
ICANN77 | PF – GDS: Subsequent Procedures IRT
Wednesday, June 14 2023 – 09:00 to 10:15 DCA

ELISA BUSETTO: Hello, and welcome to the fourth meeting of the Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team. My name is Elisa Busetto and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by ICANN expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. We will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, come to your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Use your mic when you're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that 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 multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name; for example a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that I will hand the floor over to Lars.

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.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thank you Lisa. Welcome, everybody. Happy Wednesday; I guess two more days, but who's counting? We've got good attendance. I know that the scheduling for some of the participants of this ICANN meeting has not been ideal. I apologize for that. We will see that we can do better next time.

Before I start, I just want to quickly introduce the team here at the head table, at least next to me. We have Leon there, Antoinetta, Elisa next to me, and Michael. In the back there on the left, there's Peter as well, who's raising his hand right now. They're working, among other people, with me on the Applicant Guidebook, so you'll see a lot more of us here this week, hopefully, and then in the future ICANN meetings as well.

The purpose of this session is kind of an update on the work plan. Obviously the timeline is of great concern. We're going to talk a little bit about the dependencies and then have a time reserved for questions and answers at the end.

Before we dive into that, since this is technically an IRT meeting, I would like to ask whether there's any updates to any of the SOIs from anybody who is on the IRT.

If that is not the case, then I do not know everybody who's on the IRT, whether everybody's in the room. Over there we have visitors or just audience members who are interested as well. If you'd like to join the IRT or the mailing list, please reach out to us online. There'll be an email address at the end and obviously you can come to speak to us as well.

With that, we have our colleague Kim very kindly running the slides. Kim, would you go to the next one after this as well? One more, one more, and one more. There you are. This is a quick overview of the rainbow that is this IRT. We have, I think the numbers are more or less correct as of earlier this week. We have seven representatives from the SOACs. I won't go over the working model again. We've done that in the previous sessions. If you've got questions on that, obviously, please reach out. We've had three meetings, and I think the overall representativeness of the IRT, as you can see from this, is very much representative of the ICANN community.

The next slide, please. And one more. Thank you, Kim. We have the implementation plan. The overall structure of the document contains a project overview, the deliverables, which is obviously the Applicant Guidebook, the purpose and role of the IRT, which is not reinvented, but is based on existing documents obviously. There's the pipeline of documents. I'm going to be talking about that in a little bit as well, as I will about the timeline. There's the methodology. I've spoken to this on the main session on ... Monday maybe? I'm happy to go into that again if there's question about that but we're not going to dive into that specifically for this session. And then the work plan also talks about the public comments and the vendor engagement that we are planning and some of that is already underway.

Before I go any further, I'd just like to take one second. I believe Anne and Susan have been confirmed as GNSO liaisons. Sebastien is more or less nodding. High five there. We'll see what the reaction is.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: More or less nodding because we put it on the table and asked for comments and any reactions. And as there's been no reactions, we assumed that [inaudible]. But I guess that this afternoon we will [inaudible] into it for all intents and purposes.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, we're looking forward to trying to cover as much work as quickly as we can. And, of course, our role is not substantive. It's more about procedure. So thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you, Anne. Thank you, Susan. Yeah, we're looking forward to exactly the same. Thank you.

The next slide, please. So, what is there to implement? What is the recommendations? We have that in the final report. I think overall there's close to 140, and 98 of those have been adopted by the Board in Cancun and so they are before us. These 98 also have attached to them a significant number of implementation guidance, much of which is quite detailed which is going to prove, I'm sure, very helpful. The remaining and pending recommendation ... You see that [at the end of] the upcoming headline. It was a very productive (if I can make that editorial comment) the session between the Board liaisons and the council on day zero on Sunday. So we expect that a lot of these recommendations that are still marked pending for the time being will be resolved rather quickly. It's not for me to say when the Board will resolve on this, but there's a Board meeting in September and if I can

divulge that I've marked in my calendar that there's a Board paper to be written. So we'll be working on that.

Then there is maybe a couple of recommendations where the council may (I don't think this is decided yet) use Article 16 of the PDP manual. "May," I said. If that's the case, then there's a procedure that has to take place; the council has the possibility to amend recommendations and submit them to the Board. There's obviously potentially also are other ways to move through that differently or more quickly. That is obviously the prerogative of the Council. What we set as a working deadline, to kind of not have an overall impact on the timeline of the IRT, is that if all recommendations that are marked as pending are resolved by the end of this year, we think then the overall timeline will not be impacted. And from what was just said, with the majority of maybe even all of them being resolved in September, I think we're looking very good on that.

There's a number of other dependencies that have – oh, Jim, please go ahead.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Thanks, Lars. And I wasn't sure if we raised our hand here or there or wherever, but you caught it. Real quick, I'm not steeped in GNSO Council procedure, but has Article 16 of the PDP Manual been used before, or are we sort of plowing new territory with that?

It has. Okay, got it.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Anyone who want to comment further I just have a yes as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's only been used once before I think it was used on the International Red Cross/ Red Crescent and Olympic Committee when Recommendations were changed as a result of a facilitated dialogue. I guess that was what it was called. I think Chuck Gomes led that small group. But that was the only time.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thank you. On upcoming item three, the deadline to resolve on all remaining recommendations, is that Board resolution or a working group resolution?

LARS HOFFMAN: It's a soft working deadline for a start. So that's what we estimate. We would like to have everything resolved by the Board by the end of the year, if that makes sense.

And then there's a couple of work efforts. I think most of you in the room are aware of this. The council is working on a timeline and a work plan on these. We kind of listened in obviously on the council discussions, and I think the timelines here will be confirmed at the end of the meeting. But we've included here I think is what is a working assumption. So the first one is the closed generic work. The framework is out for comment. It's not a public comment, maybe just comment. So based on the feedback there, the council may launch an EPDP, and I think a working timeline of around 96 weeks has been estimated there, so it brings us roughly to April 25.

If I can see the next slide, please. Then we have the IDN EPDP. They're discussing as well, there's a public comment out at the moment, and if everything goes tickety-boo, then I think there's a good chance for an October 24 completion of that as well, which fits very well with the overall timeline that I'll get to in a moment.

And then finally (well, two more “finallys,” I guess), the Council has launched a guidance process on applicant support to provide some more input on those recommendations. I'd like to add that the GGP can't make recommendations, so essentially it will help us guide the implementation there, which should prove very helpful. And the current dashboard of the GGP also indicates an April 24 delivery to the council. Again, that fits within the overall timeline.

And then the outstanding issue here is the NCAP2 study. The Board has also marked a recommendation on stability and security as pending subject to the publication outcome on the NCAP study. There's no concerns on the recommendation as such by the Board, but they said we want to see what the study says to make sure everything aligns nicely. And then subject to what any possible recommendations of the study may say, there might be a need to evaluate the risk of name collision, how that mechanism is going to be built, and or a need for a gTLD collision occurrence management framework. So we will hopefully know more of the outcome from the study. I believe it's envisioned to be published before ICANN 78. And then we'll take that into the overall work plan of this IRT and the program as a whole as well.

Just a quick reminder, for those of you less familiar, including myself, with some of the procedures, the delivery dates here for the IDN EPDP

and the closed generics EPDP are the delivery of the work of those groups. And then there's a small little procedural tale that follows from that. The council will then review and adopt. There will be a public comment since there are going to be consensus recommendations potentially. There's going to be a recommendations report drafted by the council for the Board, and then the Board will resolve on those. I think back of the envelope math suggests that that can probably be squeezed into four months. So that's our working assumption around that as well.

Jim, I don't know if that's in your hand.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Yeah, it is. So on item number four, actually I think there's some good news. I was in the GGP session yesterday afternoon, and they indicated they're on track to deliver by December.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Excellent. Thank you for that. And we also have a team internally, if I can just add to that, that is working on the Applicant Support Program. So they are following what happens and using a lot of the workers' working assumptions as well. So I think that will dovetail very nicely. Thank you.

The next slide, please. The next steps. I alluded to that. The council on the pending recommendations as well will put forward a timeline in the work plan. I think that will align very much with what we talked about here. We will also produce, based on the input of the council, if anything varies or if any other items occur, an update to the timeline and the work plan by the 1st of August deliverable. You may recall the Board has

asked ICANN Org to produce a comprehensive implementation plan for 1st of August. The IRT work plan is a part of that, so we review the work plan for that deliverable as well. And overall, I think what we agreed over the first couple of sessions with the IRT is to treat the work plan as a living document. So if we can move through the work (Anne alluded to this) effectively and efficiently, and we can move more quickly, then we will change our, I think, overall timeline, which is, I think, marked in the document between 15 and 24 months at the moment from the start. So that was in May 20__... What year are we in? '23. So that brings us to the beginning of 2025, no later than May 25.

And the next meeting for the IRT (everybody will be relieved to hear, nobody more than me—well, maybe Jeff) to start on the substantive discussion on the predictability framework will be on the 5th of July.

And one editorial comment. We had proposed to the IIT to also discuss the chartering of the SPIRT group for the IRT. I don't want to preempt anything, but I've seen some discussion on the council list that that is probably going to be taken back to the council. Is that right?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: At council, Susan and I have recommended that the SPIRT be chartered by the council, and there seems to be an agreement on council to that now, so hopefully we can take one small item off your plate.

LARS HOFFMAN: Very good. Or a [communal credit], I think.

[SEBASTIEN DUCOS]: Maybe a quick caveat.

LARS HOFFMAN: Rubens' hand was up first, and then Sebastian's. No, no, go ahead.

[SEBASTIEN DUCOS]: But with a quick caveat that I think it's agreed that indeed we will take it on board. It's also agreed that it's not a matter of urgency. So we will consult with you when you want it back.

LARS HOFFMAN: And I think that GAC might have some thoughts about it as well. I've seen that they've communicated that as well.

Jeff, do you want to talk to that?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I just want to say that just because the GNSO Council is taking it on that does not in any way indicate that we won't involve the other SOs and ACs. So I think it's really important that that message be delivered that, yes, the GNSO is going to be working on the chartering, but it's fully well expected that the GNSO will involve the GAC and the ALAC in that process. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMAN: And then we have Rubens. I think you had your hand up as well.

RUBENS KUHL:

Thank you. I was reviewing the work plan and noticed that application evaluation is very much down the road. But we have two items that are in the critical path of the next round, which are applicant support and RSP pre-evaluation. We can't work on applicant support at this time because it's being worked at the GGP, but we could work on RSP pre-evaluation. And there is one part of the AGB which is contingent to that, which is the technical evaluation. And so I don't see why we leave that to many weeks down the road, where we could work at that now and make that work in a more timely fashion.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thank you, Rubens. I hope I've got good news. So we've got two teams in place led by Francisco for the RSP and my colleague Kristy Buckley is in the back here as well on the ASP who are working on both those topics. And we expect that we're gonna bring concrete language on what these programs might look like based on the recommendations to the IRT no later than the beginning of Q1 2024. So the overall timeline, which I think has been discussed by the in the main session as well, is the 2 plus 1 years from the start in May. We foresee a launch of both of these programs 18 months before the application window opens. And so that is the timeline that we are very much working towards and aiming to meet. So while there's nothing on the IRT timetable played yet, that doesn't mean that there's no work going on in the background. Au contraire, as the French would say.

Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

I raised this on Monday, whenever that session was. I don't understand why it's going to take six months to get that language on the technical evaluation when basically nothing's changed. I shouldn't say "nothing," but there's very little that has changed. So we make these comments. We ask for things to be done better and more efficiently, and it just goes in one ear and out the other. I don't understand why things like that take so long just to get the IRT some language which basically is going to be the same as what the guidebook was. The only changes that were recommended by SubPro were on the pre-delegation testing. And that's not really involved in the evaluation process. So it'd be great if we can get a better explanation as to why it will take six months to deliver language that's basically already there. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thank you, Jeff. I'll talk to Francisco and ask him about language that might satisfy you. All I can say is that we have talked internally of what a reasonable timeline is to get something of substance that works as a concept to the IRT and that is a timeline that is reasonable for us. It aligns with the overall timeline. It does not go in one ear and out the other. We are trying to engage, and we are trying our best to do and work as efficiently as we can. I know in the beginning it's gonna take some time for us to get some stuff in front of you. We're working in parallel on many work tracks, and maybe we can have that discussion in ICANN 78. If by then we still haven't put anything before you and you think things are going too slowly, then we can have a discussion about how we can change that. I think a little bit of time for us to get off the ground properly and get the work done the way we think it should be done is not an unreasonable thing to do. Thank you. Please, Jeff.

JEFF NUEMAN: So just to follow up, our next meeting's on July 5th. Does that mean we'll have some draft AGB language for predictability, or do you expect the July 5th to be a different type of discussion?

LARS HOFFMAN: I expect there to be draft language on the predictability framework to be delivered to the IRT. I don't want to say on the 4th of July, because some of you are celebrating America that day and I celebrate my mom's birthday, but it'll be the week before I take it. Thanks.

I see a question from Greg in the chat. Greg, I don't know if you're in the room. Do you want to speak up, Greg?

GREG SHATAN: I was just going to follow up. Following up on Jeff's question, I just was wondering if we could get a breakdown on how the six months was arrived at for technical evaluation since, as Jeff suggested or said, that there's already existing language that should be already fit for purpose, and your answer was more about how long it would take to get language in front of us. So I'm wondering where the gap is between just reusing the existing language and the six-month period to get it in front of us.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thanks, Greg. I'll speak with Francisco and we'll get some language in front of you, some rationale in front of you, on what the kind of work

that we're doing is and why it takes some time to get the program proposal in front of you. Thanks.

ELAINE PRUIS:

Lars, may I? So can I just ask the members of the IRT to allow ICANN to do the work we need them to do instead of justifying the way they're going to do their work? I think we'll all be a little more efficient that way. Asking you for a timeline, a description of why you have the timeline, and the way you do takes away from your ability to actually do the work on that timeline.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Thank you, Elaine. And one other thing I think that I forgot to mention (I appreciate it, by the way, very much) is that we are also planning ... For example, there was, I think, a suggestion (I don't know if it was in the plenary [or] an IRT session previously) to not just move topic by topic but try to move bigger chunks to the IRT in one go. So I don't think I'm giving away too much by saying that in August we have a meeting with a small group of writers and other SMEs within the organization where we are planning to tackle a large chunk of documents. Our bosses have told us not to take any calls and not to go into the office but lock us in a room essentially for a week. I wish I was joking. So that's going to happen. So we believe very strongly that ... As I said, in ICANN 78 there's potentially more topics than the IRT can discuss in one week at a time. We're probably going to move into parallel meetings. And so we most certainly have a plan to move through this as efficiently as we can. Thanks.

Jim?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks Lars. So, since we have this scheduling item up there, is there any way we can get at least placeholder calendar items for two or three months in advance for, just so we can ... We're all really busy, so I want to be able to schedule more rounds.

LARS HOFFMAN: I appreciate that, Jim. Yeah, absolutely. That's a good point. Thank you for raising that. Because at the moment we don't want to have another update meeting, we want to move into substantive discussions, and so we are trying to plan ahead how quickly we can get the initial topics out before we have our meeting. We will put in dates. It's now a Wednesday because the 4th of July we didn't want a meeting obviously on. And we will put in the slots going forward, I think, on an ad hoc basis until September if that is okay. And then there will be weekly meetings as of September and we'll put in the calendars.

JIM PRENDERGAST: I guess I'm not so much worried about what the topic is that's going to be discussed on any particular day. I just want to make sure I have the availability in my calendar to participate.

LARS HOFFMAN: Just an open question. Would you prefer then that we put the calendar invites in going forward to the end of the year and we let you know if we—

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

LARS HOFFMAN: Okay, okay. Cheryl, it's all right.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Sorry, you've got a couple of type A's on this group.

LARS HOFFMAN: I don't think that exists in ICANN. Does it. Type A's? And then we'll cancel if we need to, if that's what you would like us to do?

Fair enough. We'll do that.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yeah, and you can swap in and out topics depending on how quickly you're making progress.

LARS HOFFMAN: You'll have the invites before the weekend.

Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. So, at the end of the day, all of our stuff needs to go out for public comment, of course. And so, has there been any ... I think initially with the work plan, it was all scheduled to go out to public comment all at once, if I'm not mistaken. Or maybe it didn't indicate when. But has there been thoughts of dividing out public comments not as each topic is finished, obviously, but as there's a concrete section that is finished, could that go out for comment so we can kind of take all of that in on a rolling basis as opposed to throwing like 200 pages out at once and saying, "Okay, it's available for comment"?

LARS HOFFMAN: Yeah, Jeff, I think I spoke about that in Cancun during the plenary session and it's in the work plan: that we will put out sections of the Applicant Guidebook language as they become available in reasonable chunks, exactly as you said. I think I said on Monday as well it's no individual topics, but whether it's a module or maybe a smaller section of a module, depending on if there's a lot of topics within the module ... So yes, we expect that every bit of the Applicant Guidebook will have gone out for public comment at least once before we have the entire Applicant Guidebook out in May. So there will be public comment kind of on an ongoing basis whenever a sizable chunk defined by IRT and staff is ready to go for public comment.

JEFF NEUMAN: Can we put temporary placeholders in there just to put it in the work plan just to build into the schedule and not ... And since we're building out a work plan, it would be good to kind of estimate, okay, we should have at least, I don't know, four public comment periods, whatever it is,

on the four different sections; this would be the time frame. Because during those weeks, I'm assuming comments will need to be evaluated. And so that may play into our discussions. It may not. So we kind of need to build that into the timeline as well, unless it's your expectation that we put it out for comment and then it's just I can't Org that deals with the comments and that's it.

LARS HOFFMAN: I think You know that that is most definitely not our intention.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right.

LARS HOFFMAN: I don't think we've ever done that. So for the work plan, I think we can put something like a placeholder in. The problem, Jeff, is we can't predict the future. We don't know whether in February or in March we're gonna be ready with a sizable chunk. So I can put something in if you want. It won't change anything [in] that when something becomes available, we put out it for public comment. When the comments come back in, I'm expecting that there will be a subgroup formed. We talked about parallel work tracks that will deal with the comments and at the same time that we will also continue on substantive work because if we don't do that, if we pause and discuss the public comment and not continue working on the topics in the Applicant Guidebook in parallel, we're not going to meet the two-year timeline. So, absolutely, that will happen.

JEFF NEUMAN: So, I appreciate that. I think that should be noted in the work plan so it's clear that, like what you said, we're not gonna be pausing work. We may establish additional meetings to discuss the public comments, but it's not going to ... Because right now you have each meeting laid out, right? And each meeting has a topic, essentially. And if you look at that schedule there's nothing built in for meetings to talk about public comments.

LARS HOFFMAN: We have every meeting laid out until ICANN 78 with the topics that we plan to bring to you until then. And we don't think there's gonna be public comment beforehand, but if you want us to include public comments on a high-level timeline every quarter, I'm happy to do that.

JEFF NEUMAN: Something so people are aware.

LARS HOFFMAN: Justine's hand is up.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. I'm not opposed to what Jeff is proposing, but to me, at this stage, it's kind of meaningless because whatever that goes out for public comment we have to be satisfied with. The IRT members have to be satisfied with it. So I can't predict what the IRT members are going to say until we see the drafts. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you Justine.

JEFF NEUMAN: That's not my point, Justine. I understand that. It's not like I'm saying you need to put it in a certain month—

JUSTINE CHEW: And I said that, Jeff, I'm not opposed to what you're proposing.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, but ... All right, whatever.

LARS HOFFMAN: Rubens, I see you noted in the chat that about five public comments we should plan. Do you want to comment on that further?

RUBENS KUHL: Yes. What I suggested is you could think of five lots. One would be technical evaluation and RSP pre-evaluation. The second one would be applicant support. And those two would clear our dependencies for moving forward. We should probably aim for a third that would be the bulk of AGB. So this one would likely be a 200-pages one. The fourth one would be closed generics. And the last one would be IDNs and the final registrar agreement, which is currently seen as the critical path in the process. So this would align with the cadence of the program.

LARS HOFFMAN:

Yeah, it's a possibility. If I can share my thoughts as well on top of that, I agree, I think, with what you said, apart from maybe the big chunk of the 200. Again, on predicting the future, nothing is harder to predict than the future. But, you know, there's probably arguments to do big topics like CPE. You could see the resolution of contention sets might go out as well separately. So I think as Justine said, we get to a point I think where the IRT believes there's a big topic where maybe we've reached a compromise or we've worked very hard on. We got to a position where different factions have come together and we have a landing space. And even if it's just one topic like CPE, for example, I think that could then be put out for public comment as well. But I think with what you highlighted here, the ASP and the RSP are obvious candidates, and I think there's no way that that's not going to go out for public comment as soon as that is ready. Thank you.

Any other questions? We're not quite slave labor yet, Rubens.

If there's no other questions, then it's probably going to be the first and last IRT meeting that ends before the top of the hour, I suspect.

Actually, Kim, before we close off, for those of you who haven't seen the work plan, it can be found on the wiki. This is what Jeff alluded to as well, and we pointed out that these are roughly the topics that we've lined up until ICANN 78. What I will say here is you heard me talk about us being locked away. Anyway, we're going to have a staff session to move things forward quickly in August. So that may change some of the topics. We are trying to tackle a whole module. And so while I think predictability and application, and freedom of expression are the topics that we have lined up for the next two substantive or first two

substantive discussions, the topics after that we'll review with the IRT for whether any changes will be made here to that. That doesn't mean that we won't get through the same amount of topics. I'm expecting we're getting through more topics by the time that ICANN 78 comes around. But as I said in the beginning, the work plan, especially the topic planning, is a working document, and we'll make sure that the IRT gets the heads up about what is coming next with an appropriate amount of time. Jeff and others have pointed out, obviously, that what we would like to see when we get to an IRT meeting is that members have familiarized themselves with the recommendations on the report and the implementation guidance and then also any draft language that we have prepared so we can have efficient recommendations. We don't really plan to walk everybody through every detail of the language that has been sent out beforehand. The assumption will be, I think, that the material is understood by everybody. Obviously there's clarifying questions, and then we can get into the substance. And with that in mind, as I said, as of the metrics and monitoring and conflicts of interest, those will be part of that work session that we're having internally, so they'll be next as well, and then we'll plan out the topics with the IRT after that, after those meetings. Thanks.

Phil Buckingham asked whether public comments are going to be 30 days. That's a very good question. I think we now have a tradition in ICANN almost that the standard period, I believe, is 40 days, I want to say, and then it depends on whether there's a request for extension. My personal assumption is that we should use the smallest amount of public comment time that we can get away with. And I don't mean that in a non-accountability way but in a simple way that we have to move

through this and we want to be efficient etc., etc. So if there's a big complex topic that is controversial, maybe we have to extend it. If there's chunks on maybe more obvious things, we make it faster. But I think, on those timelines, I personally would feel more comfortable to set that at the time with the IRT and not commit to a timeline at this moment.

Jim?

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Thanks, Lars. So I don't know if there's actually written procedure on how a public comment period gets extended. I know sometimes it's courtesy, but we may want to think about tightening that up for this. We know what's coming down the pipeline. We can put dates, rough dates, around this so individuals and organizations can plan. But, we've got to stop the slippage early in timeline. So I think we've got to hold fast on the amount of public comment period the length of it.

LARS HOFFMAN:

I would fully subscribe to that. And what I would also say, very quickly, is we have the model of representatives for this group, so I would also expect that representatives that have been nominated are already aware of any or have maybe even raised to the IRT any comments or concerns that the group may have, so it's already taken into the discussion. And if not, they can alert their groups that they are ready to comment in the allotted time and don't ask for extension. I would agree with that.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yeah, there should not be a lot of surprises coming through this.

LARS HOFFMAN: Right.

Do you see any other hands at the end of the comments in the chat?

Good.

Well, Jeff, last chance?

No? All right.

Thank you, everyone. I hope it's going to be a friendlier and more fun meeting in Hamburg, my almost my hometown and I'll feed us in in Hamburg. Thank you, everybody. And if you have any questions, please come and talk to me online or in person. I'll be here all week. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]