ICANN74 | Prep Week – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Operational Design Phase Update
Tuesday, May 31, 2022 – 23:00 to 00:00 AMS

MARYAM BAKOSHI:	Hi. My name is Maryam Bakoshi, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments will be only read out loud if submitted within the Q&A pod. I'll read them aloud during the set time by the chair or moderator of this session.

Interpretation for this session will include English, Chinese, French, Russian, Portuguese, Spanish, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom Room. And once a session facilitator calls upon your name, our technical support team will allow you to unmute your microphone. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you're going to speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all devices and notifications. Please speak

clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

All participants in this session may make comments in the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select respond to all participants, panelists, and attendees. This will allow everyone to view your comment. Please note that private chats are only possible among the panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session host, co-host, and other panelists.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, first name and last name or surname. To rename your sign in for this webinar, you will need to first exit the Zoom session. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I'll hand the floor over to Karen Lentz. Karen, please.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Maryam. Welcome, everyone. Good afternoon or evening or morning, wherever you may be. Thank you for joining

this session during Prep Week for ICANN74. My name is Karen Lentz, and my team in ICANN is called Policy Research and Stakeholder Program. The New gTLD Program is one of those programs, and that is all about the expansion of the domain name system in a stable and secure way.

I'll note that the slides for this session are available on the session page on the Prep Week page, in case you would like to download them to go through them on your own. The phase of work that we'll describe today is the Operational Design Phase.

So the agenda, Chris Bare and I will be your co-hosts. I will start with some of the context for the Operational Design Phase, what kind of work that is, where it came from. And then Chris will go into a more detailed account of the project work to date, including going through a sample topic from the final report in terms of demonstrating the methodology we're using to take recommendations through this analysis to get to an operational design for it. We will have a time for questions at the end. Next slide, please. Next, please. So one more and we can go into the objectives quickly. Oops, sorry. Back to five, please. Thank you, Maryam.

So the purpose of the Operational Design Phase is to provide information to the Board. The board of directors is in the position of making decision on policy recommendations that

ICANN PREP WEEK 74

come from the community and to determine whether the recommendations are in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN. So the Operational Design Phase is intended to provide qualitative and quantitative information on what the impact would be should the Board accept those recommendations. I think I've said before that the ODP itself is a relatively new process. This will be the second ODP that the Org has completed. But the work is not new in terms of being able to provide information to help inform a Board decision when it comes to moving forward with a set of recommendations. But the ODP also adds transparency to that process. All of the information in our assessment that goes to the Board will also be shared and available publicly. Next slide, please.

That community has worked over the last several years to develop some recommendations, as I said. The term Subsequent Procedures refers to a subsequent to an application round that occurred serving in 2012 that resulted in a number of new generic top-level domains being added to the namespace. Following that round, the community undertook to assess whether any policy level changes were recommended or whether any additional policy requirements should be put into place.

So, that work culminated in the final report, which has been duly transmitted to the Board. There, in that final report, it covers 48+

topics. I think I counted exactly 302 outputs, which includes policy recommendations and implementation guidance and affirmations of previous policy recommendations. So, the level of detail in this report is tremendously helpful to us as we are looking at these items from an operational perspective. Next slide, please.

The Operational Design Phase has its formulation in the foundation in the Board resolution passed in September of last year where the Board set out a series of scoping questions, where they would like to have information to consider in regards to these recommendations. The Board also provided for a budget for that work to occur and asked that the assessment be provided within 10 months from the time that the ODP was initiated. Next slide, please. Thank you.

This is another view of the same information. But one thing to point out here is there was a period of three months before we began the ODP itself. That enabled us to add some more resources to the team. We also organized all of the subjects and components of the scoping document into work tracks. We have nine work tracks, which I have published a blog about explaining those, and then going through them one by one. But then in January of this year, as soon as we rolled into 2022, we kicked off the execution of the ODP, which is where we are now. The Board consideration will follow the delivery of the Operational

Design Assessment. That is the milestone that needs to occur before we would proceed to implementation. So you see that on the slide there. Next slide. Thank you.

This is titled "What Comes After the ODP?" We include this because it's a question that we get a lot when we talk about the Operational Design Phase and the kind of work that we're doing. This may be a slide that you would wish to look at if you've downloaded the slides from the page because there are some smaller words on it. But it's dividing up the work into phases of how we get to a round. So across the top is the policy development followed by implementation and design, and then operation. And on the side, we have the ICANN Community, the Board, and the Organization, each working on different components of the work.

So the red arrow, as far as where we are, is kind of a bridge between the policy development and the implementation and design. Then as noted previously, the milestone that determines whether we continue with the rest of the work is in the orange section where the Board considers the Operational Design Assessment as part of determining whether which action to take on the final report. Presuming that those recommendations do proceed to implementation, as you see, there are a number of major components of work that still would be to come. For example, forming an Implementation Review Team, completing

the Applicant Guidebook, there's recommendations for our communications and outreach campaign, there's a recommendation for a pre-evaluation capability for registry service providers, and a number of other things. So the ODP work is helping us to prepare for all of those, as it's also preparing to share that information with the Board.

So with that, in terms of the context for this work, I'm going to turn it to Chris Bare, who is going to tell you about the ODP project. Thank you.

CHRIS BARE: Thank you, Karen. Thank you, everyone, for joining us on this session. I know that you're in time zones around the world, and sometimes it's not convenient, but thank you for coming. My name is Chris Bare, and I am a director under the Strategic Initiatives part of the Global Domains and Strategy Group. I have been working on SubPro, Subsequent Procedures, for a little while now. And before that, I was working on the 2012 round. In fact, my team manages what's left, the few applications that are left from that round.

What I'd like to do is, if you can go to the next slide, show you this. This is the high-level timeline for SubPro ODP. And you may have seen this before. It is on the webpage and it's also been in a couple of our reports. But you can see the little red arrow saying

ICANN 74
PREP WEEK

where we are, we're just past the halfway point on the timeline here. The items in green are the actual updates, the reports that we've published to the community. So there was one back in March, there was one in May, and the next one will be in August. Let's go to the next slide, please.

So there's been quite a bit of activity since ICANN73 when we did our last update. In that timeframe, we have published several assumptions and some questions that we had that are on the SubPro ODP page and also on a wiki that we have set up as well. And in there we have the assumptions that we came up with for the policy itself, the policy outputs themselves, as well as some of the overarching assumptions that were going into the actual implementation work that we're thinking of.

We've also, as I mentioned, published the report in March. You can see that here, there's a link as well. There was a blog that we published in April that talked about one of the work tracks, which is working heavily on this analysis of these outputs. That's the policy development and implementation materials work track listed there, as well as we assisted in a blog that the Board published related to closed generics that you may have seen. That was back in April. You'll see the versions three and four of the assumptions. Those are additional assumptions that were published. We have another one that will be coming out soon, which should have the remainder of what we have out there to

date. Now, again, those assumptions can always get refined over time, but we intend to have the full set of assumptions to date published in the near future so look out for that coming up. With that, can we go to the next slide, please?

So another thing that happens that we spend a lot of effort on is the actual support of the different stakeholders involved. You may or may not be aware of these different groups, but there is of course the Board and the Board Caucus and the discussions they have regarding the outputs from the final report. So the Org participates in those conversations to help give some context as to what happened in 2012, but also any other considerations that might need to be brought up with them. So there were a couple of different Board workshops that occurred during that timeframe. There were also several caucus meetings that we had during that timeframe as well.

Additionally, the GNSO Council liaison is someone we meet with on a monthly basis. That's a person we talk to, talking about the status of the ODP as a whole, as well as those assumptions that I talked about earlier. And what we're calling policy interpretation questions, I guess we could say, questions that had come up in reviewing the outputs that we thought it would be worth getting some clarification on. So we make sure that our interpretation is in alignment with that.

ICANN
PREP WEEK | 74

There's also of course, the Steering Committee that goes on, and that's the Project Steering Committee which we support, and the actual work track leads. Now, if you've read the blogs that we've published, we have the work tracks, and Karen may have mentioned that as well, that the work itself is broken up by different groups that are called work tracks. They meet on a regular basis to talk about some of the cross-functional aspects of the implementation for particular outputs that need to be discussed. Next slide, please.

This slide here reports the finances to the end of April. As Karen mentioned, we started in January, so roughly four months of data listed here. You can see that the work is broken down by those work tracks that I've just mentioned. This is just an idea of the amount of time and effort we've spent to date on the work that's been happening. You'll notice that the total expenses listed here are $972,000. That's just to date. We have continuing, obviously, we'll have May numbers coming up soon and those will be included in our August report as well. All right, next section, please.

So we're going to go into the next section, and this we're going to talk a little bit about the methodology that the team is using in its work on the ODP. We'll also go over a sample topic to talk through the thinking that goes into how that analysis occurs. So next slide.

This chart was something that we shared back in the community status report back in March. So you may have seen this before. But basically, the work that we're doing can be broken up into four stages or four steps. The first one, which is where a lot of the effort has been to date is in the policy analysis. And that's taking those 300+ policy outputs, those affirmations and recommendations and implementation guidance that we receive in the final report. First, we're reviewing it to make sure we understood what's being said in there. But then also thinking about it within the context of ICANN's Bylaws and remit or what we've done in the past, that sort of analysis. Also, one of the wonderful things in the final report is the rationale that was included in all of these. In some cases, the rationale is very, very detailed because some of the topics are relatively complex or difficult to grasp. So the rationale is very helpful for that. So the policy analysis also includes trying to understand that. After reviewing all that and getting an understanding, we've made several assumptions based upon what we heard to reiterate that we in fact understood what was being stated. Or in some cases, we had questions that would help us to better align our interpretation with what was intended. So that's when we talk about the assumptions or the policy questions but sometimes you'll hear them referred to, that's what those aspects are.

ICANN
PREP WEEK 74

The thing that comes after that is the process development. In the scoping document, one of the things the Board had asked for was a high-level business process as to what would happen. For those of you who remember the 2012 round, there's a very colorful graphic in there that shows the whole spectrum of processes that occur for an application that goes through evaluation to the point of contracting. So using that as a baseline, we started to look at what could be done the same, what needed to change, and particularly getting input from that policy analysis to figure out which aspects needed to be updated and changed to accommodate the new recommendations and the new implementation guidance that was out there. So that's still ongoing. And if you think about it, a lot of that work is a little bit downstream from that policy analysis, which is where most of the effort has been.

Then after that comes the operational assessment. This is what it's going to take to actually implement it, what's the impact going to be. This is when we're talking about the staffing, the resources, the development, the systems and tools that need to be developed. We talk about doing the risk assessment, all the different aspects of what the Org needs to get together to actually implement it. That is done here. Now this is done off of that business process that I just talked about in the prior stage. All of this is, to some extent, subject to change when we start to

get responses back to those questions or feedback on those assumptions. Because what we might find is some of our thinking may alter based upon that. So this isn't really what I would call the full implementation plan. This is the initial assessment, and we need to keep that in mind when we're thinking about and framing the scope of what comes out of this.

Then the last step, of course, is actually drafting the ODA, the Operational Design Assessment. That's not a simple task. It's something that we're going to have to take all that input drafted in a way that makes sense and is useful for the Board to be able to make its decision. So those are the steps.

What I would like to do is take you into one of the topics, if we can go to the next slide here. This is one that is a pretty simple one to understand, but actually was a relatively complex process we had last time, and that's the Application Change Request. So in 2012, after the application window closed, applications often needed to make changes to their applications, particularly when you think about how long the last round actually took to get through. We didn't have a process for that so we had to develop that, and that happened after the round closed.

The types of changes that occurred were basically two types. We had business or administrative changes, and then we had

application changes. You could think of business and administrative are things like the name of the contact, your phone number, your address, things that were really more about the administrative part of the application, not necessarily the content. The application changes, those were the actual answers that were given specific to the TLD itself that was intended to be operated. And they had different criteria. Now, we also mentioned on here, in the third bullet point, evaluation criteria was developed. We had seven different criteria that were used and they were designed to cover a wide aspect of consideration. So part of it was, was there a reasonable explanation as to why there needs to be a change? Was it a change to correct an error? Was there a precedent to the change that we had in the past? But some of the other things that were there were, what's the materiality of the change? What did it impact? What's the fairness of the change? Did it have a negative impact on other applicants or all community members, and what's the timing of it? So, all these were aspects that came into play. We had about 2772 changes for the 2012 round. Now, consider there were only 1930 applications. Some applications had multiple changes, and they changed at various times in the process for a variety of reasons. And that's part of what made this more complex. Can we go to the next slide, please?

So here's a real quick synopsis of the outputs for the final report related to Application Change Requests. I don't know if we need to go through all of them here. But basically, they affirmed that the process we had last time was pretty good overall. But there were a few additional things that were added here. There was the idea of being able to resolve contention sets with a branded TLD by allowing them to change the string, which was not something that was allowed last time. There was the idea of being able to do a change request to potentially do a merger or joint venture. And then there were some other aspects listed here. I think we can go over those in detail next time since I think we're running short on time. But if we could go to the next slide, I think this is why I really want to get into it.

KAREN LENTZ: Chris, also noting the time. But also can you please slow down a little bit for the interpreters?

CHRIS BARE: Thank you. Yes.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you.

CHRIS BARE: I got to say I'm feeling there's a lot to talk about. So with that, though, the Application Change Request, as an idea, is really easy to understand. People need to change their application, right? Especially when something's taking a period of time, not everything stays the same. So in concept, it's very easy. And when you look at the actual outputs for the final report, what was on the last slide, there wasn't anything in there that was groundbreaking or particularly of concern, I would say. But when you really look into what a change request is and how all-encompassing or wide-reaching, I guess I should say it is, it's a pretty complex process. So, one of the things to note is that a change can occur at any point up to contracting. And that sounds like an easy idea, but since there is a process flow, where certain things happen at certain places along the way, to allow for something to change downstream in the process might impact an evaluation that was done earlier or it might impact some other aspect that was done. So that needs to be taken into consideration when figuring out, is a change allowed here? Would it have been allowed here? Is it not allowed over here? The criteria could actually be very different depending on where in the process flow it is. Since the change can occur to pretty much any question in the application, it could touch any one of the processes anywhere along the way. So understanding that changing the officers of a company early on before we do, whatever kind of a background check or the like that might be

happening, might not be an issue. But doing it later on, we potentially have to restart those processes because those new people would need to go through that same process.

Each change needs to be reviewed as to where it fits in that overall process. The different criteria need to be addressed. So if you find that something could have a negative impact on either the community or other applicants, that's another aspect that needs to be brought in here. Additionally, there were some processes that required, like I said, that reevaluation and in some cases that required additional costs. So those have to be figured out as well. I think the last bullet points on here, the ones that talk about the impact of the other applicants or community, are probably the most critical ones that we thought through as we were going through this. Is the change request being used to cause a delay or somehow have an impact on something like a contention set? Quite often, we denied change requests at the beginning of a contention set to avoid the delay of the contention set. We allow the changes to occur after the contention set was resolved. But we didn't let it happen at the beginning for some reasons to keep those delays at a minimum. Or is the change request going to somehow impact the processes that others would need to benefit from or would we need access to? So the objection is an example here. If someone applies and someone says, "Hey, I object to that person," great.

That's all fine and dandy. What happens if they don't object because they have no problem with that application or the applicant the way it is? But then a change request occurs that somehow changes the makeup of that applicant or the makeup of that application in a manner that someone now has an objection to but were past the objections process, do we then run it through the objections process again or not? These are all considerations that we actually denied a lot of change requests last time to avoid having to do those things. But now, there's a desire to have some of that built in so we need to have those considerations in play. Can I go to the next slide, please?

All right. So this is the first slide you saw, the methodology. What I wanted to recap here is, hopefully, what I was talking about, about something as simple as a change request actually being very broad and being actually more complex, because it touches on all of those different processes, makes sense. So as part of our analysis here, we need to identify all the things that need to be updated for the new change request process that we're building. Then we need to figure out every place in the entire process where it could have an impact. So you can see that that actually means that almost every process in this program will need to have some kind of a caveat, a process or side bar, I guess, for the change request process to be taken care of. All of that is going to go into obviously the process development and

part of this and will have an impact on the assessment as we have to figure out the costs to have additional evaluations or the like done by either external vendors or internal staff.

I believe that's all we have for the methodology. I hope I haven't confused people too much because there was a lot of information I just went over. We are now going to the upcoming items and questions. So let's go to the next slide.

All right. So with this, we have what's coming up. We have this session obviously is the Prep Week session where we did a little bit of an update, and we kind of hinted at the idea of what the methodology was and went through a topic. The next one we're going to have is going to be during the ICANN74 session that's on the 13th, I believe, and we're calling it New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Together. That is intended to be a session that's facilitated by the program team to discuss a couple of the topics and actually have some feedback from the community on those particular areas. So I hope you'll join us for that. I think it'll be interesting. We hope to get some interesting people to come in and actually have that discussion with us. So it won't just be a spouting from our side of the table on that.

The other thing to look forward to is in mid August, we will have the next community status report that will be published as well. With that, I think we can go to the last slide.

Before we go to questions and discussions, I do want to point out we have this Follow our Work section. There is the SubPro ODP webpage, which has most of I think all of the blogs that we mentioned, all of the reports we mentioned, including the assumptions and the policy questions that we shared with the GNSO liaison. And if you want to, there is an e-mail list you can sign up for to get those interchanges. I believe that's it. We'll open it up for questions on discussion.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Chris. So we have a little under 30 minutes for any questions. We have a few in the Q&A pod that Maryam will read aloud in a moment. Also, if you would like to ask a question, you can raise your hand in the Raise Hand button at the bottom of the Zoom screen, and we will unmute you to be able to ask the question live. So can we start, Maryam, with the first question?

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes. A question from Brian King, and it reads, "Does the financial breakdown include time spent by staff and/or Board liaisons during the SubPro PDP itself prior to the ODA?

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Brian. The short answer is no. We began with the tracking of time that we use to get to the numbers that you saw

on Chris's slide. We began that tracking method in January when we began the ODP. So those numbers don't include any of the work that the Org invested during the PDP and leading up to that point.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks, Karen. The second question is from Martin Sutton: "Thanks for the updates, very helpful. For the purposes of transparency, does ICANN publish Steering Committee/ internal Work Track meetings? If so, where are these posted?"

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Martin. The reports that we publish are intended to provide that transparency. As Chris mentioned, we've published a couple of community status updates that include things like the cost, the resources used, the relative progress of these different areas. We also have been publishing, as Chris noted, the sets of assumptions. I've been publishing blogs as far as the work that's underway in the various work tracks. When you when you mentioned the Steering Committee, for example, the Project Steering Committee reviews a lot of the same data that you saw in those reports. For example, we're reporting on what we're spending on the budget, how much is allocated across each work track, and really the same kind of project information that you see in those reports.

ICANN PREP WEEK 74

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks, Karen. The next question is from Michael Palage: "Given ICANN's investments in multilingual services and Göran's public commitment to IDNs in the next round, would ICANN please consider taking questions from attendees in languages other than English in future updates?"

KAREN LENTZ: Yes. Thank you, Michael, for the question. This is something that we have spent some time on figuring out logistically. We have the great interpretation feature now in Zoom, which works really well in terms of incorporating many languages into a session. It's a little bit harder when you think about written question in terms of our time to translate it and understand it and have a question back within the time of the session, but it is something that we do continue to brainstorm on as far as how we can encourage more multilingual participation. So if you have other suggestions to that, please reach out to us. Thanks.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you, Karen. The next question is from Jim Prendergast: "Will the topics to be covered at ICANN74 be advertised ahead of time so people can prepare?"

EN

KAREN LENTZ:	Yes. That is an excellent question. I will share one of the things that we've been thinking about because we're looking for a topic that is deep enough to be worth spending for everybody's time sort of digging into within a session, also a topic that is kind of cross-cutting in terms of impacting the various parts of the of the stakeholder community.
	I don't want to say it's for sure, but the topic that we are thinking about is the predictability framework. This is topic two in the final report, and it calls for the formation of a group that would help to sort of manage and triage issues that would come up after the program has launched. So there's a quite detailed annex in the final report that talks about those different scenarios that we've sort of spent time on. So that's the biggest contender. But yes, before everyone gets on a plane, we'll endeavor to publish the agenda for that session.
MARYAM BAKOSHI:	Thank you, Karen. The next question is from Susan Payne: "It appears that ICANN74 session is intended to be quite interactive and to seek input from the community. Will you share in advance the aspects on which you're seeking inputs during that session so that attendees come prepared? And when will you do so?"

ICANN PREP WEEK 74

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Susan. And thank you also, Jim, for the similar question. I think the answer is the same. The topic that we're thinking about would be a good contender is predictability. But we will make sure we post the agenda as soon as we can for the session, which is next Monday. No, not next Monday. It's on the 13th of June. So we will get that up before that.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: The next question is, is from Phil Buckingham. Question: "Will the audio be providing the ICANN Board with some analysis of the demand and number of applications to be expected?"

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Phil. This was a topic that people were very interested in a few years ago, it's been now since we shared some of the planning assumptions that were going into the pre-planning, if you want to call it that. And we provided a set of planning assumptions because at the time we were doing this, the PDP was not finished. So there were a lot of unknowns, and so these are working assumptions that we're using for planning since we don't know the answers in all of those cases. So the planning assumption that we provided in those assumptions was that the volume would be roughly the same as it was in 2012. So just around in the neighborhood of 2000 applications, and that is what we're continuing to use in the ODP for the

purposes of estimating and building out these various processes.

One of the things or aspects that we've also looked at is how some of the other factors in the report can affect volume. For example, there are recommendations for a communications campaign in outreach. So the way that we do that probably has a direct effect on the ultimate number of applications. The same is true for the Applicant Support Program, for example, depending on what type of support is available, and how clearly those opportunities are shared, that also has a bearing on the likely volume. So there's our basic assumption, and then there are several pieces of the analysis that consider how you do something could also have an impact on the volume.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks, Karen. Göran, do you want to comment on this as well?

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. It's such a good question. I just want to add to something that Karen said. One of the things we realized in conversations with existing top-level domain operators is that this could probably our sort of marketing campaign about this, where information conveyed about this could probably have a good effect on the existing top-level domain operations as well.

ICANN PREP WEEK 74

Because what we actually have to go out to talk, we have to—excuse my expression—marketing the use of top-level domains. So I actually started with it could be a good thing for the interest itself to go out and talk about the importance of top-level domains, regardless if you're a country code operator, if you're in generic top-level domain, etc., etc. The aspect of that is also that if we do this right, we are also looking into communities around the world because one of the things we are looking into is IDNs Universal Acceptance. It doesn't actually have the ability to do them in their local language using their own keyboard. It's really hard to say exact numbers. That's why we stay with the assumptions, but we do spend a lot of time on that side of the equation as well. So thank you for a very good question.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much, Göran. The next question is from Kathy Kleiman and it says, "While SubPro Working Group supports some changes to application made midstream, the goal was always to allow the community to review and comment on material changes to the public sections of the application. Of course, this will result in some delay, but anything the community could have commented or objected on or reaching, we should have the opportunity to do on a change. Can we confirm that this opportunity will exist?"

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Kathy. As far as change requests, we are working with the recommendations as they are in the final report. One of the things that it notes in there is that we should be clear about what types of changes or which are subject to which types of review. So there's not a one-size-fits-all answer for any possible part of the application that might change. But what is asked for, I think, is that we're transparent about if this type of change occurs, here is how the steps will happen. So I don't know, Chris, if you want to add anything on the change request.

CHRIS BARE: Yeah. Just one thing to note is that in the last round, in the 2012 round, like I said, there were the two types of changes. The information was publicly visible and some of them weren't. Anytime a change occurred, it was noted on the Application Status page. But it was only shared publicly if it was a piece of information that was public to begin with. However, there was a spot in there that allowed people to comment. If there was an issue, there was a 30-day comment period for … Not a public comment period. It was operational comment period, I guess, is what we're calling it. That allowed anyone to raise any concerns or issues with the change request. It was rarely used, but once in a while, there would be a comment in there, and it would be

something that would be considered before that change was actually, I would say, truly finalized. It took that period of time to be finalized. The few that did not have that would be much more of the administrative type, which would be a change in the primary contact, a change in the phone number, that sort of thing, was not likely to go through a comment period at all. Thanks.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you, Chris. I think, Kathy, we've answered your question. I see it's updated but we'll skip that.

The next is Martin Sutton. "In the timeline charts, the IRT team information seems to be delayed until significant time after the Board's decision. Would it be more efficient for the IRT team in parallel with the Board's review of the ODA?"

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Martin. For the slide that I talked about in the beginning, it's not a timeline. So those dots are not meant to tie to any specific time period. Could we go back to slide nine, Maryam? Just so it can be up there while I'm talking about it. Yes. You see an orange on the top there that forming an Implementation Review Team is something that we would expect to happen should the Board accept the final report. So

the Implementation Review Team has the role of being a resource to the Implementation Team on any of the technical and implementation questions. So it comes into place after the Board has directed us to implement. That doesn't preclude the community from starting work that it thinks would benefit some of the implementation.

For example, some of the questions that the ODP team raised via the GNSO Council liaison, there were certain places in the final report that suggested further work. Some of those are being considered, I believe, in the GNSO Council now as far as whether they might undertake a guidance process or some method to try to advance that work while we are continuing with the ODP.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you, Karen. I think that's all we have for questions. Thank you. Donna's question has already been answered and sorted the questions in the Q&A pod and now visible. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: Great. Thank you. Okay. I will pause for another minute to see if there are any last questions. I'm not seeing any. So I appreciate everyone joining for this session. I hope to see some of you in The Hague. And please be safe. We'll talk to you again soon. Thank you.

ICANN PREP WEEK 74

EN

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much, everyone, for joining. The meeting is now adjourned. The recording can be stopped now. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN PREP WEEK 74