right? At some point, we can't just have these things hanging out there and have the Council drag on `120 days, 360 days, right? But right now, there's a, unless we are prepared to parse out what happens to the requests coming from staff down to the SPIRT and then back up to Council, from the requests coming from Council and the requests coming from the Board, if we want to parse those out, maybe we can get to different standards on what happens. But right now, it's all one standard and unless we build in some breaker, it's entirely possible that there's a path forward to where staff could ask for something that's policy, SPIRT goes along, sends it back up to Council, Council does nothing, and staff implements new policy. The entire community process could be circumvented. That's troubling. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Paul. I think the... But just looking at it from the other aspect though, what worries, what would worry me as putting my applicant hat on, right? If I were an applicant and there was an actual issue that needed to be solved and the SPIRT team is comprised of experts on the issue that actually have a solution and it doesn't involve policy, and let's pretend for the moment right

---

now that we all agree it doesn't involve policy, and that it truly is operational, to Council in action then could actually be a huge detriment to the applicant and could indirectly stall a solution or stall the process and we don't want that to happen, right?

So let's say it's... I'll give an issue. Let's say it's changing the registry system testing requirements such that now, say, a new SLA has been created and ICANN now wants to incorporate the testing of an SLA, a purely technical SLA into the testing requirements. Okay? This sounds pretty technical, and let's say the SPIRT team provides its advice on it which says, "Hey, we think it can be done in this manner and that shouldn't, and if done in this way, we don't think that that's going to be any kind of operational impact on the registry service providers," and let's say it has that and now it delivers it to the Council like it's supposed to. But the Council sits on it. I'm not sure that that's a good...

Right, and as Donna says, "So if it's agreed, it's an operational issue, why does it need GNSO Council agreement?" Right. So that's the problem, right? So I totally understand, Paul. You're looking at it from using it as a way to circumvent the policy whereas the way that I'm sort of looking at it is if everyone's following its slim lanes and it's doing what it's supposed to do, then you could have policy people, by their inaction, stalling something that's really necessary to be changed.

And so Paul, rightly say, "But for every known policy example, you can think of policy disguised as operational [inaudible]." That's right. So we need to strike a balance.

---

Anne says that it seems that if Council immediately believes it's not policy, not operational, it would be dumb for SPIRT to do a bunch of work. Anne, I think that's... I hope that's right. Yes.

So I think we have a question of a default situation. I think on the others, I don't think the other three options there approve raise an issue or elect to remove back to the GNSO is an issue with this group anyway. So we potentially have what happens in the default. Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. So I'm just throwing ideas on the whiteboard at this point, but does... How entrenched are we on the idea of staff being able to put things in the funnel? Because if it comes from GNSO Council or if it comes from the Board, there's already a significant amount of community input in that process before it even gets to the SPIRT. If something really rises to the level of critical, does the staff not have access to the Board for the Board to do this for them? Because it really is, for me, I don't like the whole idea. I'll be very honest. But for me, the real hiccup is staff involvement and their ability to put something in that seems to be operational but could be policy, right? Like, "Hey, we're having a problem with our whatever, whatever provider and we want to pause the program for six months." Well, one man's technical pause is another man's policy basically taking an entire program offline, right? So how... Do we need to keep the staff? Is that something that we have to do? Because if we do, then unfortunately, I think we do need a default that it doesn't move forward until Council says they should move forward. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Okay, thanks, Paul. So a couple things. So I think yes, staff has to be able to raise issues because most of them do not rise to the level of critical Board action. Right? You think about the new PDP changes that were introduced through the pre-delegation testing process or the IDN tables which were changed by the PDP provider. These aren't Board-level issues but they certainly have an impact on the applicants and going through the evaluation and the testing and other processes. And I think 90% of any of these changes are not going to be Board-level changes.

So I think when we first started talking about the topic, it was very important because remember, the alternative, what happened in 2012 was staff didn't go to anyone. They just did it. Right? It may have had a comment period on some of them, but not everything had to be approved by the Board and certainly not everything went to any GNSO or committee that represented or is made up of community members. They just did it on their own. They may have had a comment period and then went into their own silo and did what they wanted anyway. So this is supposed to be an improvement to what happened.

I want to also remove the "pause the program, stop the program" because I think above, we do get into the notion that anything that rises to that level has to be something much more major and the SPIRT team cannot recommend directly to staff and the Board that it stopped the program without any other action. So I think that extreme example we can certainly kind of carve out so that we're not dealing in the extremes. But I want to try to deal with the 90% of the issues that would come to the SPIRT team.

---

Donna's saying, "So the intent of the SPIRT, as I understood it, was primarily to address concerns from 2012 when ICANN staff made unilateral changes that had consequences on applicants after applicants were submitted." For the most part, yes, Donna, that's right. I think there were other changes that were introduced between the publishing of the guidebook and the applicant window opening up which would be in the remit as well. But yeah, basically, right. It's changes that have an impact or could have an impact on the applicant, or for that matter, the community.

Paul asks, "Can SPIRT target classes of applications? Can it target specific applications? Can we carve..." Yeah, we can cause, we can carve out or set a kind of code of conduct, if you will, of the SPIRT team that it may not, sort of like what's in the registry agreement, Paul, that it may not taken any action that is designed to discriminate against one individual registry operator or group of registry operators to the detriment of others. I'm paraphrasing. But yeah, we absolutely could make a recommendation that it does not do that type of thing.

Okay, so having some sort of code like that, I think, could help and Paul agrees.

Anne states that we said SPIRT should operate under IRT rules. Anne, we initially said that but then realized that there are many IRT rules it can't operate under because of the way that IRTs are structured. But we have incorporated what we could which was applicable in this section.

James states, "If an issue arose that only applied to one type of applicant, it would have to target them." Potentially, Jim. I think

---

maybe there's a way to... I think there's a way in a code to not have that so. Right? So for example, ICANN has in the registry agreements that it can't discriminate against one to the detriment of others. But if it's only an issue that arises because of one registry like thick WHOIS. Right? That's an example that ICANN's not supposed to discriminate but the reality is that there are only three registries right now that operate without thick WHOIS, and that's com, net, and jobs. So yeah, I don't think anyone in the community would recognize that coming up with policy on thick WHOIS is targeting those three registries even though it wouldn't be applicable to any other registry. So I think there is a line between targeting and only having a policy applicable to certain applicants or even one applicant. I hope that makes sense.

Anne, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, Jeff. I think that some of the extremes that we're talking about just wouldn't really be there if we were looking at this as an IRT. And I'm not sure how many of the IRT rules and principles you thought we had to drop but I had understood that to the extent that those principles were already agreed on by the community with respect to IRTs would be applied here but it would be representative. And even the IRT guidelines say that if you need an expert, put an expert on. But I mean, if somebody thinks that an IRT can stop a particular application from going forward or do any of these extreme things, I haven't heard that before I don't know I would be raising it with respect to this predictability IRT. I am a little concerned that you're saying that we decided that the IRT rules don't apply to the SPIRT. I mean, if there are specific

---

rules that should be accepted, we should accept those. But my recollection of the discussion is that in general, all the IRT rules that made sense do apply.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yes. Anne, that's right. So as we go through these next several questions, you'll see that we incorporated provisions of the IRT into it. So yeah, so in general, you are right.

Lots of discussion here about the difference between targeting different groups versus the code that we're talking about. So I think we're going to capture these comments. But I think if we phrase this right, I think we'll... I don't think it'll be a big issue. But maybe that's me being optimistic. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. So how do we capture some of these guardrails that we're talking about? Because I'm a little worried that we'll talk about them and they won't make them into the next draft.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. So we're capturing all of the comments, and so we're not rewording things at this moment on the fly, but we have captured the concept that a code of – I don't know if we'll call it a code of conduct – whatever we call it, essentially, to ensure that they're not targeting. We'll take these notes back after the call and draft applicable ones.



---

Okay, I want to scroll down because we've talked about where it's the initial entity was, that forwarded the question was not the Council. This next part talks about, well, what if it was the Council that was the forwarding group? Then it's pretty easy, right? Or easier situation because the work product of the SPIRT team is just going to go back to the Council itself and the Council will inform the SPIRT team of its decision, providing the rationale and proposed steps. So in that case, it started at the GNSO Council and goes back to the Council.

So let's talk about some of the elements where Anne was talking about or where I had mentioned, in response to ask questions, where we've incorporated things from an IRT or other process.

So here we have for number one, the decision making process. I believe... I know it was labeled in the last time we went through this. This did get listed out of, I believe, an IRT but maybe Steve or someone that remembers because I know we talked about it the last time. But essentially, decision making process, again, it's intended to serve as an advisory body to provide guidance. The advice or guidance is not binding on any party nor does it replace any other method of providing advice or guidance under the bylaws.

The Chair of the SPIRT in consultation with any Vice-Chairs will assess the level of consensus within the SPIRT team and that uses the same definitions in Section 3.6 of the guidelines and then it says, "Strive towards achieving consensus on all advice or recommendations, but even if consensus is not reached, the SPIRT can provide input on any particular issue received as long

---

as the level of consensus support within the SPIRT team is reported using the standard decision making methodology.”

So what we have here, which is a little bit different than a policy group is that all of the output from the SPIRT group will go to the forwarding body whether it has consensus or not, but certainly needs to be labeled the level of consensus it achieved. Again, none of this is binding. None of this is implemented immediately or anything like that and it doesn't replace any other process. But it would be... We didn't think it would be optimal to only forward the things that it reached complete consensus on because it is going to the group or whoever is sending the issue to the group. Well, it's their advice and whether that advice is from a large majority of the group, but maybe not consensus. Or consensus, I think, is still going to be important information for the group that sent it, that sent the question to begin with.

Justine's saying that it's a mixture of PDP [nine role] which is leveraged by the IRT guidelines. Right.

Paul is saying, "Will the non-GNSO members have a vote?" So if we go to the next section, I can't remember actually. So if we scroll down, I don't think we provided for voting nor do I think we said anything about... We do talk about Statements of Interest. We talk about identifying the knowledge expertise, the having sort of a Statement of Interest form like, that's more detailed than the ones that are normally done. We talked about the group being representative. Scroll down a little more.

And I know we talk about appointing experts, but I don't think we get into the kind of voting issue. I think this group is intended to

---

operate with an advisory body where it's just everyone there is going to provide their views and the Chair leadership team of this group is supposed to indicate the level of consensus within the group. So it's not... We haven't indicated a formal kind of structure like that. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. I understand that, that this will be consensus-driven and that makes sense and because of the nature of our community. But I guess I'm trying to... I guess my question could be phrased more carefully and it could say something like, "Will the non-GNSO voices be given the same weight as the GNSO voices?" In other words, say everybody in the SPIRT that are GNSO members think we should do X and everybody who is not thinks we should do Y, what happens? Does that report just go back to Council or staff or Board or wherever it came from with a note saying "Nobody could agree. Here's who agreed. Here's who wanted to do this and here's who wanted to do that"? If that's the case, great. Then the Council, the Board, and scarily, the staff can, I guess, decide who wins ultimately when there's a split like that. I just... I'm not advocating for it one way or the other. I just want to understand what will happen in a situation like that. And then that will, I think, give us a sense how representative everybody really will be in this process. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Paul. It's... You know, only recently has the GNSO started to do policy groups on issues and give different votes and non-voting. I think normally, with IRTs and maybe this is what

---

Anne's going to say anyway, with IRTs, there hasn't really been that formality of these members get votes and these don't. So, Anne, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. I just think that a lot of this discussion could be accelerated if we would just incorporate the IRT guidelines. And keep in mind that SPIRT can only make recommendations. I don't like the idea that members of the SPIRT who are non-GNSO Council members could not get a vote because I don't think that's how we implement policy. We implement policy with the way IRTs operate and somehow we seem to be forgetting here that this is an IRT. It's standing IRT, initial public comment was in favor of a standing IRT. We changed the name but the public comment is in favor of a standing IRT. So let's just supply the IRT rules in total, make a reference to them and then exclude any that we think don't work. And that answers a lot of these questions.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Anne. And these here, these bullet points do come from the IRT. So these here [inaudible].

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I understand, Jeff, that they come from the IRT but you have not incorporated the IRT rules by reference and made exclusions that don't apply. So instead of just picking the ones that, hey, we think this is particularly relevant, we should be incorporating all the IRT rules because it is an IRT and the public comment was in favor of

---

a standing IRT and then we should single out the ones that, for some reason, we think don't apply.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So this outline, Anne, is... Steve, go ahead. Maybe you'll say it better than I have. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Jeff. That's a lot of pressure. Hopefully. So if I recall, the working group actually went over this concept of just basically importing or referencing the IRT guidelines and I think what we ran into is that they are maybe not logical or applicable in many of the cases. And so what we had did in the original formulation of trying to develop some of the details around each of these elements is to sort of take the best in class of a number of different groups and rule sets and charters. And so I think in one of those, Elaine had suggested that the CSC rules might make place.

And so in some cases, that seemed to make sense for this formulation of the SPIRT and in some cases, the GNSO operating procedures might have made sense or the PDP manual. And so we actually developed... As I said, we pulled in the elements from each of these different things and we provided references in one of the previous versions so you could actually see which applicable rule set we used for each set of composition of SPIRT or additional subject matter expertise. So we tried to make a best of breed and we provided references where we lifted them from. And it all stemmed from what we saw as the IRT guidelines not

---

being fully consistent and applicable with what the working group wanted to accomplish here. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. See, you did. You [said that], Steve, better than I did. So the short answer is if you look at this, it incorporates everything from the IRT that is applicable and where things weren't applicable, we, as Steve said, we applied a best of breed and that was going back through the rules in the standing committee, the Customer Standing Committee and other committees that have been set up.

So Anne, if you go through and you see something that's not incorporated here that should be, let us know. But what I tried to say and what Steve did better is that we, to the extent it was applicable, we put it in here.

So Kathy is saying, "Shouldn't we include this as background?" Steve, do we have... So remember this is an annex to the actual recommendations. I believe in the actual recommendations, so if you can scroll to the working group, the actual recommendation itself and the deliberations. Scroll up a little bit more. Sorry, down a little bit.

I thought we had put something, and if not, this would be the section to talk about maybe a little bit down further. Yeah, we should put something in there if we haven't already that talks about where we got some of these rules and things from to give it the background.

---

Okay. So Christopher, go ahead. Sorry. Thanks for being patient. Go ahead, Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Jeff. Of course, the privilege of the Chair, and indeed, the staff to take the necessary time and I agree. I'm not going to enter into the weeds of the procedural details of this IRT issue. Not now, anyway.

But I think we should recognize that the reason that this is so sensitive, so many of us in a proactive, and indeed, in some cases, a defensive sense, recognize that this is a big issue. It is because the PDP and notably, it's work groups, have not done their job. There are several major issues underlying the new round that have not been addressed and for which no policy has been proposed and I know that some folk think that the no policy solution is the best because that means you can all dance back to the 2012 situation. But I don't think that will carry. I think that if you don't address these issues, what you will get is not 2012. You will get SPIRT. You will get GAC. You will get disputes which will undermine the basic public interest objectives of the next round.

I don't expect you to address these issues tonight. At least, not here. But let's not bounce around the procedures. You are addressing these issues in such great detail because it is very likely that they will be exercised and in the process, they will determine policy. And some of you won't like that, but the reason for that is that you have not done your job as the PDP. Thank you.

---

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Christopher. Yeah, I'm not going to respond to that because I think that's a lot of comments on the multi-stakeholder model and consensus in general which could keep us occupied for months.

So I do want to note that we are sort of getting towards the end of this call. I would love to... Steve, yeah, before I speak. Actually, Steve wants to make a suggestion. So go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Jeff. I guess I just wanted to clarify something or maybe confirm something with the working group about the understanding of the framework and then also the SPIRT itself. So staff have been operating under the premise that the SPIRT is generally there for ambiguous issues, essentially. So in the cases where it's clearly policy development, then a party could go directly to the Council to, for instance, develop policy on a rights protection mechanism. And so what I might suggest then is that these cases where there's direct action taken by the responsible party which is in many cases can be the Council, it might be helpful to identify where that's going to happen. And in that manner, I'm thinking maybe a process flow to help provide some clarity about how issues actually circulate through this mechanism might make a lot of sense.

And when I was actually thinking about this, if you think about ICANN Org raising an issue, does it actually make sense for that to go directly to SPIRT? And that actually gave me pause. Does that actually make more sense to reference an ambiguous issue that ICANN Org has to the SPIRT [Board], maybe directly to the



---

Council? And so some of these issues and questions might get more clarity or they might actually make it more... I don't know, it might give the working group direction by seeing it presented graphically. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Steve. So this is one of those instances where you're going to see me disagree with staff, which doesn't always happen. But certainly happens when... but I'm glad you put that comment in.

So let me first say I agree with the process flow because I think that's important. What I don't agree with is the notion of things being ambiguous because there may be things that are very clearly operational, no ambiguity whatsoever and that would go to the SPIRT team. So I know you're using the policy as an ambiguity in policy, but I think that's a little narrow because if something is completely operational, it's not something that they want staff or Org to do alone, then so the whole reason why the SPIRT team came up was so that it wasn't staff making these decisions on its own in a closet, especially when it impacted applicants and they didn't seek input from the applicants. And so understand the example you used, Steve, about ambiguity on whether something is or is not policy, but I think it's very limiting for, to just say when it's completely operational but you would have to go to the Council and that you couldn't go directly to the SPIRT team. So that's just why it was done in that way. So that's a little different perspective. But certainly, a flow chart will, is a good suggestion and we will add that. Sorry, Steve.

---

So yes. Anne, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, Jeff. This is back to some of the existing procedures that are in place. When I recall on Policy and Implementation Working Group, there were very specific guidelines and annexes about how staff works with an IRT. And I don't know why this IRT would be any different from those guidelines, staff working with an IRT and then staff working with a standing IRT.

So I mean we're talking about this SPIRT as if it's something very different from an IRT and it shouldn't be. It's a standing IRT and staff should work with the SPIRT in the same way that it works with an IRT. And there is a lot of stuff in the annexes about how that works.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So again, Anne, that is correct and that's what we're talking about here. And the IRT, staff does go directly to the IRT with operational issues. It doesn't go to the Council first.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Exactly. So I agree with you. I agree with you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks. Donna, go ahead.

---

DONNA AUSTIN: Just quickly, Jeff, to Anne's point about an IRT, so an IRT is essentially managed by ICANN staff. What's the situation with... What's the intent with SPIRT?

JEFF NEUMAN: You're going to have to come to the next call to find out. No, just kidding. There is some information on that in the questions below. We just haven't gotten to it yet. But if everyone can, we will continue this discussion. But I would like... It would be great if we can get some of this work done or thinking about it in-between calls. So please do take a look at this. Send some e-mails. We can do a little bit of work in-between so that if there are things that we haven't discussed, that we can make sure the discussions are focused so that we can... If we do a little bit of homework first, it's not going to take as long to go through the other questions. So I'll use that as sort of the teaser for the next call and we'll adjust the work plan accordingly and if someone can post the time, there you go. It's... Okay, Thursday, the 21<sup>st</sup> of May at 03:00 UTC. So thank you very much, everyone, and we will start with the composition of the SPIRT team and we will hit Donna's question, I assure you. So thanks, everyone, and talk to you all on Thursday.

JULIE BISLAND:: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**