
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council**

Thursday, 16 April 2020 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/u8B-JL-s-203T9fEswSDBPNxW42_Kf2s0CII__JYnRy8ViQBNiShNbUaNLfM_IODxxNWDyu4GV3EyXox
[icann.zoom.us]

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/xdFbdLrz0HxJaKf07Er7Aq86lbjEX6a80XJM_Kdeyh2bL7AFQKubZnWsr6_fshba?startTime=1587038442000 [icann.zoom.us]

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar> [gns0.icann.org]

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Erika Mann

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon, Greg Dibiase

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Keith Drazek, Sebastien Ducos

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Tom Dale

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Scott McCormick, Philippe Fouquart, Osvaldo Novoa, John McElwaine, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Juan Manuel Rojas, Elsa Saade (apologies, proxy to Rafik Dammak), Tatiana Tropina (joined late, proxy to Farell Folly), Rafik Dammak, James Gannon, Farell Folly

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlton Samuels

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

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.

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer

ICANN Staff

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional

Marika Konings – Senior Advisor, Special Projects (apology sent)

Mary Wong – Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant

Emily Barabas – Policy Manager

Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist

Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager

Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations

Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO council meeting on the 16th of April 2020. Councilors, would you please acknowledge your name when I call it out? Thank you ever so much. Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon.

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tom Dale.

TOM DALE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks, Marie. Scott McCormick.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: John McElwaine.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip Petillion

FLIP PETILLION: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Flip. Philippe Fouquart.

PHILLIPPE FOUQUART: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Osvaldo Novoa. I don't see Osvaldo in the attendee list. We'll reach out to him. Elsa Saade has sent her apologies and has given her proxy to Rafik Dammak. So Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Rafik. Tatiana Tropina has sent her apology for the first half of the call, so will be joining for the second half, and has given her proxy to Farrell Folly. Farrell Folly?

FARRELL FOLLY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Juan Manuel Rojas.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: James Gannon.

JAMES GANNON: [inaudible].

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Carlton Samuels. I do see Carlton in the Zoom room. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We'll be reaching out to Cheryl in a few minutes. Erika Mann. I don't see Erika in the Zoom room either. Johan Helsingius.

JOHAN HELSINGIUS: Here, Nathalie. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. So from staff, we have David Olive, Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Ariel Liang, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Terri Agnew, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for recording purposes, and a reminder to councilors that we're now using a Zoom webinar room, so you've all been promoted to panelists. You can activate your microphones and participate in the chat as per usual. I would however remind you that we're welcoming observers today. They're in the attendee list. And in order for them to be able to read the chat, please make sure to change your chat settings. At the bottom at the chat pod, rather than to just panelists, set it to all panelists and attendees. That way, observers can also follow the chat discussion. Thank you ever so much, Keith, and it's over to you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. Hello everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening as usual. I'd like to welcome everybody to the GNSO council call of 16 April 2020. I'd like to just take a moment first to just say that I hope everybody, each of you and your families and your colleagues are staying safe and healthy during this challenging time. One of the things that we will discuss today at the outset of our meeting is the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on us, our communities, our stakeholder groups, and essentially on our ability over the next six months to conduct our work. That will then lead into a discussion of work prioritization. But I did just want to note that I'm hoping that everyone is staying safe and healthy.

I'm going to review the agenda in a moment, but I'd like to first ask if there are any updates to statements of interest.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hi Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sebastien, go right ahead. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I have partially updated my statement. As you would have seen, two weeks ago, Neustar announced that it was selling its registry division, to which I'm attached, to GoDaddy. And as GoDaddy is a listed company, this is not a transaction that goes overnight, so it'll take several months to be validated. I am still a Neustar employee at this stage but will eventually become a GoDaddy employee. All that has been put in my statement of interest and has been published. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Your update is noted, and I'd like to ask if there are any other updates to statements of interest before we move on to a review of the agenda. Seeing no hands, let's go ahead and move on.

So the review of the agenda today, we have no votes or guest speakers scheduled. We'll go through a review of the projects and action items list as usual. Item number three, there are no items on our consent agenda. Item four is a council discussion of the

impact of coronavirus and COVID-19 on us, our stakeholder groups and constituencies and the council's work.

Item number five will be a discussion of GNSO work prioritization and the 2020 onward workplan, and during that section, we will actually review a new approach that ICANN staff and council leadership have developed to try to help prioritize, help us focus our prioritization discussion. Following that, we will have a report from the transfer policy scoping team. We'll discuss the report from the transfer policy scoping team.

Then item seven, we'll talk about the RDS program management, and I think just to tee this up a little bit, as you'll recall from our face-to-face discussions during the strategic planning session in January, we talked about the concept of looking at the work that we have before us at Council in terms of a program rather than just specific projects, and there are quite a few projects under the sort of program of RDS or the registration directory services. So we'll talk a little bit about that, talk about the multiple items, multiple projects under that overall program heading.

And then we'll get to Any Other Business under item eight, which has quite a few items, so we'll want to make sure that we leave time for our AOB as we get through the other discussions. Does anybody have any updates or suggestions for the agenda? Okay, I don't see any hands, so let's go ahead, and I will now note under administrative matters that the status of the minutes for the previous council meeting, per the GNSO operating procedures, have been posted. The minutes of the council meeting of the 20th of February were posted on the 6th of March. The minutes of the

council meeting of the 11th of March were posted on the 27th of March.

Let's go ahead and now move to a quick review of the projects and action items list. And before us—I just want to note here that council leadership, myself, Pam and Rafik, met with our staff colleagues to review the project list in quite some detail. I'll note that during our last formal council meeting in March, we actually went through a deep dive on a significant portion of the projects list, and then earlier this week, Pam, Rafik and I met with Steve and Berry and our staff colleagues to go through in some additional detail and had some further conversation about the layout and the way that we're going to approach the projects list moving forward.

And one key takeaway from that conversation was that we're going to, moving forward, sort of segment out the projects in the project list. So those in one bucket that are within the control and remit directly of the GNSO council, and then a second bucket of items that have essentially moved past the council's ownership and have been moved forward to the board or implementation.

So the projects list is structured in such a way that it follows the process that we have of issue identification, issue scoping, initiation of formal working groups, the actual working group work itself, council deliberation, and then on to board-voted implementation. So we're acknowledging as we revise this project list moving forward that as we track under the status and the health codes of the projects, that we're going to focus one segment in what we can control and the second segment for those

items that are no longer in the control of the council's remit or the council. So watch for that as we move forward.

And with that, I'm going to pause and ask if Steve or Berry, if there's anything specific you would like to call out or you'd like the council to be aware of as it relates to the specific line items in the project list today. Okay, Berry, go ahead. Thank you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Nothing specifically to call out. I think you did a great overview of what we discussed earlier this week. Staff will be working on the changes and hope to have kind of the next revision available for our next council meeting.

I do agree, I think it is important to make this delineation between the council's current span of control/ownership around the completion of the project versus those that have moved on beyond the council's current activities. So hopefully, that will make this a little bit more digestible.

I still think when we get to this next version, we'll probably, as a council, still want to address some of the status and health of those and how those are maintained or more accurately reflect the current state of those projects. But I do believe these are positive changes.

In terms of individual projects to call out here to call out for current status, I don't think there is really anything to take note of, but I do encourage the council to really take a closer look at some of the details that are provided for each one as you work down the list. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. And if anybody has questions or comments, please feel free to put your hand up. To follow up Berry's comments, yeah, we felt it was important for really making the status codes and health codes meaningful, that it was important to segment this out in the way that I described, but that we also wanted to maintain and retain the visibility into the things that have been moved past council control and that we don't lose the information and the sort of visibility into where things are at the board level or during implementation, because all of that's still very important to the end-to-end management and engagement on these issues. But that really, for the purposes of council and our ability to manage our work and to have a clear warning or early warning if things look like they're getting off the rails, that we have a clear focus as to what those status codes and health codes mean for the things under our control. So I hope that's helpful. With that, let's move to the action items list, please.

Okay. Thank you very much. We have the action items list before us, and the first item on the list is actually on our council agenda today, which is a discussion of work prioritization. This is a follow-on to the discussions that we initiated and had during our face-to-face meeting at the strategic planning session in January. But clearly, under the current circumstances and where we are with the existing work and the existing PDPs, plus the impact of COVID-19 on ICANN Org, ICANN community and our ability to conduct our work, the discussions that we had in January in some ways have been overtaken by events and I think we need to take another, more careful look at the prioritization discussions. And on

that point, we'll talk a little bit more about the proposed approach that's been developed by staff and council leadership.

So I hope that, as we move into the discussion here shortly about impacts of COVID-19, that you have each had the opportunity to engage with your stakeholder groups and constituencies to be able to bring insight and perspective to our discussion today.

Next item is action item on the PDP 3.0 final report. Support staff is working with leadership on the deployment of improvements based on the time frame proposed by the PDP 3.0 small team. As we look at the PDP 3.0 final report implementation, we're looking at this in the context of as we prepare to initiate new work, new PDPs, for example, on the transfer policy, on the IDN issue, and we've already done this on the IGO protections work track, is that the implementation of PDP 3.0 recommendations are sort of before us, in the future, the near future as we discuss the initiation of new policy work.

The next item is reference to managing the IDN variant TLDs. This is another one where we have the opportunity as a council to initiate the chartering, the charter drafting for the group and to incorporate the PDP 3.0 improvements there. At some point, we will need to reach out to the ccNSO to engage with them directly on the IDN issue to make sure that our parallel processes are at least informed of one another's work and ideally not inconsistent in the approach.

Next item is an action item for evolution of the multi-stakeholder model of governance. This is another item that we have. The action here was, if you'll recall, going into and coming out of

ICANN 67 virtual, we had discussed having some engagement with other parts of the ICANN community, including the GAC, including the board who specifically each had requested some update on our PDP 3.0 work and specifically, we wanted to identify where our PDP 3.0 efforts over the last couple of years have actually addressed several of the items that were identified in the evolution of multi-stakeholder model effort that took place last year. So we had talked about, following ICANN 67, possibly conducting a webinar for the community broadly on the PDP 3.0 work, and that's an opportunity that we still have before us and that we need to discuss and plan and try to figure out when the right time to do that will be.

That brings us to the end of our open action items. The rest on the list have been completed. So if there are any questions or comments about any of these, please put your hand up. If not, we will move back to the agenda and to our next item.

Thank you very much. So item number three would have been the consent agenda, but we haven't items on it, so we can move directly to item number four which is our council discussion on the impact of coronavirus and COVID-19.

I just want to bring everybody up to date. Over the last couple of weeks, the SO and AC leaders have had two meetings with Göran and with David Olive and ICANN staff to discuss the impact of the coronavirus and COVID-19 on ICANN, on the ICANN community and the ability for us to continue to do the work of the broader community. And it is the estimate of ICANN Org that we're currently working at approximately 70% capacity based on the fact that many of us, if not all of us, are essentially locked down, have

other responsibilities, in some cases may have children at home or family members at home that are requiring attention, schooling, etc., and that frankly, there's the possibility that there are members of the ICANN community who may become ill.

So the discussions have been taking place about what is the impact and how do we, as a community and the community leaders, ensure that we can continue to do the work that is critical or important or time sensitive but also recognize that we may have parts of our community or members of our community that are unable to continue to engage in the manner that we had prior to the onset of this pandemic?

One of the concerns that Göran raised directly to us was the concern about the legitimacy of the outcomes or the outputs of any process if people and groups are unable to participate in the way that they're expected to under the multi-stakeholder model and our bottom-up consensus policymaking processes. And essentially, the legitimacy of the output and the concern about possible capture if certain groups are not able to participate.

So I just wanted to make sure that everybody understood that that conversation was taking place and is taking place, it's an ongoing discussion of the SO and AC leaders with ICANN Org, Göran and David in particular, and that this is an opportunity today for us as a GNSO council to discuss the impact of coronavirus on our respective groups, on our ability as a council to do our work, and so that's the setup for this conversation.

I will note that there has been some email traffic over the last 24 hours, e-mail from Marie on behalf of the BC, and then I think an

e-mail from Michele on behalf of contracted party participants in the EPDP about sort of the impact of coronavirus and a desire to focus and to actually spend some time specifically talking about EPDP.

So I wanted to note that, and that's fine that we have that conversation today, but I'd like to start this conversation with a broader discussion or a discussion about if there are any reports from or concerns about this topic from each of the stakeholder groups and anybody that would like to contribute.

I'm going to open up the queue. Michele, I see your hand. If anybody else would like to get in queue, please do.

MICHELLE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. I suppose a couple of comments I would make would be in relation to the overall kind of economic impact. For those of us offering services in the Internet infrastructure space, it's been an interesting time. I suppose that's putting it mildly.

I've spoken to colleagues in various parts of the globe over the last few weeks, and I think experiences have varied quite a bit, but there's definitely a much greater need from just about everybody for online services. So I think many of us have been managing that scaling quite well and haven't had major headaches, but there's definitely issues arising where some clients are having difficulty paying bills. I'm also hearing issues in some quarters where people are having issues physically accessing datacenters and the like, which of course is kind of concerning.

It's been good to see that quite a few of our registry colleagues, both the ccTLD space and the gTLD space, have actively engaged and have implemented a variety of schemes to assist, as it were, I suppose, to use kinda the broadest term, the more obvious ones being kind of like waiving restore fees for deleted domains, or deleting domains, rather. Some have extended grace periods, and others have been working on various other incentives.

I think the kind of general view for some of us from smaller operations is that a lot of our attention and focus over the last few weeks has been on those kind of day-to-day operations and dealing with some of the challenges that come with that, because most of us now are operating in a distributed fashion whereas a lot of us would have been going into offices, which of course, we can't really do right now. It's an interesting time.

Overall, I don't think from the Registrar Stakeholder Group side we have any specific issues. I don't think we, in terms of the ICANN part of it in terms of GNSO work and all that. But I think you can see, as we mentioned in the e-mail that I sent earlier, we're quite happy to keep plowing ahead with a lot of those activities. But I think there are going to be widespread and deep economic impacts of all of this, and we really don't know what the hell those are going to look like. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Michele. Maxim, you're next.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I'd like to note that the current assessment of the impact is based on the current data, and we haven't seen all the secondary effects yet of businesses stopped working, etc. and I think there will be a need of additional assessment in one month, in three months and in six months. Maybe we'll have to reduce number of subjects on the plate. Thanks. Due to natural reasons, the less companies are able to devote time of their staff to the work of policy bodies, the less volunteers we have.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Maxim. Next, we have John McElwaine and then Rafik. John, go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Hi. You'd just kind of asked what we're seeing within our constituency. I can say subjectively we have a few projects going on, comments, things like that. Getting an awful lot of people requesting more time to get their comments in. So you can tell that there's some stress on people being able to find the quality time to sit down and do the work of the community. With respect to calls, I think all of us, our schedules have magically cleared. So we have had the ability to get people onto calls, but finding that quality time to actually sit down and do the work. In fact, if anybody hears a lawnmower in the background, it's my neighbor mowing right now. So it's hard to, I think, find people to sit down and have those chunks of time really to focus on some of the work.

I notice, too, again, we have some comments going on, we're having a harder time getting volunteers. I think getting back to the

big picture, Keith, that you introduced, or what Göran had said, I think that the 70% figure is about correct. I might have said, when I look within my business and the metrics that we're seeing at a law firm, it's at about 75%, maybe 80% capacity. And I think it is a good point that legitimacy does come into question if we can't make sure that we're having the proper focus and people are feeling like they're left out because of particular pressures at home or at work.

So I think this is a great conversation to be having, and that's sort of my input. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, John. Very helpful. And I think your point about the lawnmower is a good one in the sense that when working from home and having distractions that we might not otherwise have in the office, it does become a challenge. I think your point about the quality of the work is an important one. Quality time to be able to conduct your work is an important one to note, and I think we're all dealing with that and adjusting to that, especially for those who have not previously worked from home for significant portions of their job. So thanks for this, John. Rafik, rue next, and then over to James.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. When asking the question to NCSG member, we could hear different opinions. Mostly everyone is under different situation, like [shelter in place,] lockdown, or self-confinement and so on. So some might find more time to focus on ICANN Org,

surprisingly, but other, because family engagements or when they have their kid and so on, they are impacted in their work. Also, those who are most involved because of their work and they're impacted by the current situation.

So I think at this stage, it's maybe hard to assess accurately the situation for this month or maybe next, but I think this is maybe something to be revisited later and to see how things are going for everyone. So it just is kind of hard maybe to give firm assessment because really depending on the situation of the individuals, because at the end, many of us are volunteers and ICANN just represent part of their involvement and they're participating on other area too. So this is the kind of sense that I get and it's something to probably revisit and get maybe a better assessment in coming weeks. And hopefully, it should be better.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Rafik. I think your point—and I think Maxim made a similar point about this is an evolving situation and we're going to need to have regular check-in points to see how we're all doing, particularly around our capacity to do our jobs and to play the role that we do in the ICANN community. It's going to change over time and we're just going to need to be cognizant of that. So thanks, Rafik.

James, you're next, and then Phillippe, and then John, I think that's an old hand if I'm not mistaken. So James, over to you.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. I'll keep it brief. Rafik made the bulk of the comment that I wanted to make. But first, some context maybe for other councilors. From the discussions I've had with some of our NCSG members, I think we are potentially uniquely impacted due to the group that we represent. A lot of our members and our folks work for NGOs and are actually networking on humanitarian relief and other similar projects due to the pandemic situation, right up to some of our own leadership. We're missing Elsa here because she's actually working on the ground on realistic impacting things.

So in terms of capacity for our group in particular, what we've seen is a pretty large impact. A lot of our folks are not in a situation where their day jobs allow them to have flexibility to do things like ICANN given current situations. When you're looking at the humanitarian relief side of things, they are already 3-400% over capacity. So I think particularly from our side, we are going to see capacity issues in the coming months.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, James. Over to you, Phillippe, and then to Flip.

PHILLIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. From the ISPCP's side, I just want to echo what Keith, you just said, when you had that discussion with Göran. Basically, I don't think the ISPs are concerned about the impact on their own activities within the constituency, if you like, but the concern is definitely there about having legitimacy of the outputs of the structure.

There's a concern about not having cross-community discussions, for instance. There's a concern about not having joint meetings. And I think that's the most challenging part, thinking ahead, of our next virtual meeting—or meetings for that matter.

So that's for the process. On the substance [inaudible] echo what others have said. I think there are good news. The DNS is robust, the ISPs are robust too, but many unknowns in the equation, including how long that's going to last. So I think that whatever we come up with for the next meeting, we may consider this being a model for future meetings as well. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thank you, Phillippe. And we have ICANN 68 discussion as an AOB item, but I'll take this opportunity to note that there was a meeting yesterday of the ICANN 68 planning group, which is the leaders and representatives of the SOs, ACs, SGs, Cs broadly to come together with ICANN, David Olive and Sally Costerton primarily to discuss the format and the structure and the approach for ICANN 68 virtual, which I'm sure everybody has seen is going to be a virtual meeting now entirely. No face-to-face in Kuala Lumpur.

So those conversations are underway in terms of trying to figure out how to structure our next—and essentially the second—virtual ICANN meeting, in this case the policy forum. So those conversations are taking place, we'll have some more input on that as well when we get to AOB. Thanks for that input, Phillippe. Flip, over to you.

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you, Keith. I would like to echo actually a lot of what has been said already and a couple of the points that I wanted to make have been made, so I'm not going to repeat them.

I think we should not underestimate the psychological effect of the situation. You may think you have more time. I don't think so. The message I take from that is we should act wisely. We should not over hasten things. We should focus on the right things. Some things need to be done, and others are under discussion and these discussions should continue as planned. We should not change our plans just because we are in that situation. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Flip. That's helpful, and I think a good setup for perhaps the next part of this discussion. And I know that because there's been some discussion about DNS abuse and EPDP and the subject matter and focus of the EPDP, I want to provide and update here. And then I know that there was already, as I said, some e-mail traffic on the list on this topic from Marie and Michele and we can get into that next.

But I want to note that the GAC on two fronts has expressed concern and a desire for either an extension or a slower pace of work in first the EPDP and second in the subsequent procedures PDP. So we've heard now from the GAC as an important part of our multi-stakeholder community that they are concerned about either the existing pace of work or the timeframes and the timelines that we're working towards.

And I think it's important for us to not discount or ignore concerns that are being raised by other parts of the community. The GNSO and the GNSO council through our management of our PDPs actually create work for other parts of the community. During the So and AC leaders discussion with Göran, we talked about this in terms of prioritization, in terms of looking at the bigger picture of ICANN's priorities and responsibilities as we approach the next six months.

ICANN has produced a draft engagement paper that you should have seen. If you haven't seen it yet, I'll make sure it gets to the list. this was just circulated this week. But the discussion was around the prioritization of ICANN's work, and it was clear that each SO and AC has its priorities, but there are also external forces or external influences on the broader community, and in many cases, our work in the GNSO is an external impact on other parts of the community in terms of their work. I hope I'm making that clear enough.

Essentially, each group has its internal priorities and then there are sort of cross-community or cross-cutting priorities, and many of those cross-community or cross-cutting priorities or influences come from the GNSO. And we need to be cognizant of that and make sure that we understand that the work that we're doing, that we're responsible for, have impacts on other parts of the community.

So with that, in this particular case, I think the GAC expressed some concern that the subsequent procedures PDP was actually moving faster than was sort of predicted or was planned for in the project change request that we approved recently for that group,

which had a target of the end of the year, basically December 2020 for delivery of the subsequent procedures final report.

The SubPro group is actually moving faster than that, and in conversations with Jeff and Cheryl, the December 2020 date that was included in the project change request was actually the worst-case scenario from the perspective of the PDP leadership and the staff and council liaison. The fact that they're moving faster has caused some strain among the GAC in terms of their ability to participate according to their report or from the e-mail, the letter that was sent to the SubPro leaders.

So it's just something that we're going to need to keep an eye on. I think the fact that the date that was submitted to us in the project change request was a worst case scenario, that was actually good from a process management perspective, but the GAC clearly felt like that was not worst-case scenario, that that was the schedule that the SubPro group was working towards. So we've got some challenges there in terms of perspective.

In EPDP, there was a request from the GAC to pause the group or to extend the group because of concerns about their ability to participate. I actually had a call with Janis and Manal and another representative from the GAC's EPDP team earlier this week to talk this through, and essentially right now, the situation is—it became clear that it wasn't only about the current timing and timeline that there were actually some substantive matters that members of the GAC wanted to have included in the conversation in the EPDP such as data accuracy, legal versus natural, and privacy proxy, that it wasn't just a question of concerns about the timing and their ability to participate and contribute in the EPDP for the delivery of

the phase two policy recommendations on the SSAD, it was that there was actually a desire for additional time to discuss other issues that are not on the critical path for the SSAD policy recommendation.

But again, what we're hearing from the GAC are concerns about the pace of the work and the schedule of the work, and I'm just putting the marker down that we have to be cognizant of that, and under these current challenging circumstances, have to take these concerns seriously.

So that's enough from me. I'll open up the floor right now. And I don't know if Marie or Michele or anybody else would like to specifically get to the point that you've raised about the work of the EPDP. Marie, go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Yes, Keith. Thank you so much. Firstly, I'd like to reiterate what you said at the top of the call. I really hope that all of you guys are well and healthy and your families are. And even the guy in John's back garden who's doing his grass, I hope he's good too.

On the specific point of the e-mail that the BC circulated yesterday, picking up on some of the comments that you just made right now, Keith, we as the BC itself are not seeing any difficulty in the pace of the work. We're not seeing any people being affected by virus, thank god for that, so far.

Our concern about, in particular the EPDP if we start there, is that to us, the items related to data accuracy, to legal versus natural, these are very much part of the EPDP charter. They were

punted—for want of a better term—out of phase one in the compromise agreement that they would be fully discussed in phase two. We don't really see the June deadline as being set in stone. We think it's rather artificial. And completely agree with the GAC here that we need to discuss these things properly. They matter. They're important.

[About the] GAC, I don't know where they are with their withdrawal request. Sorry, their request as to whether or not they want timeline to be extended. [inaudible]. But again, on your legitimacy point, I could fully understand that we may be losing some of our GAC representatives to the national COVID-19 responses, and we need to be very sure that whatever comes out of the EPDP can't be questioned for legitimacy either for artificially short deadlines or also because our GAC friends couldn't actually be present. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Marie. I'll put myself in queue, but I want to get to those others in queue. So Greg, and then Rafik.

GREG DIBIASE: Hey. So I guess I just start on the idea of accuracy. Among the registrar group, we do think adding this to the EPDP at this point is an expansion of the scope. The EPDP was always very specific and narrow in scope to ensure the new registration data policy is compliant with GDPR. And as we've kind of noted in a lot of places in this call, resources are tight and we should be focusing on the work that is currently before us.

Right now, there's really good work that has been done in the EPDP that has gone out to public comment, and it seems like we should focus on what is on our plate and finalize this work which has taken so much time and effort, and I think it's really good work as opposed to expanding the scope and expanding the timeline which opens up a lot of other questions. If we expand the timeline, it seems like Janis might not be able to chair in the future. We might have volunteer fatigue as this thing moves on. So we just kind of feel like there's really good work that's been accomplished. We believe what is in scope has been discussed and we should move forward with the timeline as it's set now. Basically to finalize this work that everyone's worked so hard on.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Greg. Rafik, you're next.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Keith. So I think it's important to recall maybe some factors or facts. The EPDP team already adjusted its timeline and it was in December trying to deliver because there was that push to deliver on time and that's how much the SSAD is a priority.

And if we take that factor that we are trying to do a better project management or program management here, and even if we take into account the current situation that I think everyone understands, it's important that how we can ensure that we are functioning and finishing our projects. It will be quite risky to extend or create delay because it's kind of in contradiction with

what we heard in terms of expectation before that we need the SSAD. So any extension can put in jeopardy the SSAD itself.

And if we come back to the topic that I understand that they are important for some groups like accuracy, legal versus natural and so on. I want just to remind everyone that EPDP team spent a lot of time deliberating on those topics and it was [inaudible] and it was clear that it's really hard to reach some consensus in how to move forward on those items.

So I think here the question is what we really need, what we are expecting. At the end, what was clear from the beginning is we wanted the SSAD, that we could not work on that in phase one, so phase two, that was the focus.

Priority two was a way trying to do as much as possible work, but in the situation that we are more like in mode of business continuity, it's important to get what's the high priority first and get things done. And that's the SSAD.

The team isn't the way to resolve many of the issues there. There are still other items to work on and we are doing now the current review of the public comments, but I think we are kind of close to reach that goal. So there are still maybe some unknown, there are still some risk, but it's important [to folks to have one goal] and to get that done. Trying to cover as much as possible and extension is always risky, because we could spend more time deliberating more but we might not reach any conclusion if we don't change really the kind of parameters of that work.

So it's better to do scoping, as we say, decoupling [inaudible] work and maybe a more proper context and with better factors to reach that delivery on those priorities. We can probably discuss how we can insure that they are done in timely manner, but it's important to get something done first, and that should be the SSAD.

We know also about the situation with Janis as the chair, that he cannot go beyond the 30th of June, and he is one of, I think, the elements that led the EPDP team to make progress. So that's another risk that we need to take into account if we lose him because he had other engagement. So it can really put us in high risk that we don't get things in timely manner for longer time.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Rafik. And I thank you for your work as the council liaison and vice chair of the EPDP, of course. And your point about Janis is an important one.

I'm also in queue, but I want to go to John and then Michele, then I'll make a comment and then we need to move on. We're already over time. This is an important topic to discuss, but we do need to move on in our agenda. So John, then Michele, then myself, and then we'll move on.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks, Keith. I'd just like to point out that accuracy is going to be the key to the SSAD. If it's bad data in the WHOIS records, then obtaining it is going to do nobody any good. And we're particularly not even getting into coronavirus type scams, but just I can see in

my own practice that malicious use of domain names is on the increase, so having accurate information is important.

It's also my understanding that a compromise was reached to move the issues that we're discussing now into phase two, so I just think the optics of this look bad. We're in the midst of a pandemic, we have people who are having a hard time being able to devote their time to do all this, or again, some members not being able to devote any time, and the reason is that one person—granted, the chair—can't extend, I just really think it looks bad not to deal with the issues all in this phase two. Even if we need a little bit more time, I think the EPDP can get together and figure out how much time they need, and we can handle this like any other sort of project request. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, John. Michele.

MICHELLE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Just a couple of things. First off, the idea that anybody would want to extend a PDP of any kind, whether it's an EPDP or any kind of PDP, that they would want to make it longer than it already is, I do find that kind of amusing.

One of the biggest criticisms that have been laid at the feet of council, the GNSO as a whole and ICANN in general for years has been that our processes are too slow, that we take forever to do anything, that if you're trying to build a business around anything involving this space, you better not rely on ICANN to make a decision because it takes so long to do so.

But the request for more time comes from those parties who have been pushing since they get go for swift resolution, for a fast conclusion, that have repeatedly written to ICANN and to others to ask for a quick result. I find it quite farcical.

But let's deal with the practical issues here. At present, the EPDP has a chair. Finding that chair and appointing that chair was, for those of you who lived through that experience, a long, painful and arduous process. It is not something that happened overnight. Finding the first chair was hard. When he had to step down and we had to find a replacement, it was as hard if not harder.

I honestly do not know how anybody realistically expects us to replace the chair. I don't see how that's going to happen. So, what does that mean? How can that group proceed with any further work without a neutral chair? And what is the benefit of proceeding any further, of extending the timeline? What benefits will that bring? Are they real or are they merely perceived?

In the e-mail and document that the CPH sent earlier today, we've asked some specific questions which I believe need to be addressed. Obviously not right now on this call. But if we at council are to consider any extension to the EPDP, we need to know exactly why and who is driving that.

Is it simply a question that one or two groups feel that they need more time? Is it that there are problems for specific groups? And the other thing as well [that's paramount,] the EPDP is a GNSO process. We did expand the membership to allow other groups to participate, possibly due to optics, possibly due to a certain degree of politics. But it is at its core a GNSO process.

So adding and extending it to facilitate groups that are not actually part of the GNSO seems a little bit counterintuitive to me, especially, as I've already said, those are some of the groups that were pushing for swift conclusion right up until very recently.

There are also of course the financial implications of this. To extend any working group beyond its original schedule is going to have a financial impact. It's going to have a budgetary impact which needs to be dealt with. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele, and thanks to everybody for the input. On this particular point, I think my view on this through conversations with Janis and Rafik and the conversation earlier this week with Manal and Laureen Kapin from the GAC is these issues of—let's just call out two: legal versus natural and data accuracy. These are not simple or easy topics that, by providing a one-month extension to the EPDP for example, are going to be solved.

And I think while they are important issues and important topics for discussion and consideration by the community broadly, they are not on the critical path to the delivery of policy recommendations for a standardized system of access and disclosure, the SSAD.

So I think we as a GNSO council and as a GNSO community need to figure out how to address questions related to data accuracy and legal versus natural, among possibly some other issues, and PPSAI was one that was actually referenced as well during the conversations with the GAC. And I think there's

probably an easier path forward on that one in that the EPDP is not expecting to make any additional recommendations on that and the PPSAI implementation was paused by ICANN Org pending any output from the EPDP. If the EPDP isn't going to have any recommendations on it, then we could probably ask ICANN Org to move forward with the PPSAI implementation.

But the questions of data accuracy and legal versus natural are much bigger questions that in my view are not on the critical path for the SSAD policy recommendations. And we're getting closer on that.

What is on the critical path within the EPDP for concluding its final report are the questions of automation, use cases, automation for different user groups and the evolution of the SSAD, basically creating a process that the SSAD can evolve and can be improved over time without having to necessarily go back and go through a years long PDP to make what could be implementation improvements.

So I think there's a distinction in my mind between critical path for delivery of the SSAD recommendations and other issues that may still be important. So I think we're going to need to, as a council, perhaps leading into and during our next call, our call in May, is to actually start thinking more about how we're going to engage and consider some of these other topics. And data accuracy is one where we have already communicated to the EPDP team.

We as council have already communicated that we are prepared to have a conversation about scoping and effort around the broader topic of data accuracy, what that means and trying to get

a better handle on exactly what we're talking about. But that's the kind of topic or issue that would need to be very carefully scoped and approved by the council rather than having such a broad topic take a life of its own within the EPDP, because frankly, I think that would just extend the process of the EPDP indefinitely.

Flip, I see your hand, and then we do need to move on. Thanks.

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you very much, Keith. Keith, I would like to raise a question. I don't expect an answer, it's more a rhetorical question, I think. But we should be careful and approach all projects in same way. Why would we deal differently with a project that is as important as other projects and that has been going on for two years? Why would we over haste things on that project when we actually deal with other projects for three, four, five, six years?

I think we need to install bounds and be reasonable. And I'd rather have a discussion at a specially established group of people that are supposed to be and that are specialists rather than [stop them] working and bring it to another level that could well become a pure political discussion. And I don't think anybody will be served by that. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Flip. I think the initial reaction, the view, is that those PDPs that have been going on for three, four, five, six years is not the ideal and not what we're trying to achieve. And in this particular case, I think we are close to being able to conclude on time—well, relatively on time because it's already been extended,

but on the current timeline—the policy recommendations on the SSAD and then figure out how we can actually address some of these bigger issues.

And I'm just going to throw this out there: it could be a separate PDP. We could consider as council—and I'm not advocating this—extending the EPDP for a phase three to talk about these issues after the conclusion of the policy recommendations on the SSAD.

I think there are a range of possibilities and options before us as council to consider these issues, but I am really concerned that by introducing or extending the time of the EPDP in terms of its current deadline, we introduce a lot of uncertainty. Losing Janis, who replaces Janis, who's able to step in over the course of many months to continue to work in that group and move it forward?

So I think this is something that we need to continue discussing. I think the EPDP team needs to continue working at its current timeline and its current target date of the end of June for delivery of the SSAD recommendations. But I am not in any way denying or ignoring the fact that this issue of data accuracy and the topic of legal versus natural are both very important to this process and to this community.

So I think with that, we need to move on. It's an important discussion and we will continue to have this conversation, but we do need to move on on our agenda. So thank you.

Okay, next item on the council discussion is sort of the work prioritization and workplan. And we need to be fairly brief with this, but I do want to make sure that we have the opportunity to review

the proposed approach that has been pulled together by staff and the council leadership.

So I'm going to ask if we could put up on the screen the chart. Yes, exactly, project planning. So I'm going to tee this up and then ask Steve or Berry or Marika to jump in and to help provide a little bit more context. But essentially, what we're trying to do here is to consider, rather than doing a prioritization effort, try to figure out what goes first and what comes second and third in terms of new work, we're trying to consider this in the context of we have a certain amount of capacity, there are projects in flight that will be coming to a conclusion this calendar year—and that's EPDP phase two, RPM phase one, and then Subsequent Procedures.

And the question is, are there dependencies? And where, at what point can we begin new work at the conclusion of the previous work? In other words, this is, again, looking at this at a program level instead of just at a project level. So Steve, could I turn to you? And then if anybody else is going to contribute.

STEVE CHAN:

Sure. Thanks, Keith. Actually, first just to say that [noting] distractions, there's a cat in my lap who's deciding to use her claws quite a bit this morning. So hopefully, that doesn't distract me too much. But anyway, as Keith was mentioning, the focus on this document is to sort of move away from the prioritized list which is essentially a ranked order and to look more granularly at the work here and to treat this more as a workplan.

On the first page of this document, it sets out a set of assumptions to try to help the reader understand how the work was approached or how this proposal is approached. It looks at, essentially, four factors. One is the urgency or importance of the effort, and literally, this is focused on essentially what would happen if the work was not initiated.

One of the other factors is the level of effort, and this is both from the community and staff perspective. The timing, that actually plays into the dependencies. And then finally, it talks about whether or not there are potentially small, bite-sized portions of the work that can be carved out and potentially frontloaded or done sooner rather than later so that some of the work can proceed but maybe the more substantive work, the more labor intensive part like the PDP, if applicable, that can start at a later date. but some of the preparatory work can begin now to help the council be more prepared in the future.

And some of the other things on this page, it just notes that it better integrates the recommendation, well, the wave one report related to EPDP recommendation 27 which needed some of the nuance of the approach to be included here.

I would also note that some of the efforts that—the GNSO has a role to play, but maybe not the central player in the effort like the SSR2, the RDS2, ATRT3 and Work Stream 2. Those are also not included. As I said, there's a role for the GNSO to play, but they're not the convening or chartering body, so they're not included in this work.

And then just by way of overview and touching on the chart on the next page, this high-level is really about the timing and it notes that the—actually, can we move to the next page, please? Thank you very much. So as Keith noted, the idea here is to try to understand what some of the existing work needs to complete before these additional efforts should really initiate since the discussion at the strategic plan session is that essentially, the community is already at capacity, and then with the impact from the COVID-19, that's impacted even more so.

But I guess what I want to make clear is that you see a number of these things listed after, say, the EPDP phase two. That isn't to say that all three of these things could necessarily begin afterwards. There's still some level of consideration that's needed and taken into account along the lines that I mentioned earlier, like urgency, level of effort. Those things need to be taken into account in deciding which of these items actually gets initiated.

The last thing I'd just mention real quickly is that two of these things listed here can actually begin without dependency. It's really more about when the council believes it's appropriate and has capacity to being, and those things are the IDNs and the IGO curative rights track, which I think was on target to launch its call for volunteers and expression of interest for the chair, but again, related to the coronavirus and capacity issues, that's actually one of the open questions we have for the council, is whether or not it's appropriate and timely for that work to begin. So hopefully, that helps. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Steve. That's very helpful. I'll just call out a couple of things here by way of example. You see here on this slide we've got EPDP phase two targeted to wrap up in June with the final report recommendations, and then we've got transfer policy review, policy and implementation review, and then the third item there is the accuracy scoping team that I referenced earlier. In our communication to the EPDP a few weeks ago, we basically said accuracy is something that the council will consider as a separate track, a separate discussion. So that would be separate from but following on from the work of EPDP phase two.

Steve noted that IGO curative rights track, this is the IGO protections work team or work track under the RPM umbrella. I'm going to be reaching out to Manal to find out and to assess the GAC's ability, of the IGOs' ability and capacity to participate under the current circumstances, and we'll come back to the council with more detailed information about their view on the priority and the capacity to participate, because we identified that that was one of the important components of the IGO curative rights work. And then we've got a whole lot of other stuff on this list as it relates to some of the other policies and procedures impacted by the EPDP phase one recommendations.

So anyway, any questions on this, any further input? Steve, is that a new hand?

STEVE CHAN:

Yeah, it is, Keith. Just one additional.

KEITH DRAZEK: Go ahead.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks very much. Just to add one additional thing. I did mention and touched on the fact that as part of this analysis, we tried to look at what discrete steps might be taken now. So that's included into the more detailed analysis in the following pages. But what I did want to add though is that some of those discrete steps are dependent on the parties, and in particular, the Global Domains Division or GDD.

So even if we have carved out these steps that could be taking place now, especially around reviews [or] policies, it's not to say that they will certainly have that capacity, but it's helpful to be able to identify those preparatory steps that could take place. So we can have that conversation with GDD and determine what their capacity is, what their ability to actually start that work is now. And at worst, they can at least integrate into their own work planning to make sure that they can give a sense to us of when they can actually start that work. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Steve. Your point about being able to segment out some of this work, we've already identified the distinction between a chartering effort—in other words, the charter drafting process—and the actual initiation of a new PDP for example.

So I think to the extent that we as council can get that initial piece of work done, the charter drafting and approving charters for future work, that doesn't mean that that future work has to start

immediately and that there's an opportunity for us to get our house in order and get things ready, and then as community capacity and bandwidth is available or made available, then we can pick and choose the right time to actually start those working groups.

So I think it's important that over the coming weeks and months, that we will probably, as the council, be having small teams working on charter drafting efforts and things like that for some of this future work. I just want to put that out there.

Okay, we probably need to move on, so if there are any questions, comments, feedback on this particular agenda item, put up your hand. If not, we will move on. Right, seeing no hands, let's go back to the agenda, please.

Okay. Next item, item number six, is a council discussion on the report from the transfer policy scoping team. You'll recall that—I guess it was several months ago, we requested a group come together to provide council advice or recommendations in terms of next steps of a transfer policy review process. Scoping team has met and come together to actually work on the development of this report. We're going to pause here and see if Pam would be able to speak to this issue. Pam, I apologize for putting you on the spot, but I know that this is one that you've been tracking quite closely. And if I could hand this one over to you.

PAM LITTLE:

Sure. Thank you, Keith. No problem. Yes, this was one of the policy reviews that was actually part of the original policy recommendation from the working group back many years ago,

and this policy has been in place for a few years. The council actually kind of chartered a scoping team to work on recommendations of how best to conduct this policy review, and that scoping team has delivered its report to the council that was sent to the council list, I believe.

And the scoping team was actually recommending or requesting as a first step that the council actually instruct ICANN policy staff to draft an issue report as the first [step] of initiating a PDP. And there was also a request to have that as a motion to be voted on by the council at this meeting we are having today.

But Keith, Rafik and staff and I actually had a discussion about the council workplan as a whole. In light of all the discussion we had earlier given the circumstances we are in, we were just sensitive to the fact that—the timing of starting such an issue report and would like to just have more time for our councilors to perhaps take a look at the recommendations from the scoping team and perhaps just defer this item for vote to our May meeting.

Really, we just feel that we have a very heavy agenda to discuss COVID-19 impact and the draft workplan and request for extension of EPDP, already difficult and important topics. We thought we would leave this one just as a discussion item for this meeting.

So what I would say is to councilors, Keith, is to perhaps take a look at the recommendations or the report from the drafting team and look out for the motion to vote on this item at our next month meeting. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Pam. That was perfect. And yeah, so everybody has an action item now to review the report from the transfer policy scoping team if you have not done so already, to engage with your stakeholder groups and constituencies and be prepared to come to the May GNSO council meeting to vote on basically approving the issues report request to move this forward in terms of the GNSO PDP process.

And Emily has put the link to the scoping team report in chat, and it's, I believe, linked in the agenda as well. So, any questions or comments in terms of the transfer policy scoping team report? I don't see any hands, so let us then move on.

Item seven on our agenda relates to the registration directory service, RDS program management. And with this, I will, in a moment, hand it back over to Steve for a little bit of additional context. But again, as I mentioned at the beginning of the call, one of the approaches that we're trying to move towards is looking at things a little bit more holistically as it relates to program management as opposed to just project management.

And under the RDS umbrella, there are a number of things that we have individual projects under this program. We've got the EPDP phase one recommendation 27 wave one report. Wave one report is the document that was produced by ICANN Org essentially giving the council an assessment of the other impacted policies and procedures from the EPDP phase one recommendations. And we need to figure out, as council, in fairly short order how we approach and how we plan to approach managing these other

impacted policies, in particular where there are conflicts between the EPDP phase one recommendations and existing consensus policy.

We also have the WHOIS procedure implementation advisory group that is hanging out there in the RDS review team where the ICANN board passed two recommendations to the council for consideration as it relates to the RDS review team. So we've got some additional work here. Steve, if I could hand it over to you now for any additional context that you think would be helpful for council.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Keith. I'm certainly not the expert on RDS things, so I will hopefully have Caitlin or Berry jump in to help me along, but I can start. So the first bullet here is related to the wave one report, and I think that directly ties into the workplan item above.

This first part was trying to parse out the different things that need to be done to address the wave one report. Some of that's related to just minor text changes to change things related to the admin contact for instance. And then some of the other ones are more substantive, looks at the actual policy to see if there's more substantive adjustments that need to be made.

So I think some conversation about not only—well, I guess some consideration and review of the suggested approach that was shared sometime ago from staff would be helpful, because I don't know that there's direction or approach on how to address that wave one report. I'm certainly not the expert on this, so I'd hope to

be able to defer to one of my colleagues here, but at a minimum, we need some discussion, I think, from the council to really talk about how those updates from recommendation seven should be approached.

The second one here was the WHOIS procedure from implementation advisory group is included also on the workplan. I guess the draft workplan. I don't have a whole lot of detail to provide on that one other than to say that I guess on the context of the—okay, my colleagues also don't have much to add. Yeah, just whether or not the work is timely and needs to be addressed for this one as well.

And the last one, I'm definitely not familiar with. There's a couple of recommendations that were referred to the council, and the council needs to consider what it needs to do here. So in sum, the three bullets here are really for the council to determine what next steps it needs to take, if any.

For the first bullet, there certainly is some next steps. The second one, it's really a decision about whether or not that work needs to be undertaken if and when. And the third certainly needs some next steps, at least to determine—to consider them at a minimum, but also then to determine whether or not there's actually work to be done. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Steve. Yeah, thanks for that overview. And Berry or Caitlin, if you'd like to jump in, feel free at this point. You're welcome to provide any additional context. But I think Steve

captured it well that the first one, the first [bullet,] the EPDP phase one recommendation 27 stuff is really important because we have inconsistencies between the new policy and old policies that need to go through a process for management, for resolving those conflicts.

The second one is something that's been put on hold and has been on hold for quite a while, and we need to, as a council, decide whether this is work that needs to take place, and if so, when. I think we had initially paused this work pending the finalization of the EPDP, but we probably need to do a review of that to figure out if it's even, at this stage, something that needs to be conducted at all. And then we need to review the RDS recommendations that were forwarded to us by the board.

Berry, over to you. Thank you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. I really don't have much more to add than what Steve already elegantly summarized. I'd just really like to put emphasis I guess really on the first bullet. There are a few items in that wave one report that have implied priority because Org's reaction or the communities having to react from the GDPR impact and those aspects have broken several things. And obviously, there's one that is related to Thick WHOIS, but also a second one that is related to transfers, hence why the scoping team from the transfer scoping team had already taken a look at the wave one report and recognized synergy about being able to start some of that work, not only for the primary issues that the scoping team had already identified just of the transfer policy in

isolation, but also recognizing that there was cohesion between what was also identified in this wave one report.

So if anything, the token is back on the council to thoroughly review the suggested approach so that we can basically build a next steps, go forward plan on how to address some of these. The WHOIS procedure implementation advisory group, I agree, it's been sitting on the council list for a long time. Perhaps that is a topic that could potentially go in terms of the program management [which is where accuracy is kind of throwing in.] We do need to get some traction there, or if it's no longer applicable or there's really no work, maybe the possible decision is that it just continues as is and readdressed at a later date. But again, we really need input on the suggested approach. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. Okay, any other discussion, any other comment on this? I think the action item here now is for—and I'm going to ask for interested parties or volunteers who would like to contribute to the effort, but for council leadership working with other interested councilors to work on a proposal as far as a path forward is concerned related to this. In particular, the first bullet, but looking at this, as we talked about, a little bit more holistically and trying to figure out a path forward on the RDS program management.

So we'll send a note to the list and ask for other interested parties and volunteers who want to contribute to trying to map out what the next steps might be and how we might approach this. But we'll have [that up] for consideration and further discussion during our

May meeting. We can do it on the list as well, but we'll follow this up during the meeting that we have in May.

Okay, any further discussion, input, contributions on item seven? All right, let's move on then. We're, I think, doing pretty well in terms of time right now. So we are now at item number eight, Any Other Business. We have five items on the list. If anybody else has something to add, please let me know through your hand or through chat. But we will talk about the GNSO chair election timeline, EPDP phase two initial report and project package. Rafik will lead that discussion.

RDS data accuracy, possible next steps, that's reference to the scoping effort that we discussed earlier on the topic of data accuracy. Expectations for ICANN 68. I alluded to that briefly earlier in the call about the conversations that are going on. We'll talk in a little bit more detail about that and what our expectations are for council. And then finally, there's a letter that we received from the ICANN board about the potential impasse in implementation of EPDP phase one recommendation seven, which is the transfer of data from registrar to registry and the current conflict with the Thick WHOIS transition policy.

So with that, let's discuss the GNSO chair election timeline. And Nathalie, I may turn to you momentarily on this one, but just to flag that as I think you all know, I am termed out at the AGM this year, and there's going to be a need for an election process for the GNSO chair. And just wanted to flag that and make sure that you and your constituencies and stakeholder groups are aware of that and are starting those conversations about who our respective

houses might put forward as a candidate. And with that, Nathalie, if I could hand this over to you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks, Keith. Just very briefly, [inaudible] the official announcement is now regarding the chair election timeline. Given the deadline of the 19th of June for the SG and C new council members. Obviously, SGs and Cs have started coordinating and have been aware of this a lot earlier on in order to organize their election timelines.

This timeline overall follows what's suggested in the GNSO operating procedures. However, with the new travel deadlines for funded traveler names to be submitted, this deadline used to be 90 days before the names before the meeting, it's now—well, it has been for the last year—120 days. We've obviously had to make sure we have the names of the new SG/C councilors received by that deadline, which is for ICANN 69, the 19th of June 2020. So from the second line of the timeline onwards, when keeping with the GNSO operating procedures, for the date of the 19th of June, we're following the guidelines from Constituency Travel.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Nathalie. Any questions, any comments? Anybody like to jump in the queue on this one? Essentially, this is just a flag and a reminder to ensure that you and your stakeholder groups and constituencies are starting your conversations,

because we've got some deadlines here that need to be observed. Okay, let's go back to the agenda, please.

All right, so item number two is the EPDP phase two initial report and the EPDP project package. Rafik, I'm going to hand this over to you as our council liaison and vice chair for any further update on where things are in the EPDP in terms of timing, in terms of process and progress and anything you'd like to raise for our consideration beyond what we've already talked about.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. I shared, I think, a few days ago the project package which includes all the details and also the status and condition. So it will be, I think, convenient to have it on the screen, but meanwhile, in terms of ongoing work, the EPDP team is reviewing the public comment, and we tried also to be flexible as much as possible by a request from some groups within the EPDP team to accept late submission of their comments for the initial report and during the other public comment for the addendum to the initial report which covers all the priority two issues.

So we are focusing on that and reviewing the public comment, and we are trying to adjust our workplan. So for example, last time, we had like three-hour calls, but now we try just two hours taking into account the [pace] and also the workload for the team members. And also, we are urging everyone to do their homework on time so we can be able to do the review of the different recommendation and the comments.

The staff helped us in terms of how to organize the public comments through what we call discussion document. That's not replacing the usual public comment review tools, but it's a way to help the team to cover all comments, and in particular to see where there are commonalities, but also where are the specific issues raised in the public comment and things that need to be addressed by the EPDP team.

So for now, we are still in our course for the deadline we have set for June, and we will assess the progress, and if needed, we will make adjustment to the workplan and see if we need to add more calls. But we tried to keep the workplan that we shared with EPDP team I think last week. And I think also shared last time that I think this week, the extension that was discussed by the council.

I do see Berry is in the queue, and probably he wants to add other elements that I might have missed. [Yes, Berry.]

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Rafik. You didn't miss anything, but just to build upon what you did say, the first part, you'll notice what you see in the shared screen, that the project is showing 92% complete. Don't be fooled by that number. With only 8% remaining, there's still a lot of work ahead of this group in terms of reviewing the comments, getting to a near final draft and an eventual consensus call. But the real idea here, the percent complete is trying to show progress on task as we move from month to month.

A lot of what increased from the previous percent complete from last month was not only the closeout or conclusion of the public

comment proceeding but a lot of other behind-the-scenes work that staff performs in terms of tracking of the face-to-face meetings and reconciling expenses, leadership calls and those kinds of things.

Secondarily, if you'll move to, I believe, page three of this document. Oh, it's just the summary timeline. I see. Well, what I was going to bring up for those that have reviewed the project package, on page three is an excerpt from what you would find in the project list. Within this project package, we produce these at the close of the month, so that is a snapshot at that point in time. The project status and the health of the project are still basically listed at green. When you look at this particular project package, the task ahead of the group, such as reviewing the comments and those kinds of things were listed as green, but as we discussed here during this meeting and other conversations that are going on in the EPDP and external, those tasks have now switched into a red condition because there's a risk of not meeting our planned delivery date.

That does not invoke the status or health change procedure yet, but it is an initial indicator that the risk has been elevated. And as Rafik noted, we're attempting to manage those risks before we get into an at-risk condition. So thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. Rafik, back to you. Go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I just want to thank Berry. I think that's it from our side. So if there is any question or comment, we'll be happy to answer.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Rafik. One thing I'll note, if anybody would like to ask questions or get in the queue, feel free to do so now. But I'll just note that one of the things, my understanding is that one of the challenges that the EPDP team is facing in terms of getting its work done and staying on schedule is the need for all members of the EPDP to actually do the homework that's assigned to them and to come prepared with well thought out and compiled positions or input or feedback so the plenary sessions can actually move forward efficiently.

So I'm just going to put that out there for everybody. Please, as you engage with your stakeholder groups and constituencies and your respective members of the EPDP, it is critically important at this time that folks are doing the homework and doing the work in the background in-between the plenary session so that those meetings can be conducted efficiently and moved forward at pace to be able to keep to the schedule. And I don't see any hands, so let's move on from this back to the agenda.

Okay, next item is 8.3, which is the discussion about RDS data accuracy possible next steps. Steve, I see your hand. Go right ahead.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Keith. So I guess I just want to point out that in the workplan document, I guess the draft workplan document

mentioned in item four, I think, of this agenda, it suggests a possible next step which is really just to ask ICANN Org to try to start documenting the existing accuracy requirements and the impact from GDPR. So that's a possible next step. But partly why I raised my hand is actually just to re-plug that document again. I think if possible, I'd really like to try to make it a call for action for everyone to review the document, because within that document, I mentioned that there's analysis of each of the projects mentioned, and definitely as part of that, it starts identifying some of these possible next steps that could be taken for each of the items listed.

And the input from the [councilors] is really important because without that, we can't really turn this into an actionable workplan. So basically, it was two things. One is to note what is mentioned in the draft workplan related to the accuracy item, but also just a general plug for the workplan and a request from councilors to take a close look at that and provide their input. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Steve. That's helpful. And if we could go back to that workplan document. And maybe in this particular case, we won't go through the entire thing, but let's focus on one of the pages that provide the additional level of detail. And if you'd like to walk us through that, and maybe we look at the one on the accuracy point. I see Maxim is saying audio issues. Can you all not hear me?

MICHELLE NEYLON: Keith, you sound like you've moved away from the microphone.

KEITH DRAZEK: I didn't make any changes, so I hope you can hear me.

MICHELLE NEYLON: That's better.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. I'm not sure what happened. I didn't make any changes on my end. But thanks for letting me know. So Steve, if I could hand this back over to you, and if you want to use this opportunity, five minutes here to sort of review the way that this document has been framed and set up, and we can talk specifically in this use case about the accuracy scoping team.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks, Keith. To go over this one, I don't think I necessarily need five minutes, but thanks. So it sort of follows the framework and approach mentioned on the first page. Now you actually see all the discrete elements captured on this single box for the accuracy scoping team.

And I guess to call it a scoping team presumes the next step, and maybe that's what it should probably have been labeled as, is maybe just RDS accuracy or RDS data accuracy.

So the first thing is of course the description, which of course is expected, but the next one is the level of impact and

consequences of not addressing in a timely manner. And in this case—well, I guess in all of the cases here—this is just the staff attempt at trying to capture our understanding of the issue.

So In that regard, the idea is to try to understand what the impact is of not taking action on the item. So this notes the importance that many have assigned, on this call even, to this particular topic and is just—in this box, it really is trying to provide a description of that importance. So not only assigning the level, which in this case is medium-high, but also trying to ascribe what the impact and outcome is from not taking action.

So the next part is the discrete preparatory steps that could be undertaken and resources needed. And this is what I mentioned earlier, that the next steps here could be asking ICANN Org to document existing accuracy requirements and impact. And then the second one is whatever might follow from receiving that analysis, which could in fact be a scoping team.

One of the other things I had mentioned earlier is that the next steps here in this particular one, the impact is—well, the next step is actually dependent on availability from ICANN Org to actually do the work. But at a minimum, if the council thought that this is a sensible next step, that request could be made so that ICANN Org could at least take it into consideration and determine if they can fulfill the request.

The next item, again, follows from the assumptions on the first page, is the resources needed. And this touches on what I just mentioned, that the primary support needed and resources needed for this possible next step is ICANN Org, and not

necessarily policy support folks but the GDD staff. And then for the second, if there's a scoping team, then that would in fact be the GNSO staff support, and then community volunteers.

The last element here is the possible timing. For step one for the discrete steps, it's really about ICANN Org availability again, and then two is the suggestion is that it would take place after the EPDP phase two final report. So thanks, Keith, for letting me run through this specific step. But indeed, the format for this item is replicated through the rest of the items on this page or in this document.

So again, I'd really like to ask all the councilors to make sure you take a close look at this, and then not only let us know if the approach taken for formulating this document is a sensible one, but also if the details in it make sense and some of the suggested next steps make sense so that we can see if we, in the limited capacity environment that we're in, that we can still actually start making some progress here and there. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Steve, and thanks for running through that. Thanks to you and your team for pulling this together. I think this is a very helpful framework and approach for helping the council figure out how we move forward in some of these tracks and some of these programs.

So with that, I'm going to ask all councilors to take a homework assignment and that within the next two weeks, make sure that you've reviewed this framework document in careful detail. Really

spend some time looking at this and provide feedback to the list on any concerns or any input or any suggestions that you have for the content here, not just the framework and not just the structure of the document but actually on the level of detail and the substance that's captured here, because as we get into our May meeting, we're going to need to start making some decisions about how to move forward on some of this stuff.

I feel like since January, we've been talking about work prioritization, but I don't feel like we've been successful in actually identifying unique pieces of work that need to be initiated and coming to agreement on when and how that needs to take place.

So within the next two weeks, provide feedback, and that will set us up for hopefully moving the ball forward during our May council meeting on at least some of these items. Any questions, any comment? Okay. Thank you, Steve. Let's move back to the agenda. We have about 12 minutes left of the scheduled call.

Next item is expectations for ICANN 68. I noted earlier in the call that we've been having some conversations with ICANN Org, with Göran, with David Olive, with Sally Costerton and the SO and AC, SG and C leaders to talk about ICANN 68.

The current thinking is that the core of the meetings taking place during ICANN 68 will take place during the time zone for Kuala Lumpur and that there's some flexibility both before and after the ICANN 68 week, but also before and after the time frames that are identified as being core in the KL time zone. So we have a little bit of flexibility from a council perspective in terms of how we schedule our work, but it's just a little bit of flexibility.

Nathalie, I'll turn to you in a moment for any additional input that you have for the group as we look to plan for ICANN 68, but essentially, the group is tentatively looking at identifying a four-hour block through the course of four days where the core or plenary or cross-community sessions, to the extent that they exist, will be scheduled. There's still ongoing discussion about priorities and making sure that we're focusing on really just the items that are absolutely necessary for both our council work, for the GNSO work and the work of the broader community. But let me pause there, and Nathalie, see if you have any further input or sort of overview for the council.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Keith. No, I think you summarized it really well. What we've put in motion right now is asking PDP chairs and SG and C secretariats to all coordinate with their leadership teams and really identify and clarify also which sessions will need to take place that week, regardless or not whether they're part of ICANN 68—so maybe as part of a recurring working group schedule for instance—and which sessions will be key and priority in terms of broader input need or just normal open interaction.

So this is what we've got set in plan right now. As per usual, we will depend on having plenary sessions decided upon and the slots assigned before we can fill in the rest of the schedule. But there will be a big difference in terms of normal meetings as to how many sessions [inaudible] on the schedule.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Nathalie. So I think the key here is that because it's entirely virtual, our PDP working groups have some flexibility in terms of how they schedule their meetings and whether there's a need for those meetings to take place actually during the ICANN 68 week or whether they can be scheduled at other times around that particular time in the time zone or timeframe that makes sense for the group. So I think this is important.

Because this ICANN 68 is a policy forum, the question is, in addition to regular work of our PDP working groups, is there a need for those groups to schedule something during sort of what is being termed the core of the ICANN 68 week meeting schedule? And if not, what other sessions are really critical? Are there cross-community or so-called plenary sessions that are really important to hold during the ICANN 68 week? And those conversations are all underway [and just really sort of starting] at this point. So if anybody has input or feedback from your respective stakeholder groups or constituencies, please make sure you provide that. Rafik, and then Michele.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith and Nathalie. Just [if we can] get some clarification maybe, or I missed that. What was kind of the outcome related to the dates? Also to maybe the number of ours or sessions per day and about the time zone.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Sure. Rafik. I'll ask Nathalie to jump in and correct me if I get any of this wrong, but I think the current thinking—and nothing's been

finalized, but the current thinking is that ICANN 68 would take place over the course of four days, Monday through Thursday. There would be a four-hour block or four hours allocated to what they're calling sort of the core of the meeting, which would include any cross-community plenary-type sessions and other engagement, for example, like Q&A with the ICANN execs, or if there was a going to be a public forum, that would be considered core.

And that's the idea, that there would be probably two sessions per day if I'm getting this right. I'm remembering back to the conversation. Yeah, two sessions per day over the course of that four-hour block. Nathalie, am I getting any of that right or any of that wrong?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: [Keith, that's right.]

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. All right. Rafik, I hope that was clear, and that the core would be taking place during the working hours of the Kuala Lumpur time zone. So Michele, James, Mary, and Steve. Michele.

MICHELLE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Time zone, KL time, which means that for us in Ireland, that's 5:00 AM to 8:00 AM local for the kind of three hours that they were talking about, 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM for central European, and for the Americans, You get to experience an

ICANN meeting like Pam does all the time. You don't get any sleep, essentially.

I suppose the only question I'd really have is, what sessions do we absolutely need to have during those hours? What are the ones that are of absolute, utmost priority and what are ones that can just be slotted in in around that time zone? That block of days, as it were. I don't see how many of us are going to be able to focus for longer than three or four hours, especially with the weird times for most of us. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Michele. And I think that gets to the point of trying to identify the critical meetings that need to take place during those particular times and then not overloading the schedule unnecessarily. James, you're next, and we're starting to run short on time, folks, so if everybody could be very brief.

JAMES GANNON:

Yes, I will keep it brief. Channeling discussion that happened on the NCSG mailing list, I think there's a hidden role that we have here through yourself, Keith, in particular, and there was a discussion on the NCSG list that essentially, we don't want to create obligations for people who are under a lot of stress in their daily lives right now by attempting to—let's not call it save face, but to try and make up for the fact of we have to have an ICANN 68 virtual. We really need to be very ruthless in choosing the minimal amount of absolutely required sessions and not just adding things, like the public forum is a good example, I think, just

because that's what we would have had at a face-to-face meeting, because we are going to create obligations for people that feel they have to attend these things because they're members of the ICANN community, and that will cause a lot of stress for certain people.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, James. Agreed. Mary.

MARY WONG: Thanks, Keith. Just to keep this real quick, everything you said is of course accurate, and I just wanted to emphasize a couple of things. One, it is still a work in progress between ICANN Org and the community. And hopefully as Nathalie is saying, there will be a preliminary schedule of sorts coming to you from the GNSO staff for the GNSO schedule next week. And hopefully as a community, when all the different community groups can provide their specific feedback about what they consider core and priority topics, then Tanzania can prepare a preliminary schedule.

Then I want to just also emphasize that while the proposed block of four hours over the four days is intended to be friendly to our APAC and Kuala Lumpur location and participants, that doesn't mean that you are only limited to those four hours. In other words, to, again, repeat what Keith said, those four hours are intended to focus on what the community identifies as priority or core topics. And as Tom referenced in the board resolution, based on community feedback, that would be things like the plenary high

interest topic sessions and cross-community dialog on important policy topics, be it EPDP, SubPro or something else.

As the GNSO council and as each of your stakeholder groups start to plan, you can also of course include other top priority sessions as part of the formal ICANN meeting. Whether or not this will receive the full ICANN meeting support will depend on technical capacity requests and limitations, but I want to end on this by saying that—and this is something I want to say because my GNSO colleagues may not want to say that for themselves, that they will of course be happy to support whichever sessions the GNSO council and the GNSO stakeholder groups consider to be important priority topics. And Tanzania will try to put that puzzle together. But the important starting point is that that proposed four-hour block should focus on the top priority topics identified by the community. I hope that's helpful, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Mary. That's very helpful, as always. So thank you for that, and we'll watch for that draft schedule for review next week. Okay, Steve, then Tatiana, then we need to move to wrap up.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Keith. Very briefly, just to follow on from what Mary said and touch on what Michele also mentioned, is that the selection of those four hours is also partially about the provision of technical services. So in that regard, the PDPs are, I think, slightly unique in that they don't necessarily need the full lift from the Meetings team

and technical support to be able to conduct those meetings. For instance, they don't need language services and interpretation. But from the other perspective, they do potentially warrant wider attention from the community.

So I guess one of the things I'd suggested to some of my colleagues is that there might be the need for this sort of hybrid where you do get that additional attention and inclusion on the ICANN 68 schedule, but it doesn't take away from the services that other communities like the GAC and ALAC might need.

So I'm not sure if that necessarily means a slight expansion of the window where there's a different category of sessions, but just point out that in discussions with the SubPro co-chairs, the initial thought from them is that it makes sense to maybe have one of the sessions as part of the ICANN 68 official schedule but the other one as a regular working session to sort of approach it from a hybrid perspective. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you, Keith. Hi all, and I will be brief. I just wanted to point out some of GNSO council members said something about America or Europe. I just want to say that there are four regions affected, in fact, because Africa lives mostly on European Time, and Latin America. So basically, I'd like to see more flexibility here because we're talking about one weird time. And I sympathize

Asia Pacific. I'm really sorry about that, but it does affect four more regions and four big regions. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Tatiana. Okay, folks. We're at the top of the hour and there was one other item on the agenda. We have a letter from the ICANN board about the conflict between EPDP phase one recommendation seven and the current Thick WHOIS transition policy. And I'll take that to the list. We're going to have to come up with a response. So I'll take that to the list. We don't have time to cover it today, but we've got a conflict between a new consensus policy and an old consensus policy that needs to be dealt with.

So with that, any last business, any final comments before we wrap up? All right. Thanks, everybody, for joining the call today. Thanks for all of the input and the conversation, and we will conclude our April meeting. Thank you very much.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's GNSO council meeting. Have a great rest of your days, evenings.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]