Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 03 September at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 03 September 2014 at 1900 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-implementation-20140903-en.mp3

On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#sep

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large
Olevie Kouami – NPOC
Greg Shatan-IPC
J Scott Evans – BC
Amr Elsadr-NCUC
Michael Graham – IPC
Anne Aikman Scalese – IPC
Alan Greenberg-ALAC
Tom Barrett – RrSG
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISPCP
Jonathan Frost - RySG

Apologies:
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Stephanie Perrin - NCUC

ICANN staff:
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Marika Konings
Karen Lentz
Berry Cobb
Steve Chan
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Cybil). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 3rd of September, 2014.

                 On the call today we have Olevie Kouami, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tom Barrett, J. Scott Evans, Wolf-Knoben, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Amr Elsadr and Greg Shatan. We have apologies from Chuck Gomes and Stephanie Perrin.

                 From staff we have Karen Lentz, Marika Konings, Amy Bivins, Mary Wong, Steve Chan, Berry Cobb and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

                 Thank you very much and back over to you, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Terri. This is J. Scott Evans for the record. We've had our roll call now I'll ask the perfunctory question if anyone has an update to their Statement of Interest.

                 Hearing none I will move us to the second item in our agenda for today. And for those of you on Adobe Connect the agenda is listed in the far right hand corner. We're going to get a presentation today about the consensus policy implementation framework that's been set up by the Global Domains Division within ICANN.

                 I see Jonathan Frost is joining us. Welcome, Jonathan.

                 This is the division within ICANN that is now responsible for dealing with the new registries and for also working with existing registries and registrars with regards to their contracts, contract administration and those kinds of things so

we see that of course that will affect the implementation of policies that come down.

So with that, I'm not sure who from staff is going to take the lead with presenting to us today. The whole idea here is to get sort of an idea of how staff is thinking about this as we work through our charter and the charter questions we've been asked if we can sort of get an idea how others are thinking about this type of workflow and the way that we might be able to implement it within our charter questions and the suggested recommendations that we've put forward to the GNSO.

I want to acknowledge that I understand that Michael Graham, one of the vice chairs for this group, has joined the audio portion of the call so he's now on the call as well for the record.

With that I'll turn it over to Marika who can introduce the staff member that's going to be presenting to us today.

Marika Konings: Thanks, J. Scott. So this is Marika for the record. So we have Amy Bivins and Karen Lentz on the call who will be jointly presenting this framework. I think one of them will probably kick this off.

Just to note that indeed, you know, staff has been spending quite some time on developing this, working as well closely together with, you know, colleagues on the policy team as you see that there's a, you know, this is really a joint effort and different departments are involved in the process of consensus policy implementation development.

So without further ado I'll hand it over to Amy and Karen to take us through the framework. And as you'll see there's also an agenda item that's basically focused on any questions you may have or discussions around the proposed framework that's up for discussion today. So, Amy or Karen, who would like to start?

Karen Lentz: Yeah, thank you Marika. This is Karen. So I wanted to build a little bit on what Marika said in terms of the work that we've been trying to do. We've been obviously following the work that - the discussions that this team, the Policy and Implementation Working Group, has been having in terms of how these activities occur and how the dialogue that happens, you know, in the implementation stages takes place.

So in creating this document we really had two...

((Crosstalk))

Karen Lentz: ...two goals. One is to provide some visibility into the steps that we take once a policy has gone through the multistakeholder process and been adopted as a consensus policy, what are the steps that we follow in terms of building the requirements and implementing the policies so to create some transparency in that.

And secondly, we wanted to, you know, create guidance for staff so we've had a lot of new folks join the team in the last several months. And when you have a person who's handed a new consensus policy to implement the goal is to give them a set of working principles and steps to follow. So those are kind of the two goals that we hand in mind with creating this framework draft.

And I will hand it over to Amy Bivins to walk you through it. Amy is part of the Registrar Services Team and has done most of the drafting on this so she's going to take you through it. And also we'll be happy to take questions throughout or at the end.

Amy Bivins: Thank you, Karen. And definitely, as I go along when you guys have questions please feel free to just go ahead and bring them up; you don't have to wait until the end.

As Karen mentioned this framework, we've been working on it for the past couple of months and we really just wanted to kind of give you an idea of how we think about implementation from a staff perspective. And so as you'll see in this framework it's very much from the staff perspective so just keep that in mind when you're looking at it.

We realize that it's not a one-size fits all solution because different projects require different steps sometimes but this is designed to be a basic framework for staff to follow and we're interested to hear your feedback on it.

Just to kind of go in from the beginning of the document I know you guys gotten the document via email but probably have not had time to go all the way through it. We wanted to point out the general working principles that we kept in mind when we were developing this framework. So we came up with about 10 principles give or take a couple so I'll just go through those with you quickly.

The first principle that we listed was that implementation of policies should be completed in a transparent process. And we view communications as being very important. Communicating with the community or with IRT and other relevant entities throughout the process just so everyone is aware and up to date of what's going on while staff is working on the staff side of implementation of policies.

The second principle is that staff will be held accountable by the GNSO Council or the agent of the GNSO Council such as the IRT for ensuring that policy implementation is consistent with the policy recommendations and also the reasoning underlying the recommendations that are sent for implementation.

The third principle that we have is that all consensus policy recommendations must be evaluated using a consistent and rigorous framework before requirements and release and deployed. And this includes things like at the

beginning of implementation doing a risk assessment, thinking about what stakeholders are going to be involved in the implementation of a policy and who the policy is really going to impact and things like that.

This includes having a checklist at the end of each of the phases of implementation to make sure that we've covered all the necessary steps through the implementation process.

The fourth principle is that the implementation process must ensure that the integrity of consensus policy recommendations is maintained or as the recommendations are transformed from recommendations into processes, systems and standards.

The implementation process must enable staff to plan and manage the capacity and resources required to build, test, deploy and release a policy.

The next principle that we have is that there needs to be a formal transition process throughout the entire process because this includes all the way from the PDP process, staff already planning for implementation at that stage and then each step along the way; when it's handed to the services side from the policy side and when an implemented policy is handed on to Compliance once a policy is ready to go.

The next principle is that policy implementation activities should follow a lifecycle. And this is getting into - we're trying to come up with more standard implementation phases including a policy change calendar, which is one of the projects that we're working on within this so that policies can be rolled out on a set schedule ideally twice a year so that contracted parties and the community is aware of what's coming and they have sufficient notice before they're coming so that's what that principle is getting at.

And then the next principle doubles up on that just noting that in cases where there are really immediate security and stability issues that have to be

addressed and can't necessarily wait six months these types of changes could be deployed in a more expedited manner.

But in that case staff would obviously collaborate with the community and consider moving back other implementations to make up for the fact that there may be some more pressing policy that needs to be implemented earlier.

And the final principle that we followed in trying to set up this framework that is on the screen is that the whole policy itself need to be revisited periodically just to ensure that it's doing what we need it to do and what the community needs it to do and to cover the lessons that we learn over time.

So before I move on, does anybody have any questions about the general principles that we are working off of?

J. Scott Evans: I see that Alan Greenberg has a question. Alan.

Amy Bivins: Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just a general question, this relatively elaborate framework seems to presume that policies are coming out of the GNSO a lot faster than they are right now, is that something you're gearing up for? I mean, right now I don't know what the actual rate is, I'm sure Marika can tell us, but it's, you know, eight or nine months and often they're not all that onerous to implement. So I'm just wondering is this based on some presumption of a much higher rate or are things a lot harder to do today than we think they are?

Amy Bivins: I don't know. Karen, do you want to take this one?

Karen Lentz: Sure. Hi, Alan. So you're right, there's - there have been times when the policies coming out are few and far between and then there's, you know, been times when there's, I don't know, five or six in the pipeline.

So, you know, we're trying to build a standard process for, you know, that doesn't necessarily depend on, you know, how many. If you're taking a policy from start to finish you're always following the same set of steps.

The point that maybe prompted your question is the principle G where we're talking about trying to be more predictable in terms of establishing a calendar for when, you know, are there certain times during the year when we might announce new policies or have an implementation period or, you know, give the Contracted Parties X amount of time in advance.

So, you know, working on trying to manage volume in the event that there are, you know, a lot of policies that will require changes coming down the - coming down the pipeline we're trying to give ourselves tools to manage that case.

Alan Greenberg: So as a follow on, I would hope that if they are - when they are still coming out few and far between we not impose artificial constraints in their implementation. Thank you.

Karen Lentz: Right, yeah. Makes sense. Thanks.

Amy Bivins: Thanks, Alan. Did you have something, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Maybe just to add to, you know, what you already said and then in relation to Alan's question because I think as well some of the timeframes you see here and then I think, you know, Amy made it clear as well at the start that this is, you know, there's not necessarily one size fits all.

I think we've, you know, tried to give some indications here of the different steps that we would anticipate in the implementation phase as well as the staging which is the, you know, policy and development phase but noting that indeed in certain cases these may be longer or shorter.

And I think, you know, part of the, you know, which principle is that I think the last one where it's, you know, review on a regular basis and assess, you know, how it is evolving in practice I think it would also be actually tracking indeed how those different phases, you know, how much time they take in reality because I think this is indeed an estimation that we're making based on maybe recent experience where indeed as you know some where easier to implement than others.

But again, you know, having, you know, concrete data and tracking this may give us some more information and more realistic estimation of some of these phases going forward.

Amy Bivins: Alan, is that an old hand?

Alan Greenberg: No, that's a new one. I was just going to add a comment that the current implementation for thick Whois has a timeline which is close to 2.5 years so I would hope that we're not going to aim at a lowest common denominator for all policies. Thank you. And that was said with some humor I hope.

Amy Bivins: Noted. Thanks, Alan. All right, so the next portion of this document just goes through - we tried to set out the different roles and responsibilities of all the different parts involved in the implementation process. So we had the GNSO Council and the GDD staff, the GNSO policy staff, the Implementation Review Team and then also the supporting organizations and advisory committees as we reach out to them at various points for feedback.

And then also the different (unintelligible) compliance and risk assessment that the GDD staff obviously work with pretty closely when we're working to implement a policy.

And J. said that in the chat that you guys can also control this document if you want to scroll down. We're not controlling it so.

Okay so when you move along to the - I think it's Page 3 in your document it's - you see the nice color coded waterfall diagram that Berry Cobb made for us. And that just attempts to visualize the process and to divide it up into different stages or at least how we're envisioning the stages of implementation at this point.

And so we included - at the very beginning we're calling it the staging process. And really what that is is, you know, while a policy is in the GNSO, in the working groups, we really want to, from our side, the GDD Services side, start thinking about implementation and knowing what's going on and following the process of providing input so that we're well aware of the process by the time it gets to our side for implementation.

And then we go through the planning stage and that's when it gets into the more active like it's been passed over to our side, the GDD staff side, for implementation. So that includes things like recruiting on the IRT and thinking about who's going to be involved in the implementation.

And I'm going to go through the more details, that's later, but these are just the basic. The analyze phase gets into starting to write the actual language. When an implementation requires policy language, designing if there's new product or a different service that needs to be built, so that's part of that phase.

And moving all the way through the implementation and support phases so this chart that's coming next if you don't have any questions about this diagram itself we'll actually go through those phases.

I want to (unintelligible) too, the timelines on this obviously are not going to be - or they're not intended to be applicable for all. I mean, some phases may go really quickly in some implementations and in others they may take way longer than what's there but this is just kind of a general guideline.

Okay. So starting at the beginning in the staging process and GDD staff generally and for those of you that are on a lot of policy calls probably see GDD staff on these calls. I'm on a lot of these calls right now. But really what we're doing is just listening and waiting to see for when the working groups are ready for input on things.

So the first set that we have here the first formal set that we have in this is providing input on the preliminary report when that comes out and trying to point out issues that we think are going to be important for implementation.

And so also just generally following PDPs with an eye toward implementation issues so that's what all these staging issues are about in there. Do you guys have any questions at this point about that stage of the process? It's pretty straightforward but if you have any questions we're more than willing to answer obviously.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, this is J. Scott. I have a question.

Amy Bivins: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Amy, is that input going to be input that will be provided straight to the working group before the reports are out for public comment or would that be submitted by staff as a public comment that they commit - that they provide during that process?

Amy Bivins: I think - J. Scott, I think it depends. I think for the most part - and I'll tell you guys I'm really new as well, I've been at ICANN for about 8 months. But in my experience so far generally it's when a report goes out for public comment we'll generally look it over as well, it's in our comments over to the policy staff that are working on the PDP or that are working with the PDP and then they share that information with the working group.

    I don't know if you have any - Karen, do you want to weigh in on that?

Karen Lentz: No, I agree with you and Marika has her hand raised to comment as well.

Amy Bivins: Yeah, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just indeed to confirm I think at least the practice as it has been so far is that, you know, policy staff usually reaches out to GDD staff but we sometimes will, you know, check in as well with compliance staff, legal staff just to see if they have any feedback or input on the recommendations that are in the initial report.

    And then usually, you know, we work through those, you know, because sometimes there may be issues that the working group already discussed or considered or that, you know, there may be questions on why something was recommended that we can answer and we then try to package it and situate that indeed those specific items that indeed will need, you know, may need clarification on the working group should review as part of the review of other comments they should consider.

    And usually we submit those directly to the working group and haven't really submitted them as public comments as such. I mean, I think that is, you know, if working groups feel strongly or the community feels strongly that that kind of input should come through a public comment, you know, we can definitely consider that.

But I think just to note as well sometimes those kind of comments may come in at an earlier stage as well especially if we see that certain recommendations, you know, or if, you know, even if the working group has specific questions on whether something is implementable or whether it has any kind of impact on existing policies we may already go and check at an earlier stage.

And in most cases the policy staff serves as an intermediary between, you know, the working group and staff members that may have input or feedback on those.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Amy Bivins: Thanks, Marika. And this is Amy again. Okay so after the staging phase, and we consider that all the way until a specific policy recommendation or a set of recommendations has been sent to the Board after it's been approved by the GNSO and providing input on the report that goes to the Board, we consider all of that prep work before the actual implementation starts so we're calling that the staging process.

So after a Board - or after the Board passes a resolution that's when we really start the planning process. And part of what we're doing is we're working on creating just a set of - set checklists that are internal documents that are just things that GDD staff need to be sure - information that the GDD staff needs to be sure to get from policy staff, things like the industry of a policy recommendation and reports and things like that.

So all of that is involved in the handoff and at that point then the GDD team takes over the responsibility from the policy team just internally for recordkeeping purposes and in practical purposes as well.

So at that point, once the policy has been handed over, we start the recruiting of the Implementation Review Team in cases where there is one. And generally the policy team - we'll send out the email that they work with the GDD staff in coming up with the invitation for volunteers - the call for volunteers.

And that's usually done after a look at what the recommendations are. You know, in some cases it may be that they're really technical recommendations and we need more technical expertise and less policy expertise or, you know, more the technical folks and less of the lawyers that are usually on the PDPs.

So if that's the case we try in calling for volunteers for the IRT to keep that in mind as we try to recruit based on the needs of the specific project. And so at that point while the IRT is being recruited staff go ahead and try to create a draft implementation plan and just to, you know, map out what the deliverables for this implementation are going to be.

These include things like, you know, key milestones and target dates, and a description of all the issues that are going to need to be addressed. And also at this stage staff start thinking about in cases where actual policy language is going to need to be drafted by staff as part of an implementation in cases where the PDP didn't recommend actual language staff will go ahead and come up with some draft language that they can then distribute to the IRT once the IRT begins to meet so that they'll have something to talk about and to work with.

And so this is all part of the planning phase. Also, I mean, in many cases, or at least in some, there's already policy language or at least recommendations for language there so this part may go more quickly in some cases than others.

Okay. And also one thing that we wanted to point out at this stage is that staff, you know, in cases in the planning process where at the very beginning of an implementation there are obvious questions.

You know, if something comes to staff and we see it as, you know, there's just something that's not answered or ambiguities that we are going to have to make some sort of decision on, I mean, we would definitely support some sort of process for staff to be able to ask the GNSO about that at the beginning of an implementation as part of the whole planning process.

I think at various points in the conversations of the working group you guys have mentioned kind of the interrelationship between staff and GNSO and so that's definitely something that staff is open to but it's not in here just because we can't really create that process ourselves so just something to keep in mind.

Do you guys have any questions about this - the planning phase?

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I have a question.

Amy Bivins: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: When you send out solicitations for the Implementation Review Team is it your intention or do you plan to recruit members that were on the working group as well as perhaps technical experts?

Amy Bivins: Yes, I mean, I think - and practically speaking I think most of the time people who were on the working group or many of them tend to end up on the IRT.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Amy Bivins: So definitely both.

J. Scott Evans: I see that Marika has a question or a comment. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. To answer that and I think that's probably one of the
                    questions where, you know, the working group at some point will dive into
                    that as well as we look at, you know, if further guidance need to be - needs to
                    be provided in relation to how IRTs are supposed to function and operate.

                    You know, because the assumption that staff has made to date, and I think
                    that's typically as well the guidance that's provided by the GNSO Council that
                    the IRT typically consists of members that were involved in developing the
                    policy recommendations because the idea is that, you know, they know what
                    the intent of the recommendations were and they know what was meant with
                    it and, you know, the IRT in a certain extent is, you know, supposed to serve
                    as a kind of consultation mechanism or a sound board for staff.

                    If they have any questions or clarifications they can go back to their group
                    and say was this what you meant? Or, you know, for this recommendation we
                    see three different ways in which this could be implemented. What comes the
                    closest to what you believe, you know, the working group intended with those
                    recommendations.

                    However, in practice we've now seen as well that, you know, there are a
                    couple of challenges with that. Because, you know, first of all sometimes
                    there is a bit of delay between, you know, when the Board adopts the
                    recommendation - once, you know, between when the working group
                    completes its work, when, you know, the Council adopts and the Board
                    adopts and when staff had the chance to review, you know, some time may
                    go over that.

                    So by the time you then get back to a working group, you know, members
                    may already have moved on to other things. So I think that's one challenge
                    we see in having, you know, a bit of time between that.

A second one is, indeed, if we get to implementation there may be certain technical aspects that need to be dealt with or addressed that are not necessarily, you know, within the scope or the expertise of the members of the working group.

So indeed the question is how are we then able to reach or approach those experts that were not involved in the original working group in developing the recommendations, you know, without running the risk that bringing in completely new people that may not be, you know, familiar with the working group deliberations that they may end up, you know, raising a whole lot of issues that were already considered and discussed and actually start bringing policy conversations into, you know, the implementation part of the work.

So I think that is, you know, some of the questions that we from staff have identified that, you know, probably, you know, it would be good to have a further discussion around those, you know, with the working group to see what will be the appropriate guidance in those cases. Indeed is this IRT supposed to be limited to, you know, the original working group members? You know, should it be broader than that?

If it is broader than that how can you make sure that, you know, the IRT does understand that its scope is really, you know, to focus on making sure that, you know, implementation is conformed the intent of the policy recommendations and not, you know, to reopen those conversations around the original policy recommendations.

So I think those are some of the questions that, you know, we expect as well you will hopefully start dealing with as well when you get to the question on - or the charter question on implementation review team. And as said, we're as well preparing some, you know, feedback on our experience to date with IRTs and we're happy as well to provide some suggestions or ideas that, you know, we may have gathered from those experience so you can as well

consider that as you, you know, start talking about that specific aspect of the working group charter questions.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Marika, very much. Karen Lentz, I think you have a comment or question.

Karen Lentz: Sure. Thank you, J. Scott. Just briefly I wanted to add to what Marika said because in developing this framework we did have quite a lot of discussions about the IRT and what their role and composition should be.

And we did kind of see this dual role if you want to call it that where, you know, you definitely want the continuity from the working group members and, you know, you want - and this goes to I think something that Chuck Gomes raised in his comments, that you want people who will be, you know, implementing it at the contracted party level.

You know, the ones that I've been on that's been really critical as well is having, you know, the registrar who's going to build the system and interact with the customer involved as well.

So, you know, what we've kind of gotten to at least, you know, so far is that we want to, you know, in our planning we want to look at the specific policy and figure out what the implementation challenges and needs are going to be so that by the time we're recruiting the IRT we can, you know, clearly articulate what it is that we're looking for and what it is that we want them to do. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I have some connection with IRTs since I think I'm the one who proposed the concept and on the first IRT I was effectively the IRT with the help of one other person who joined in occasionally.

It's fine for us to write rules at this point but we're just learning that we want this thing to do. And I think it's going to be a work in progress for a while. So I would strongly suggest we not try to cast too much in concrete. As we experiment with the concept of an IRT with different types of PDP outcomes I think we're going to have - we're going to need flexibility and so I would urge you not to try to put too much in writing and lock too much in. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: All right. This is J. Scott again for the record. Is there any further question or discussion at this stage or do we want to let Amy go ahead and pull us on through the chart - the table? Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, J. Scott. Just a question I posted in the chat, because Karen said that when there is new consensus policy language that is drafted that it is not meant to change the substance of what the policy recommendations were. So I'm just assuming that every time this phrase is used throughout the table that it is done with that in mind as well, correct? And I see Mary has said "yes" in the chat so I guess I got my answer. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Any further comments? Concerns? Questions? Okay, Amy, turn it back over to you.

Amy Bivins: Okay. Thank you, J. Scott. Okay so once we get through the analyze...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I'm sorry, Amy, I hate to interrupt you but I just noticed that Greg Shatan has...

((Crosstalk))

Amy Bivins: Yeah, okay.

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan. Sorry, and I'm not sure if this is the best place to ask this question but I'm kind of thinking about it as I'm listening to you so I figured I would ask it before either it got to be 4 o'clock or I forgot the question, whichever came first.

And the question is how would you deal with policy that is coming out of the GAC rather than out of the GNSO since they seem to be kind of increasingly in the policy business? How does that get into implementation?

J. Scott Evans: Karen.

Karen Lentz: Yeah, Greg, this is Karen. So the intent of this document is to address policies that come out of the GNSO policy development process so they've followed that set of steps and they've been adopted by the Board and staff has been directed to implement them.

In terms of GAC advice this document - this framework isn't really intended to address that at all. GAC advice is provided to the Board and the Board has a process for, you know, considering that and making a determination as far as how to proceed with it. But that's, you know, the scope of this is really meant to address the GNSO policies that are delivered to us.

Greg Shatan: Okay. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Thank you, Karen. Thank you, Greg. Now any further questions? Anne Aikman-Scalese.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you J. Scott and I apologize if there's some explanatory email that I missed but I was trying to understand this initiative in relation to the initiative of our working group how the two fit together in that it was my understanding that our working group was tasked with recommendations with respect to these questions for the GNSO.

And so trying to understand how the initiation of this effort, having been done in a manner other than by way of input to the working group.

J. Scott Evans: Okay thanks, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Unless I'm wrong about the whole - maybe if it's consensus policy it's not a subject that we're treating under our working group. Maybe straighten me out on that.

Marika Konings: J. Scott, would you like me to try to respond to this?

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I saw your hand. I was going to acknowledge you. Thank you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, J. Scott. So, Anne, so this is Marika. So, Anne, I think the work on this implementation framework I think already - or these discussions around it I think already, you know, preceded the formal constitution of the working group.

Because I think as part of, you know, discussions that took place, you know, part of as well the staff discussion paper, you know, challenges that we had experienced ourselves in moving from policy to implementation, you know, recognizing as well that I think, you know, a few years ago you would maybe have one policy a year and that would really require, you know, that much time and effort to do it with, you know, going to three, four PDPs a year which, you know, suddenly would require a bit more planning and methodology around that.

So we started work on that, you know, thinking about the fact that from a staff perspective we need a clear framework so, you know, partly as well so between departments we're able to clearly identify the different roles and responsibilities and making sure as well that everyone in our teams understand what needs to happen, you know, basically with every, you know, policy that goes from policy to implementation.

So working on this and in parallel of course, you know, community discussion side as well about, you know, the role of the community in implementation related discussion. So at least from my perspective I think, you know, what we're basically looking at is a kind of a puzzle. And the piece you see here is really the staff's part of the puzzle where in which we try to define, you know, how from our perspective we should be, you know, conducting the implementation part of our - the task that is assigned to us by the Board.

But as part of that puzzle there will also be the community aspect and the community aspect I think at this stage that we're looking at is, for example, IRT. So how the implementation review teams, you know, interact with, you know, know, these different phases that, you know, run through the staff work. And I think that's where, you know, the working group comes in and, you know, starts thinking about how that needs to relate.

You know, there may be additional processes that need to be thought through. For example, you know, what if the GNSO Council decide not to create an implementation review team but, you know, certain issues do come up. You know, that mechanisms does staff have at that stage or what mechanisms does the GNSO Council have at that stage to raise certain flags? Or, you know, one recommendation could be that an implementation review team is always a requirement.

So I think what we're basically, you know, and as well again, you know, this is a draft framework so we're also looking for, you know, feedback and input from the community on how you believe, you know, this looks and if it meets as well the expectation that you would have from staff when, you know, we take charge of the implementation related activities.

So I think, you know, the pieces are very closely related and we really hope that this is, you know, becomes as well part of, you know, what the working group will eventually present as showing the complete picture of, you know,

what implementation will look like both from, you know, the staff framework but also the community aspects that are, you know, interlinked and related to that as they engage with staff on the implementation related activities.

So I hope that clarifies to a certain extent...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: May I ask a follow up? May I ask a follow up on that one, J. Scott?

Marika Konings: Sure.

J. Scott Evans: Go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, I'm, again, you may have stated this before but what's the next procedural step for this draft consensus policy implementation framework? Does it go to the GNSO? Does it go to just to us to incorporate? Does it go to public comment? Does it - where is it headed?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can give you my perspective and Amy and Karen may have additional ones. I think, you know, in principle this is really intended as, you know, a staff framework so we have a list of what needs to happen.

And, you know, we mention as well there should be certain checklists associated to this so this is a kind of I think information piece that we would like to provide to the community that explain at least how, you know, staff intends to, you know, work through implementation in a more methodological way than I think we have done to date.

You know, any input you may I have I think is very welcome. If you believe it would be helpful to, you know, share this broader or, you know, have public comment on it, you know, we're happy to consider that as well.

But I think at this stage at least we see it more as a kind of, you know, internal outline of how implementation from the staff perspective needs to be conducted.

I think, you know, and this is, again, my personal opinion, I think it would be very helpful to, for example, once the working group gets to its recommendation that this is included as part of the initial report so it does show the complete picture.

And again, you know, if people want to submit comments on this specific document as part of that I think that would be very welcome as well because I think at least from our perspective we're really looking at this as a, you know, collaborative effort.

We're, you know, we're in this together so I think we're trying to find a way that, you know, you are comfortable with, you know, how we propose to do our part of the work and hopefully you feel the same that we also feel comfortable about, you know, the role that the community plays in that part as it, you know, at the end of the day it is a kind of partnership of working through this and, you know, coming up with a successful implementable policy that, you know, everyone believes need to be intend of the original policy recommendations.

So I think that's a bit where we're at...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: One final follow up, is this something staff is implementing now?

Marika Konings: Not sure - I think we're trying to follow these stages but it's, as said, you know, this is still in development so I think, you know, for those of you that have been in implementation review teams I think you will have seen I think a slow move towards, indeed, a more structured approach and indeed, you

know, grouping it into different phases and trying as well to be very specific where implementation review teams are expected to, you know, come in and provide feedback, be very clear as well when that is expected to take place.

But I think, as we said this is really, you know, this is work in progress so we're trying to do it more along these lines as we go but, you know, as we're, you know, still working on this as well it's not, you know, set in stone or really the firm rule for everything we're doing at the moment. And I probably shouldn't refer to it, Amy and Karen here, because of course they're the ones more hands on with regard to current implementation efforts.

J. Scott Evans: Okay...

Karen Lentz: Yeah, this is Karen. I just agree with what Marika says.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. I have a question that I was going to wait until the presentation was over to ask but it's - I think Anne kind of touched on something related. And I ask this question because I am on the implementation review team for the thick Whois PDP.

                    If I could just refer back to the first principle of transparency throughout the implementation lifecycle and the different stages you have in the (unintelligible), if I can call it that, I was just wondering what did staff envision when they drafted this in terms of transparency and reporting along each one of the different stages.

                    Because to be honest on the thick Whois implementation review team we haven't - my impression is that we haven't been getting too much detail on most of this and it seems that we're going to be waiting for reporting once the implementation plan has all been worked out as opposed to getting more transparent up to date information on each one of these different stages.

So I'm just asking what was actually envisioned in terms of transparency not just of the IRT but as this document says to the GNSO and to the community at large. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Amy?

Amy Bivins: Hi, yeah Amr. Actually I was going to answer that question when I got back to this. But I - part of this color-coded waterfall and document in the different stages that we have, what we really want to do and what we've been thinking about doing is to increase transparency have implementation status pages like we have for the policy status pages of PDPs so that you can look at a page on the ICANN Website and see where a specific implementation is in this process and to get more information about implementation just because there's not much about that on the Website right now. Is that helpful?

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr again. Maybe somewhat but it still doesn't make clear to me what you see, I mean, I'm thinking staff drafted this document, which I think is fantastic, but I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on how you're going to share all this information with everybody, you're going to sort of post it on the ICANN Website or on a community wiki page for an implementation team - a staff implementation team.

And is it going to be communicated differently to different parts of the community such as the IRT as opposed to the rest of the community for one reason or another? So I'm just curious at this point. Thanks.

Amy Bivins: It looks like Karen may have wanted to comment on that.

J. Scott Evans: I'm sorry, Karen, go ahead.

Karen Lentz: Sure. Thanks, Amr. So, you know, to build on what Amy said about, you know, creating more visibility on the Web pages one of the things that we've

tried to do is also to build communications into the template project plan and, you know, the more, you know, detailed steps that somebody inherits when they become the project leader for an implementation project.

You know, part of those checklists and part of the, you know, expectations that they're required to do before they something is complete is to, you know, undertake communication so it doesn't go down to, you know, exactly what form that might take in every case. Certainly all of the proceedings of the IRT are public and available.

And as Amy said, we do want to build a more comprehensive resources where you can see, okay, here's all the things that are in the process of implementation, here's where they are in terms of these stages, here's the timeline, here's the, you know, most recent activity and all of that.

And so that there are two ways going about it, one is to, you know, create the resource and two is to build the communication steps into the procedures. But if you have, you know, additions to - in that regard that you think we should think about that would be welcome as well.

J. Scott Evans: Great. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. With regard to that I'm a great fan of openness but I'm also not a great fan of death by disclosure. And I worry a little bit about putting in plans the requirement to document things in completely public ways at every level for every possible set of audiences.

I think it's really important that the implementation review teams be kept up to date. I'm not as convinced that everything has to be documented. You can end up spending three times as much time documenting as doing the work. So I think we need to be reasonable on what we're asking for. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Alan. I see that Cheryl is voicing her agreement by check. We've got about five minutes left. Do you think, Amy, you could finish going through this table in that time?

Amy Bivins: Yeah, I can try to do it really quickly and then if you guys have further questions after we definitely want to keep working with you guys on this so the more feedback the better.

Okay so in the analog phase this is really when GDD staff start working with the IRT. If there's new draft language for a policy or if we're working on proposing a new service this is when we start really working with the IRT on this and, you know, talking to the IRT about what staff is envisioning for the implementation, getting feedback from the IRT, working with service providers as maybe needed if there's a new service that's going to be coming out or changes to an existing service.

And then moving on into the design phase this is where once this - the implementation is moving along and the IRT is up to date and generally receptive to what's going on this is where we would solicit public comment potentially on an implementation.

And there's a presumption that we will seek public comments on language and an implementation plan. And then in response to the public comments the GDD staff will make changes potentially working with the IRT and also other internal staff. And then once that is done we'll begin finalizing the new service or policy language and consulting, again, with the IRT and with internal staff on that.

And then if there are changes or significant changes since the first time something was posted GDD staff would consider or should consider posting again for public comment and getting more feedback from the community and then following the general process of updating if needed in response to the public input.

And then at that point once a policy or service is ready to go that's when we set the effective date of the policy. And this is getting into the policy change calendar that we were talking about and working on and announcing this to the contracted parties and to the community at large about the new policy. And this is moving into the actual implementation phase of our - this framework.

And so at that point we start making educational materials, you know, trying to do outreach to the contracted parties to be sure that they know what's coming, what the changes are, sending reminders periodically to let contracted parties know that changes are coming and also working with compliance to get them ready to start enforcing the policy changes once the effective date has passed.

And so at that point once a policy effective date has been announced and that's set out then the GDD staff begin handing over the project to compliance, compliance starts gearing up for enforcement and then the goal is to continually monitor the policy once it's gone into effect to see how it's working.

So the goal we think is to come up with ways to measure how effective a policy is during the implementation ideally so that we can get a better idea after a policy has been implemented if it's working how it should.

So that's basically the end and that was quick in the end but if you guys have questions please ask.

J. Scott Evans: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This is more a question indeed in relation to next steps. You know, we know it probably will take some time for everyone to, you know, digest the information. We'll definitely, as well, you know, encourage

those that weren't on the call to listen to the recording and, you know, hopefully on that if there are any further questions or suggestions or ideas, you know, people can maybe share that on the mailing list.

I know Chuck already went through it and provided some detailed comments so I guess, you know, one of our questions would be, you know, is it helpful, you know, if Amy and Karen are available, you know, to come back next week and try to walk through those questions? Is it more helpful if, you know, we provide some written responses or feedback on, you know, for example, what Chuck suggested?

Or, you know, at this stage we'll just take that input and, you know, update or make changes as we deem, you know, appropriate or necessary based on that feedback. So I think I'm trying to see what would be the most helpful from the working group's perspective at this stage.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I think it might be helpful if we had staff to go through Chuck's questions and any other questions that the folks in the group today, after digesting some of this or those on the list might pose with regards to this given that.

And then we, you know, as we get through that because one of the aims you talked about, Marika, might be that as part of our report we point to this process to say this is, you know, we're only dealing with the community side, there's also the staff side and make reference to this particular policy. But what do others in the group think?

Do they agree with me that it would probably be beneficial if we had them come back and work through some of the questions that Chuck has put forward and any additional questions? Michael Graham, I see your hand is arisen.

Michael Graham: Yes, having gone through them I think if they could start off with Chuck's list and then anyone else especially having gone through most of this today anyone else has questions either in terms of definition what's meant by this, how they fit together, I think that would be excellent to put that together and submit it to staff and get their responses to it.

J. Scott Evans: I see lots of agreements. So that will be our plan if Amy and/or Karen are free next week to join us, same bat time, same bat channel. It is now 1:02 which means we have gone over our allotted time.

So if we're in agreement I will bring this call to a conclusion with the understanding that next week we will all meet again and we will begin our discussion with looking at the questions and concerns and points that Chuck has raised in his written comments that he made. We will do that on the call next week so that we can all consider the answers together.

Thank you, Karen and Amy not only for the presentation today - and I should I guess include Berry since he does waterfall charts so beautifully - thank you also for this wonderful document that we were able to review today that I personally, not speaking for the group, believe is headed in a very good direction and very pleased to see that we're all thinking sort of in a mature fashion towards the same end.

So with that I thank everyone for their time. We will all meet again next week at this same time. And thank you also, Marika, for circulating everything to it this week and, Mary, again, for helping us come up with our agenda. And we will speak again next week. Ciao.

Amy Bivins: Thank you, J. Scott.

Marika Konings: Thanks, everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for joining today's conference, you may disconnect at this time.

END