.

James Bladel: Okay the next session is an update from the PDP on New gTLD
                  Subsequent Procedures, which is led by Jeff Neuman and Avri Doria.
                  And they're coming to the table now.

                  I've been asked to remind everyone to please state your name when
                  speaking and please ensure that you're speaking into the microphone.
                  The folks who are participating remotely, and there are several for this
                  meeting, are asking us to help them out a little bit so that they can
                  follow along the conversation in the room.

                  So with that we'll turn it over to Jeff and Avri and go ahead and run us
                  through your update.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I'm going to start and then Avri will
                  jump in when she wants to add something or I forget something or I

state something wrong. So if we can go to the first slide, which I believe is the timeline?

So this looks very similar in terms of the graphics to the one you saw for the Rights Protection Mechanisms. We are in process, and you'll see on the next slide, I don't want to go to the next slide yet but on the next slide you'll see a more detailed layout.

But what we're doing - aiming to do in January or beginning of next year is to send out what we call Community Consultation 2, which is a set of specific questions to the community on the different work tracks that we have. I'm going to talk a little bit more in the next couple slides but just want you to see that we're still on the same timeline that we had projected in the Helsinki - yes, that's where we were, yes - Helsinki meeting to complete a final report hopefully in July 2018.

So we just want to jump to the next one. And the next slide I don't expect you all, it's really small, to read every little detail. There's not going to be a quiz on this later. There's a lot of moving parts basically is that this slide shows. There's a lot of moving parts in different work streams that are going on. Right now we are in the thick of all of the red and gray lines there, which is different items from the different work tracks. And there's a lot of dependencies on moving through.

But ultimately, this is just really to show you right now that we do have a work plan. We are operating towards that work plan. The work plan is available on the wiki if you really do want to see all of the detail. But just to show you that we have that.

If you go to the next slide, which is really kind of the - starts the important stuff for the Council update talking about the current

challenges and issues under discussion, we started with a set of overarching issues that related to things such as, you know, whether there should even be additional new gTLDs and whether the existing policy should stay the way it is or whether it should be amended. And other issues such as should we proceed in terms of rounds or first come first serve. We're still working on those overarching issues and analyzing the input that we've gotten from some of the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

I will note, for the Council, and I'm hoping that this is improved for the next consultation but we only received feedback from the Registries, the Intellectual Property Constituency, the GAC, the ccNSO, I'm not sure if I'm missing anyone. I'm looking at Steve. I think that's it, right? Oh and the SSAC did respond.

But we did not get responses from the Registrars; we did not get responses from the BC or the ISPs or the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group or NPOC. So or the ALAC. So this is something I'm hoping we can improve. There was ample time to respond to this consultation and we extended it several times. I'm hoping that when we do come out with the next consultation period that we can put a stronger encouragement to respond. And I understand it was also during a lot of the transition stuff and, you know, that kind of distracted a lot of the groups and so I'm hoping I'll knock on wood that for the next consultation we'll have a better response.

And now I'm going to try to do this from memory since we've blacked out here. So we have four - oh thanks, Avri. We have four work tracks that are underway at this point. The first work track is dealing with support, general process questions and outreach. That will include things like the - obviously applicant support is one of them and other

issues that deal with whether we should have an accreditation process or certification process for registry service providers. That's being led by two cochairs, Sara Bockey and Christa Taylor.

The second work track is legal, regulatory and contractual requirements in the new gTLD process, so that will include obviously the base registry agreement, it includes the reserve names issues, which has a lot of interdependencies as Heather next to me knows very well. And we are also dealing with one issue that we thought we were going to have help on from the CCT Review Team, which we don't, which is the issue of registry registrar separation or vertical integration depending on which side of the coin you're looking at.

So that's something we learned at this meeting that the CCT Review Team is not taking on. We do have that in our Work Track 2 but we're hoping that we would have a lot more input from the CCT RT to do the kind of economic study and competition studies. That's not being done so we have to now regroup and figure out how we're going to tackle that issue.

And so we may come to the Council at some later point to either ask for additional resources to commission our own kind of studies or to maybe even commission a new team. We don't know. I'm just putting this out there that this maybe something we come to you all to ask f or additional resources.

Work Track 3 involves the contention resolution, objections and other dispute resolution mechanisms like the accountability measures and appeals. And then Work Track 4 deals with the technical and IDN issues. The, you know, there's a lot of pressure from a lot of groups to move quickly. And, you know, we're looking for kind of creative ways

to do this as quickly as possible. Obviously not every group wants us to move quickly so there's that push and pull.

As I said before, this is - our effort is really interconnected with a lot of other activities that are going on including the use of country and territory names, the Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names; the CCT RT and even the RPM Working Group that we just talked about before. We intend to take the findings from that and then incorporate those into our work. Avri, if I could just - sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, because it's not - if you could just go back one slide? Sorry. And then one also issue in how the GNSO Council can assist us is, you know, obviously there was a recent letter from Steve Crocker that I know the Council had prepared a response to, based on not only our feedback that we couldn't, in our PDP working group, we couldn't achieve a consensus one way or the other, as to whether there were items that we can move more quickly on and ones that we could, you know, park while a new round or whatever is going on.

So you produced the response which is just really a summary of how people feel. I don't know if that's a topic of discussion between the Council and Steve or the Board this meeting, or subsequent. But if there's ever anything - discussions that you all are having obviously we need to liaise with you if the Council determines that there are certain items that you'd like to put a priority on.

We obviously expect that you'd come back to us and let us know that certain issues deserve priority treatment. So that's one area where the

Council can assist us. And also to help us ensure that we are taking into consideration all of the other dependencies that we have. So, you know, we obviously have dependencies from the IGO INGO Working Group and how that all turns out. I know that's an interesting issue for you all in this meeting. But is there anything that we're missing?

I know that the GAC has a working group that met at 8:30 in the morning yesterday on geographic names and territory - geographic and territory names. That group has not initiated any kind of conversation with our PDP working group. I don't believe they intend to. But it's our hope that that will - that we as a Council and the GNSO urge that whatever output the GAC does have that that works through hopefully the GNSO process as opposed to going through just straight to the Board if there is anything that comes out of that.

And I will note that there was some interesting proposals yesterday including the development of a repository hosted by ICANN of geographic and territory names. There's some creative proposals that are coming out. I'm not judging whether they're good or bad or whatever, but I do think that they should - we as a community need to remind the GAC and the Board about the multistakeholder model and trying to funnel that into our processes. I think that's important.

And also, you know, we do have like Phil mentioned for the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group there are a lot of participants in our working group but it's still open and it doesn't necessarily translate into active participation. So we have probably 130 or 130 listed as participants and 50 others that are observers but really there's only a core group of, you know, maybe two dozen of the most people that participate on an active level, and it would be great, I understand burnout issues. We do have a lot of new members.

And so I take Heather's point that she made during the last session that we are finding ourselves on occasion having to go back and trying not to reinvent the wheel. And so we - Avri and I are going to try to do a better job as well making sure that we educate the newcomers but not dwell on unnecessarily on how - on the mounds of documents that are out there, that we don't try to reinvent them.

So the other point I just wanted to add is that at some point, you know, we may come to the Council for pushing work out to implementation teams. So for example Track 1 is working on an accreditation or registry certification process. We are finding that that may have some overlap with the work that ICANN staff is doing on registry service provider or switching service providers so they're trying to come up with a process. There's a lot of intersect between those two.

And if it does look like there will be, and I'm not saying there is at this point, but if it does look like there's consensus within the group to pursue that kind of certification program we may come to the Council seeking a way in which we can push it out to a technical implementation group to work on. So that's something just to keep in mind.

And one other thing that I wanted to just make sure that Avri and I are performing in terms of the GNSO's expectations, it's our assumption that, you know, where there's no consensus within the group on changing something that the default is, Number 1, the existing policy that was the GNSO policy from 2008; and where we don't have consensus on things that were in the guidebook that may not have been part of the policy if we can't get consensus on changes the default is the Applicant Guidebook.

We do this because again, we don't want to -- we'd like to get through a lot of these complex issues. And if it's clear on some of these issues that there may not be consensus one way or the other we want to make sure that the default is what currently exists.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri Doria speaking. That is indeed the point, the starting point that we had that what exists, exists and we look at changing it. Now the other thing that comes into it of course is the comments from all the reviews that are ongoing now. So if a review comes in saying this needs to be worked on, then that's an extra element that needs to be fed in.

I just wanted to add another couple things. First of all, with regard to the schedule, it's unfortunate that it display correctly even though it was too small to be read and really did try to compress it. But I'm more than willing to sit down with any Council member at any point, you know, Steve is the keeper of - Steve on staff - is the keeper of the schedule and I'm the nerd that messes around with it a lot and talked about it. So but I'm more than willing to walk anybody through it.

I do want to point out that as you notice, the middle column there is sort of this year when all the detailed work is getting done. So even for those that haven't contributed in the first part on the overarching issues, and you notice that there is a very long tail where we go from draft report to final report, if this year is really when the intense amount of detailed work is being done, so a strong encouragement that this is the time to get involved. We are just jumping into all of that detailed stuff now. So those were things that I wanted to add. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. Thanks, Jeff. And we have a queue going here, and got about nine minutes but we will take as much time as we need to make sure everyone's questions are addressed. First up is Paul. Or is that an old hand? Okay, hey, we're really moving through the queue now. Next up is Donna. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. Avri and Jeff, the geographic names issue is an obvious - has an interest and has been working in, well, they've been ahead of the game I suppose in terms of the PDP. I think what would be interesting is to understand what other issues the GAC is talking about as well because I think underserved regions they're talking about but I'm not sure whether underserved regions and their context is the same as what is being discussed in the PDP. They provided advice on a number of occasions on the community priority evaluation process so that's obviously another one that we can flag.

But I think the more we know about what the GAC is discussing and, you know, where that intersects with the PDP working group I think that's probably helpful for the Council. And then we can try and engage the GAC in conversation about how do we get you into this discussion. You know, obviously we will have a conversation with the Board about the IGO acronym issue but I think that's going to become a test case for us in terms of how we try to work with the GAC to try to not get us into this position again where the Council approves recommendations and then we have conflicting GAC advice come in.

So we will have that conversation with the Board this week. Not sure how that's going to play out. But I think it's really important, we know the GAC are discussing some of these issues as well. We need to pull them out and make sure that we have that discussion about how we're

going to manage this moving forward so that we don't get into this problem again.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. This is Avri responding. I think you're very much right. Fortunately, we have the new liaison that you've appointed, is also a member of our group so we are expecting, but have already indeed started to having conversations with, you know, the GAC informally about how do we bring these things together. I mean, because at the moment on geographical names we have at least a three threads. We have the working group that was joint GNSO ccNSO, we have the GAC, and we have the work that we need to do.

On communities there's just been a new report that came out from an EU - I think it was an EU commissioned study that we've gotten. We are tracking all of the various statements that have come in from the GAC. We probably should pull that stuff out explicitly as a checklist of things that we need to track.

But it is one of the big concerns and one of the conversations that I've been having with people in the GAC is that we don't want to get to the end of this process and go, oops, we've got different recommendations from the GAC then we have the policy PDP recommendations. So how do we avoid that? And hopefully the newly appointed liaison will be a great help to us in doing that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James very much. Heather Forrest. Three points, number one, Jeff's position or let's say Jeff and Avri's position as Jeff has articulated it, as the default position being existing consensus policy, I think that's a very helpful reminder for all of us. Andy goes back to the

comments we made about RPM PDP as well. But I think the challenge is that we - one of the challenges that we have, picking up on the comments that Paul made in the context of RPM PDP, is these are big beasts, these PDPs. And that message has to go all the way down to the multiple work track leaders and that sort of thing.

So we as a community I think need to, you know, every morning we need to get up in the mirror and say, you know, the starting point, that default is consensus policy and where we are.

Avri Doria: Yes, very much. I don't know about every morning in the mirror but I'll try that. But one thing I do want to point out is that saying the existing policy is the touchtone means that we have problems with the AGB in that it is not necessarily consistent with the established policy at times. So it has a, you know, de facto nature but it isn't quite the policy. So that is one issue that we have to deal with.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And this is Jeff Neuman. One of the things I'm trying to work on is where there is areas of divergence is to get them into the policy so that where there is agreement that the AGB got it right, and there are some areas which the AGB got right, that we then incorporate them into the policy so that there isn't that divergence.

But there may be areas where the AGB did not necessarily get it right and we could, if there is a consensus within our group, change it completely. So reserved names is one, is an area, it's an interesting area because outside of the IGO INGO and the geographics, or actually I will point to geographics for a second.

At the last meeting in Helsinki what was very interesting is there were a couple members of the GAC that stood up and said, you know, the

reason we should continue some of these geographic protections is because it's existing consensus policy. And then I had to stand up in front of the GAC and say, no, no, no, just because it's in the Guidebook, that was actually a compromise between the GAC and, you know, the NGPC or even before that, the ICANN Board that that was a compromise and you can't take that as being existing policy. So it's - it is very touchy in a lot of areas. And we do have to keep reminding others what is and what is not policy.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Heather Forrest again. So that was my first point and Jeff and Avri jumped in on it. One of the things that I'd like to recommend as a tangible deliverable on this is I think it would be very helpful if both RPM PDP and Subsequent Procedures PDP included a table or some such in their initial report identifying inconsistencies between the GNSO principles and recommendations and the AGB. That's something that I think any PDP that we have working on, you know, a review of Applicant Guidebook and similar I think that would be very helpful.

There was some aspects of the 2007 principles and recommendations the way those were set out to were extremely helpful. For example we have a table right up front of all the principles and then all of the recommendations, in something like that would be super useful. So that's point one.

Point two, picking up on the comments I made earlier, I think we as a community need to work on how we bring new folks in substantively. And I've had a few discussions with folks that I have a terminus amount of respect for who have been here for a very long time. And

it's recently occurred to me that they are eventually going to retire and with them will go an incredible trove of knowledge.

And we won't have people, I know you're not retiring imminently, but, you know, Jeff is often one to stand up and Chuck and others are often, you know, willing to stand up and say hey, wait a minute, just a reminder, this is the background on this issue, this is the history on this issue and let's not get lost in the weeds. And here's the document to look for and so on and so forth.

Institutionally I think we've done a good job within ICANN of getting newcomers better integrated into ICANN itself. We have the fellowship program and, you know, you don't think immediately when you get here on a just basic human level but on a substantive level I'm not sure we've really tackled the problem at all.

And I think this is something that, you know, on an individual basis I think we each need to look for someone in the audience and say when I retire I want that person to sit in my seat. Each of us needs to take on some kind of a mentoring role, number one, that's an informal thing. Formally then we need to work on whether it's the Council that was without forward, we need to work on something around that.

Thirdly, Avri, to your point, let's say you said you're conscious of these -- Jeff, you did to -- other initiatives, things happening in other SOs and ACs, and how we try and engage the community - community as a whole - better before we get to principles and recommendations and have divergent views.

What specifically, other than just talk about it, are we going to do within Subsequent Procedures to combat this idea that I heard very

clearly in the session the Jeff referred to in Helsinki with the GAC which is PDP evil, CWG or something else or direct intervention to the Board, good. How do we deal with this other than just stand up here at these meetings and say to the rest of the world, please participate, please participate? Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, other than you just talk you say. So talking is often more than just. But I think first of all a large part of that role is the Council's in terms of you are the owners of the PDP process. And you are its stewards, as it were, and therefore that's certainly a place where I think we need your help. And say wait a second, no a PDP is, and we have changed the PDP working groups make sure that it includes everyone, that there is a strong effort to be inclusive perhaps again this feeds into the liaison role.

I know that the group that was working between GAC and GNSO in terms of how we cooperate isn't working anymore, which is kind of a peaty because all that group managed to do was take the first step, which is how to look at each other and how to be aware of each other but did not take the second step on how to actually cooperate. So I don't know if there's anything that can be done.

I think all that we can do in the group is to continue to, you know, invite, include. I think that the one thing that's incumbent on us is to be aware of what they're going to be recommending to respond to it in what we report so that the Board is not faced with oops, we have a recommendation from the GAC and we have no answer, for us to make sure that we follow that stuff, even if they're not delivering it officially, and that we do respond to it. And we say yes, we covered it even if you didn't present it to us. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, Jeff Neuman. Just real quick. And I think this is a good subject for you all to talk about what the Board, that to make sure that the Board knows that it can then talk to the GAC and say, you know, were aware of these different initiatives and let's all try to bring them together now otherwise we will end up in the IGO INGO situation that you have and that's just not effective for anyone.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jeff and Avri. Thanks, Heather, for the questions. Next up is Michele. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. Very, very briefly, I mean, Heather covered a lot of what I was going to say but I think it's something that these are recurring themes that we're hearing from a lot of the different working groups is this around a huge influx of very motivated, very energetic people, some are coming into PDPs, some are going into other groups. Yesterday I was at the human rights session organized by the NCUC or NCSG or all that. And they had some very, very motivated people but again this problem around the background, context.

                  And I hate to where we end up with a situation that unless you've been around for years you can't play the game. I think that the terrible situation to end up in. But there has to be a way that we can help people get up to speed so we're not having the same conversation, the same discussion, the same argument that we've already had 20, 30, 40 times.

                  And I don't know whose role is to help fix that. And this isn't specific to this PDP, Jeff, obviously, but this is an issue. We are seeing it at the RPMs, we are seeing it in the RDS PDP. I mean, the fact that you actually have to boot somebody off a PDP because they keep on

raising up their pet topic is, you know, it's a problem. But we need to come up with a way of addressing that. And maybe that's something that staff can help with, I don't know.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Phil Corwin for the record. Two quick comments spurred by the discussion we've just been having. In regard to efforts by the GAC or others to determine policy other than through the PDP process, we just went through a very long and arduous process that brought the community together, the object of which was to preserve and strengthen the multistakeholder model. And the key difference of the multistakeholder model from other models out there for creating policy is that governments have a significant role but it's an advisory role in the lead role goes to private sectors, civil society, academia, etcetera.

And we as a community need to - we amended the bylaws to both strengthen the MSM and to provide accountability measures for when the bylaws are not followed. And we need to insist that the bylaws is our constitution, that it be followed and when it's not followed we may have to use the accountability measures.

Now the other thing I wanted to mention in regard to consensus policy, I should have mentioned but now that I'm more awake, that our RPM Review Working Group all those RPMs, everyone should remember right now they are implementation details with the new TLD program. They are not consensus policy.

And one of the most important charges for our working group is, one, to recommend any changes in the RPMs; and second, are the ones that

are relevant to legacy TLDs, for example the sunrise would not be relevant, we are past the sunrise period for dotCom and dotOrg and those, is to recommend whether they should become consensus policies.

And I imagine we will probably be doing that toward the end of Phase 1 after we've come up with recommendations for any adjustments to the RPMs. But that's important for everyone to remember; right now they are implementation details, not consensus policies and we're charged with recommending whether they should become consensus policies. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. Heather. Old hand? Okay. All right thanks everyone. Any other questions then from the table or from the room for Jeff and Avri before we move onto the next session? Thanks, Jeff and Avri. Appreciate that update. Very substantive work that you're doing in a PDP. We can stop the recording and let me know when we're ready to proceed to the next session.

Okay that was quick. The next session is something that no one likes to talk about at ICANN which is Whois. It's that PDP to examine next-generation registry directory services to replace Whois or, I guess we would call it RDS for short. The leadership of this would be I believe Chuck, and who else do we have at the table that will be speaking to this presentation? Michele perhaps?