

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 01 October 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 01 October 2014 at 1900 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-implementation-20141001-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#oct>

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Avri Doria-NCSG
Alan Greenberg-ALAC
Michael Graham – IPC
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC
J.Scott Evans – BC
Klaus Stoll - NPOC
Greg Shatan-IPC
Carlos Raul- GAC
Tom Barrett-RrSG
Stephanie Perrin-NCUC
Amr Elsadr-NCUC

Apologies:

Olevie Kouami – NPOC
Jonathan Frost – RySG
Wolf-Ullrich Knoblen- ISPCP
Seun Ojedeji-NCUC

ICANN staff:

Amy Bivins
Marika Konings
Mary Wong

Karen Lentz
Berry Cobb
Steve Chan
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Today's conference is being recorded, if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Recordings have been started, you may begin thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 1st of October 2014.

On the call today we have Carlos Raúl, Greg Shatan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Chuck Gomes, Alan Greenberg, Klaus Stoll, Anne Aikman-Scalese and J. Scott Evans. We have apologies from Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Olevie Kouami, Jonathan Frost, and Seun Ojedeji. From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Steve Chan, Amy Bivins, Berry Cobb and myself Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much and welcome everyone to our call. Does anyone have an update to their statement of interest? Okay and do we have anyone on the call that is not in Adobe Connect?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan I am not in Adobe Connect, I'm having trouble connecting.

Chuck Gomes: So okay thanks Greg and you know what to do, just speak out if you want to get in the queue and that will be fine. So all right well thanks everyone for joining we have a pretty good turnout today.

And the agenda is on the right in Adobe Connect for Greg's benefit. We're first going to hopefully finish our discussion on the draft GDD consensus

policy implementation framework that we've been talking about. Then we're going to look at an updated working group work plan and hopefully get agreement that that's in good enough shape to present in our in-person meeting in LA and hopefully approve it there.

Then we will review the implementation process graphic that Marika attached to the agenda email she sent. And the goal there is to make sure we all have the same understanding, certainly we can still make some adjustments there but we would like to leave this meeting with the common understanding of that. And then we'll talk about next steps and confirm the next meeting - any questions or comments on the agenda? Okay then let's go right to the GDD consensus policy implementation framework draft.

And we're going to down to Section 4, so and each of us has control of the document in our screen so if you can move down to Section 4 there. I think you can get all of Section 4 on - well I guess it depends on what size your monitor is, but get that there. J. Scott you have your hand up, please.

J. Scott Evans: Yes this is J. Scott Evans for the record, I just want to - I want to make sure that we're all clear because I think I may be a little fuzzy on, you know, I see that we're giving our input here to a staff created document about a staff process.

And how do we see ourselves presenting this as part of our report to the community as one of the things we've considered and that we think it dovetails or jives well with the things that we're recommending. I sort of just want to know how we are packaging this up within our own charter and - charter questions and further recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much J. Scott and I see Alan has his hand up, go ahead Alan and then I'll go to Marika.

Alan Greenberg: Well my short answer is yes, I think you described it exactly. What we're doing is trying to make sure that their process fits what we think we're going to ultimately recommend.

And so that they are cognizant of what we're looking at to make sure their process as it evolves or as they do the fine details will fit well. So this is sort of a sanity check and a - an attempt to - I'm trying to get the right word, essentially to make sure that their internal processes and what we're recommending for the policy process meshes well.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan, Chuck again - Marika your turn.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and the thing that may help you become a little bit more clear as well when we get to Item 4 in which, you know, try to draw kind of a picture what, you know, from my (RR)'s or staff's perspective is that the overall, you know, implementation process.

And I think there hopefully you can see quite well where any of the staff part of that fits in and as well which are those other pieces that, you know this working group will still need to focus on so that at the end of the day indeed all those dots and arrows all nicely fit together. So I think that exactly lines up with, you know, what you were talking about J. Scott.

And I think is something as well that we want to show presumably in initial reports so that people do understand that, you know, it is a complete picture that we're trying to present even though some of this work is indeed, you know, internal pitch and stuff on how, you know, we do some of the tasks that are assigned to staff as part of the implementation. And it is part of this overall picture about how implementation works and being able to communicate that and show that I think is an important part of the initial report.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika, Chuck again and I think it's reasonable to expect that we will need to revisit this (unintelligible) after we've agreed on our recommendations to see if any adjustments need to be made. Again the goal being to make sure we're synching up the - both our recommendations and this process, is that correct? Thank you Marika, appreciate that.

And so now to J. Scott's question though I think we need to take it just a little bit further - this is Chuck speaking again. And that is that how will this fit into our ultimate recommendations document? I suspect we can figure that out more officially later on but I would think that we would at least make reference to the framework and report that we work together with the GDD team to synch up our proposed recommendations with that process - Alan you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, I don't think this fits into the recommendations unless we come to some irreconcilable difference with them that we think there's something there which clashes with what we're recommending, in which case we would have a recommendation to change it.

But I think this is part of our analysis, part of our understanding of the overall process and issues. And I don't, you know, if all goes well and we end up agreeing then I don't think it's part of the recommendations but it's part of the process that we have followed to make sure that what we're recommending as the way the GNSO goes forward on policy recommendations or on policy creation will fit well with the environment it has to fit into.

So it's not recommendations but it's part of our groundwork. And although we didn't picture doing this to begin - at the beginning, I think this adds both credibility and a higher level of assurance that what we come up with will make sense.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan, Chuck again and I didn't mean to imply that it was part of our recommendations but part of our final report to show that we synched up our recommendations with this process.

And of course that's what I meant by looking at it again after we finalize our recommendations so that we make sure that they are indeed synched up and any changes are made so that they correlate well - Cheryl your turn.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh thanks very much.

Chuck Gomes: Oh I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh no, (Anne Boggs look) if we're in the order of things, yes.

Chuck Gomes: I see two hands have come up and I skipped over Anne, I apologize Cheryl - Anne you're up.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks Chuck, it's Anne. I see why we might want to say hey this isn't our recommendations since we're not the ones that came up with it.

But given that as a - we have, you know, we're having input into it and given that it's our charter to make a recommendation for an implementation framework, I guess I'm kind of back to the question that J. Scott posed. You know, all this work has already been done by staff and it seems to me kind of silly in a way if we're going to, you know, separately consider and write our own implementation framework and say, well we disagree with staff here, we disagree with staff there.

It seems like in terms of the, you know, cooperative process that we ought to be in synch with staff. And they've found a need to produce this and it's within our charter to produce the identical deliverable. And so it seems to me that we have to be kind of working together somehow. Separately I made a late breaking comment via email that I think that this document could benefit from reference to the bylaws.

For example, you know, in roles and responsibilities when we talk about creating an implementation plan that is the responsibility of staff. And I think it's contained already in Item B under roles and responsibilities. And then there's a reference earlier to whether GNSO creates an IRT or not. And those things are covered in Section 10 of Annex A of the Bylaws.

In addition when you get down to third party service providers in the Roles and Responsibilities section under I, the retaining of external experts is covered in the ICANN Bylaws under Article 11, Section 1, External Expert Advise. And I just think that in terms of organizational governance when a document like this comes out it should be referring to, you know, the authority for these definitions and roles. So that things are done, you know, so that people don't just think, well third party service providers, here's how it works.

Well no there are additional provisions that apply and they're in the ICANN Bylaws - thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Anne and I don't want to try to speak for J. Scott but I think his question is valid in the sense that we need to - we will ultimately to see how this fits into our final report. And I think that's what part of - at least part of what he was getting at. J. Scott do you want to comment further on that?

J. Scott Evans: Sure, this is J. Scott for the record. I just wanted to make sure that as we wrap up our discussions that we had a clear sort of consensus understanding of what the role of this exercise has been and how we'll figure in.

Because I didn't want any misunderstanding when we went to do the final report and final recommendations of how this fit into that. I think that what I've heard from both Cheryl and the chat and in - from Alan and from you Chuck is that my understanding is correct. That we - it would be just part of maybe the background document or something to say that, you know, we've made these recommendations but in doing our work we also looked at this and we believe that our work is complimentary to that.

And make sure that that's transparent and that it was shared with us by staff, we had discussions with it so that these weren't - both of the processes or these several processes weren't looked at in a vacuum. And I just wanted to make sure that we understood because so often we finish and then we go to do the recommendations or we go to do the report and there's a misunderstanding of how it fits together and I just wanted to clear that up upfront.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much J. Scott and I think it demonstrates too that we're not as said - as you said and as others have said in the chat that we're really not doing this in a vacuum.

We're trying to look at the whole picture and it all ties together, so I think that shows completeness. Cheryl I like what you said in the chat, but let me turn it over to you and let you say it in voice.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and I'm not going to say it again in voice as you can all read it in the chat.

But I'm very glad it came up with J. Scott because he talked on just about everything I needed to say anyway. But one point that he's (lift) is that I think one of the things I found useful - not only does clarifying this now rationalize why we're looking at it and also why we've spent considerable time looking at it and working with staff to ensure there is a clear understanding of where we have minor concerns with language or (clarity in terms).

But also that staff has seen very quick to oh - yes we can change that, we can edit that, we can make that fit better. So I thought the most important - one of the most important things for me through this process has been the understanding and the rationale that staff had in the first place for putting this together. And I think there may be a place in our report to note that the

rationale for staff doing this to - I'm not going to paraphrase we them, can go back or they can write their own para- their own sentences.

But I think the reason that the staff document was put together was important and we should certainly respect and probably even reflect back in our own words, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Cheryl, Avri's next and then it will be Marika - go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi thank you, Avri speaking. I find myself in a weird position of agreeing with most everything (looking) at it differently.

I - first of all I tend to see this as in a sense existing practice. And I see it as an existing practice that has not only over the last year taken into account things that people are saying but explicitly in the last couple of weeks taking in some of the revisions and some of the requests we were making. And so I see this at the moment as having gotten to a stage of being beyond just this is current staff practice as documented, this is sort of current staff practice as - and (message).

Now that's similar to what Cheryl said but in doing that and in applying our definitions to that I think we've done more than just reference external work but in a sense we've brought this in as part of our work. That's not to say we can't come in with something different, it's existing code, it's existing practice that we may decide to suggest changes to based on everything.

And in fact one of the nice things about it if it's one of the few times (unintelligible), they're just not realizing that we've got existing practice that is going on that serves as an example to us of, oh following existing practice we found this gap in the process, we need to work on that. Or using, you know, existing process we find that, you know, Item 4 doesn't math the principles that we've been putting in there for what we want to.

But so I guess I don't quite see it as that (whether) to what we're doing, but really feel that we have brought it in as kind of a base that we're working with in addition to everything else that we've been creating - thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Avri, this is Chuck and in case you didn't see it there I think it was Cheryl and Anne had checkmarks of agreement and as you were talking about - so let's go now to Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika; I just wanted to note again that in relation to what the charter questions specifically ask is that framework for implementation-related discussion associated with GNSO policy recommendations.

And again I think when we get to Item 4 hopefully it will come a little more clear at least I think how we envision those policy - or those implementation related discussions what those specific question are or where, you know, the working group, you know, may see fit to develop specific recommendations around that. Of course, you know, again envisioning that those align with the implementation framework that, you know that you see on the screen.

Because indeed it's, you know, again it's a complete picture that we're trying to put forward. As a two part, we'll need to align on each to work together and I think as Avri said as well, you know, we're here as well and doing that in a collaborative way because we see as well that this needs to be, you know, all those pieces need to fit well together otherwise, you know, it wouldn't work in practice of course.

And on the bylaw question and, you know, we're happy to have a look at that and see and why it may be relevant or how to refer to that so we'll - and, you know, we'll take that back and have a closer look at that item.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Marika and I think this is a good time to go right to Item 4 and the draft framework - by the way this is Chuck speaking again.

And what I'm going to do first of all is ask Amy if she wants to give a very brief overview of Section 4 there. We're not going to go through it in detail unless somebody specifically requests that, but Amy if you could take two or three minutes and just give us an overview of Section 4 I would appreciate it.

Amy Bivins: Sure absolutely, this is Amy. So Item 4 of the framework document, we walk through it a little bit the first time we talked about it.

But basically it just sets out estimated timeframes for the implementation process starting with at the beginning and kind of how the services that were monitored, the policy development process through the open implementation of a policy. And so the first phase is that we refer to it as staging, it's just monitoring the policy development process, the preparing and participating as needed in the policy development process.

And once a PDP is complete and the Board approves consensus policy recommendations, that's when we really move over toward the planning phase and get started with the actual implementation process. And at that point we draft an implementation plan and draft a policy or come up in some cases with draft policy language if that's not already recommended by the PDP. And through that phase we expect generally for that to take two to four months.

And you'll see further back in the document it goes into more detail about everything that's involved there to include in most cases recruiting the implementation review team and consulting with various departments internally and in some cases third parties as well. The next phase is the analyze phase which we also estimate can take two to four months, some of it takes longer, some of it takes less.

And that includes working with the IRT, discussing the draft, policy language and the implementation plan and then after consulting with the IRT eventually posting in draft language for public comment. And then at that point that's

when we move over to the design phase and that's really finalizing the implementation after the initial public comment period and coming up with a policy effective date. And that can take anywhere from two to six months, sometimes more even it just depends on how complicated and involved a project is.

And then moving over honest to implementation and support base including doing outreach and, you know, doing things like updating the ICANN Web site, doing webinars, FAQs, working with compliance and then eventually turning over the policy (to good) clients when a policy is actually deployed where compliance starts monitoring . So do you guys have any questions about that?

Chuck Gomes: Just before we go there Amy - this is Chuck, a couple of things in the chat that I wanted to (work) on - first of all my coming across louder now? I guess I came across kind of softly for awhile - can you hear me okay.

Woman: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good and then (Stephanie) I don't know that I can answer your question or not.

When I have had that happen in the past where I get kicked out of Adobe Connect, I think it was usually on my end but if anybody has any other suggestions on that at least put it in the chat for (Stephanie)'s benefit because apparently she's repeatedly getting kicked out of Adobe. So mine's okay so far today but I have had that experience in the past.

Now thank you very much Amy for doing that, does anyone have any questions not only about what Amy said in her overview but about this section for any of the wording in it or something. Any suggestions for staff, questions, thoughts, whatever may be that would be - this would be the time to introduce that. Okay Anne you're first.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes Chuck I wanted to raise the topic of issues that arise after, you know, this process has been followed because we've seen a kind of a rolling situation in relation to issues that come up later.

And I wonder if the implementation framework that staff has devised here should actually (I'll) allow for the fact that there's kind of a continuing dialog when new issues arise and that the timing should somehow account for that.

Chuck Gomes: Anne this is Chuck, is that a question for Amy or Karen?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Maybe for Karen when we talk about implement in Stage 4 here, consensus policy framework and Roman Numeral IV when we talk about implement realization of an executed plan.

And, you know, does our graphic reflect the reality that we go back because new issues arise and we - which is something that this working group is, you know, is tasked with I think and was created to try to answer. And so I wonder if they - if staff's implementation draft recognizes that that occurs and how to accommodate that process. That's for Karen I guess, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yes Karen's got her hand up so let's let Karen respond.

Karen Lentz: Right, hi Anne, thank you Chuck and this is Karen Lentz speaking. So Anne we've accounted - we've tried to account for that in a few places. You know, there are always, you know, new issues or unforeseen, you know, complexities that need to be addressed in an appropriate way.

So, you know, one of the things that we've tried to - one of the ways that we've tried to do that is actually in the very beginning when we're creating an implementation plan and before we even convene the IRT for the first time. We've already gone through and identified here are some things that are, you know, unclear or where we see a gap in either where there might need to be

more discussion. So, you know, the first - part of our exercise is to identify those at the very beginning.

That's also one of the things that we, you know, hope will be clarified as a result of defining the role of the IRT and how they should - how the IRT should function. Because that's also one of the things that we see the IRT being valuable in is either identifying hey this wasn't really discussed before but it's a pretty significant issue.

Or, you know, we've gone down this road and it doesn't seem to be, you know, in line with, you know, what was discussed previously so let's, you know, backtrack and have another discussion, you know, so they play a role in that.

And then, you know, finally as you'll see in the framework - it is a framework and we haven't, you know, we reflected in our principles that we want to, you know, have a means to - where things can go back to the GNSO where discussions can happen with the GNSO where there is some new issue or, you know, policy question that needs to be addressed.

We don't have a - we don't really have guidelines for doing that we just know that it should happen and that there should be a mechanism for it, which, you know, is something that I think this group was interested in providing some or tasked with providing some definition as to how that might work.

So, you know, the framework is a framework and it allows for us to, you know, if there's a process developed that would, you know, sort of formally allow us to do that consultation to deal with new issues then that's something we would follow.

Right now within the framework it's just, you know, the intention to do that without the, you know, with a defined formal set of steps for how that happens.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Karen, Marika your turn.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and again I think that may become more clearer when we start looking at the (conversation) process graphic. Which I think tries to, you know, show some of I believe those linkages between the implementation review team as well as the GNSO Council.

But I think also asks indeed some of the key questions that as, you know, from my perspective I think are really the, you know, the heart of what the working group should be focusing on over our need, you know, current needs. And, you know, no guidance exists and those (I need) the questions of, you know, how does an implementation review team, you know, decide or identify that there is indeed an issue that needs to be addressed.

Is that one person raising their hand is that a consensus decision, is that a, you know, unanimous decision. And if that happens, you know how does that go back to the Council and what does the Council do with it? What process does the Council have for or should it have to deal with those issues. And then after that as well how does that go back against the staff? So what happens in the meantime? If a flag is raised how does that conversation go with staff on for example other elements that are being implemented?

And I think, you know, the current wording at least in the PDP manual is to the extent that, you know, the Council can go to the Board and tell the Board that they have certain issues with the way implementation is going or certain concerns that they would like to have addressed. And I think it's (done) for the Board that indeed, you know, tell staff to either stop or, you know, work out a solution.

But I think it also notes that, you know, some of the implementation work can go on in that interim timeframe when the solution is being solved. So again there's some general guidance that I think is currently in the PDP manual but

(maybe) the details I think that is what is currently missing and where indeed, you know, this working group will play a crucial part to, you know, work those aspects out and how that then interlinks to indeed the consensus policy implementation framework as we have on the screen here.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika, Anne it's your turn.

Anne Aikman-Scalase: Yes thanks Chuck, I think I agree with a lot of that. A couple of things that I think should be noted in the implementation framework document though.

First of all IRT isn't always mandatory under the bylaws, you know, GNSO Council makes that decision. I think, you know, it's a great - obviously a great resource for staff. We've had, you know, at least one situation I know of where probably the IRT wrapped up too soon. And, you know, how long an IRT should remain in existence for consultation on changes as, you know, kind of a big question in relation to this framework.

And then lastly what Marika said about the work that we're doing about what happens when you have new issues arise and some people think they're policy and some people think they're implementation. It kind of seems as though, you know, there should be some recognition of that in the staff framework that we're working on that or that's a process that still needs to be defined. Or - because staff doesn't work in isolation, you know, from what - from the what - the work that's being done in the community with working groups.

We recognize that these issues are here and yet they're not reflected, you know, that hey the staff knows we're working on this and that, you know, they'll hopefully be getting some community input on that too. So those are my, I guess three comments on the overall effect of the document.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Anne, this is Chuck and as you may not have been able to follow all the chat that was going on while you were - we were talking but you may want to scroll back and look at that.

As several people pointed out the whole issue of IRTs, whether they're mandatory and so forth and - will be things that we're going to be considering when we get the specific recommendations in the not too distant future. So your points are well taken. As far as whether we put the, you know, some comments that we're still working on in this document the - I don't know that we're at a stage or staffed at a stage where they're putting this document as a frame or out for public comment.

But we will eventually do that in our initial report and final report if there is need to get some specific feedback. Before then of course we have the option of doing that. What I - Karen go ahead.

Karen Lentz: Thank you Chuck, this is Karen. I just - to Anne's point about acknowledging in the framework that this working group is engaged in some of these discussions, there is later in the document where it talks about engaging the IRT.

It says the role of the working - and working of IRT of IRT is also active and/or consideration by the (PNI) working group and the recommendation coming out of that effort that are approved by the GNSO Council will be factored in here. I think there might be a note like that somewhere else as well but we did try to, you know, account for the fact that some of this is, you know, actively under discussion, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And Karen, Anne asked a question in the chat there about whether there is intention for this implementation framework to be put out for public comment. I don't know if you can respond to that or not.

Karen Lentz: Well our first goal with it was to, you know, have a discussion with this working group. I think, you know, we could at some stage put it out for comment but we hadn't - we didn't have a specific plan to do that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Karen and I - Chuck speaking again from my own personal perspective. And I think that ultimately it would be certainly put out for public comment as it relates to our final report, so at a minimum it would be that.

Again if we see a need sooner that's something we could do. Until we finalize some of our specific recommendations I'm not - I think it would be - the public comment would be a little bit limited because if they don't have the full context of what the policy and implementation working group is recommended it may raise as many questions as it answers - Marika you're up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I think Chuck you exactly made my point. And, you know, as Karen said I think we haven't really decided or already spoken about, you know, if when it should go for public comment.

And maybe I'm talking out of turn as well but I mean from my perspective I think it would make much more sense to indeed have this as part of the working group initial reports where people can indeed see the complete picture. Because I think if we would put it out as a separate document indeed we would get exactly some of the questions that, you know, you are all raising now like how does this relate to the IRT. You know, why doesn't GNSO Council comment?

You know, what happens if a policy issue is identified as part of these conversations? And I think it's really important to show that overall picture so it's really clear for people, you know, where everything fits and how everything isn't intended to work and then comment on that aspect. And if that, you know we're happy as well to look at whatever comes in and just as needed or as necessary they're going to set it up before us all.

It's, you know, we're keen as well to make sure all the pieces align and, you know, because we're all in this together, so.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika and this is Chuck, before I give it back to Anne I'd like everybody to look ahead as well to Section 5.

It really just like Amy said provides quite a bit more detail and there have been some edits made and they're based on some input that I think I gave sometime ago. But look at that because we probably can only spend about five more minutes on this - the GDD draft framework because there's some - because this probably will be our last meeting for our in-person meeting. There's a couple other things we need to take care of today in this call.

So that said any comments that anybody has after I give the mic to Anne on Sections 4 or 5 that might be helpful for not only the GDD team but also to ourselves please be prepared to make those shortly before we move to talk about the revised work plan - Anne it's your turn. And you took your hand down, okay that's fine.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No I'm sorry I just got off mute. I might be anticipating a work plan discussion (about that). Although I definitely agree with Marika that all of this is interrelated and so we want to have everything that's put out for public comment be consistent and not raise a lot of unnecessary questions.

I'm also concerned that we don't want to wait until a final report to get community input because although there's essentially a core group who's trying to work here every week and trying to work and collaborate with (Steph) I would hate to get the stage of final report not having had any, you know, objective's third eyes on this material.

So just to comment that I think that some of these things including, you know, this framework really should be, you know, in the form of a preliminary report.

That, I mean I'd personally like to get it on the Marrakesh Express but I don't know how others feel about that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Anne and I think that's going to happen. We've talked about the idea and when we get to the work plan we'll look at this a little bit more and maybe it's best to do that.

But also let me recommend that - or remind everyone that as representing a group of stakeholders that the hope is that all of us that are doing that, myself included, will regularly keep your group informed of what's happening and get their feedback on elements of things that we're discussing. And especially those where you think they may have particular concern. So that's an ongoing responsibility for all of us that are representing group.

But let me just very quickly say are there any more comments or questions on the GDD framework, including Sections 4 and 5 before we move to the revised work plan which will address part of what Anne was just talking about? Okay not seeing any and let's - if we can bring up the revised work plan we will go to that and I'm going to ask Marika if she would do a quick overview of this. This has been out for people to look at for a couple of days at least, so we won't go through it item by item.

But certainly want to have any input that anyone has on the work plan. Some edits have already been provided based on online feedback and we can make more. The goal after this meeting today or by the end of the week at least - because for people who are not on the call we'll allow them to provide any feedback they have on the work plan. Our plan then is to present the revised work plan in our working group in-person meeting in LA. And after that, again having discussion on it and then approving it in that meeting.

So again understanding that the work plan will change again okay, it's a very living document. But to the best of our knowledge in Los - in our meeting in Los Angeles we will approve the work plan as we best can at that point in

time. So let me just allow you - allow Marika to give a quick overview and while she's doing that you can also glance through it. And I'll open up for discussion after that - Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks Chuck, so this is Marika. So what you see on the screen is the revised work plan.

As you'll notice it has taken a different shape and form as we've moved away from the Excel sheet, you know which we basically set up in that way as I think when we started out. And we're assuming that some of the activities, you know, may happen in parallel and, you know, we envision possibly some (soft teams). But as we have moved away from that I thought it would make more sense to actually have it in a Word document if it's easier to see on the screen and easier to print probably as well.

So basically what it does is it sets out the work or the main work between here and the Marrakesh meeting which I think we've set out or at least I think (when) we discussed last week that is in principle our target date for a publication of an initial report. And so (work men) as well it assumes that when we're looking and I think - again we'll come back to when we go to Item 4 that we'll probably take the four or the three remaining charter questions together under consideration and they'll relate to the discussions as part of the implementation process.

And as they seem to be very closely aligned to, you know, having gone through the GDD framework and as well looking at the graphic, they seem to be right intertwined. So it seems to make more sense to take those together instead of dealing with those while we're probably just, you know, redoing a lot of the conversation. So the idea is to do that and work through that in the meetings that we have been now and publication deadline.

And, you know, one of the (packs) for the group would then of course be to identify what are those specific issues that we need to be talking about. And,

you know, we've made a first attempt in the graphics to identify some of those questions. That I think at least from a (stand) perspective it may need to be considered. But of course it doesn't mean that there are no others or that some of those may need to be reworded or rephrased.

And in the meantime in (power) of course there are still as well the work ongoing in relation to I believe it's charter question one in relation to the different processes that we've spoken about. And then we're working on some more detailed manuals for each of those that we hope to share as well for you after the LA meeting for review. And then basically that takes us to hopefully the preparation of an initial report by the end of this year for your review.

And then that of course we aim to bring all the pieces of work together and, you know, first of all of course all, you know, the templates we've developed, the discussions we've had. And, you know, incorporating the draft recommendations that we hopefully have by that stage as well. The information that we've spoken of today and, you know, basically package that so that the community can see very well, you know, what the working group has thought about and where we're basically at that stage and be able to put it out there for public comment.

And although maybe Marrakesh may sound very far away it is actually pretty close and the publication deadline for the meeting is the 19th of January. So take into account as well that, you know, there is probably a break in-between the Christmas period where there may be less meetings or - and less work done. It will require, you know, commitment from the working group members to review documents and raise comments and issues on the mailing list.

Because as you can see as well from the work kind of it really assumes that top (things) that people want to talk about are raised in a (dominant) meeting so that those will actually dictate the agenda for meetings. And it assumes

that, you know, if no issues or questions are raised on documents that are being put out that people are comfortable with those as they are.

And I think as we've discussed for as well of course, you know, perfect (unintelligible) that the enemy (of the good), you know, I think at some point, you know, the working group may still want to do more work or, you know, consider things further. But I think at some point that you do - may want to consider when is the moment that you can say, okay well we'll at the feel comfortable that this is something we can share with the community.

Even though it's not completely finished, even though we may have, you know, found some areas where we're willing to do more work or we specifically would like some input on. But at some point it's probably, you know, work to get that community feedback before everything is really, you know, set in stone. So that will still allow you to tweak or, you know, direct a little bit the core set that the working group is going on depending on the comments received.

So basically as well like I'm trying as well to incorporate a little bit of what may be the next steps after receiving or posting the initial report. Of course there will be discussions then at the Marrakesh meeting to get community input. Public comment forum would run in parallel and beyond that meeting and then it would anticipate that, you know, the working group would have a couple of meetings to review those comments and revise it's report as it sees fit or needed.

And of course this is just a guess at this stage because it all depends on, you know, how many comments we'll receive or how many open issues there are still remaining to discuss. So I believe at this stage it would tentatively perceive that the working group may be able to have a final report ready by the mid of April - so that's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika and certainly we have a little bit of time for some comments now on this.

But also for those who would like to look at it more thoroughly if you haven't already and want to provide comments, if you can provide those by the end of this week that would be helpful. So that we can have a version of this ready to go for our - before the meeting in LA so that people - we can distribute it in advance of that.

So in light of that and while people are thinking whether they have comments or questions on this, hopefully you have a copy of it so that if we don't leave it up on the screen we can jump to another chart - or diagram that Marika sent around that relates pretty closely to this.

And I want to reinforce what Marika said, we've got a lot of work to do in the next three months. So hopefully everybody can be diligent about doing that because we're getting to the point where now we're going to start formulating recommendations and that's really the key deliverables that we're going to produce. And so it's a really critical timeframe and especially considering that we have until the 19th of January to have at least the first cut of those so we can get lots of public input on our initial report to include everything we've talked about so far.

I think we've laid a really good foundation for doing that and I think that will facilitate our work, but it will still take a lot of efforts on our part. So that said Marika do you want to tell people what's on the screen now and describe that for them and talk about how it relates to our work plan? If you do that please I would appreciate it.

Marika Konings: Thanks Chuck, so this is Marika. So basically what you see on the screen is my attempt to translate what I think we've been talking about.

You know, and I think I've been referring to as, you know, the puzzle that needs to come together and, you know, the complete picture of how implementation would look, you know, hopefully after we're done as well. Or identify at least there's errors I think that the need to be filled or those gaps that need to be filled. And so basically, you know, please don't see this as a flowchart; it's really more of a graphic, a picture.

So basically at the top what it tries to show is a little bit of the steps that currently happen and so when something moves into implementation. So basically the Board helps the recommendation, directs that to, you know, go and develop an implementation plan. And, you know, we inform an internal team that coordinates the handover from, you know, the policy team that has been supporting the PDP working group to the GDD team that will supporting the implementation part.

And we start working on the proposed implementation project plan and which basically outlines, you know, the timing and the different steps, you know, the current frame that we shared with you. And so basically once we have that in place we would share that with the implementation review team and the implementation review team then interfaces with the Council if necessary. So if you look below it's kind of the - from the third box to going into the more detail of that specific conversation.

So on the right-hand side you see then, you know, the implementation project plan that we would share with basically half, you know, those elements that we've described in the framework and follow those steps. There's the interaction with the implementation review team and the implementation review team has the link with the GNSO Council. And then, you know, there's as well probably a link between the GNSO Council and the Board, you know, if and when needed.

So basically what I'm trying to do as well is - and that's what you see in the orange boxes, is trying to identify so what are the missing pieces from this

picture. So what are - where do we need for the details in order to have indeed all those pieces connected together and a complete understanding of, you know, what would happen in which situation and who is responsible for what.

So maybe starting on the right-hand side and I think it's something that we flagged as well in the discussion on the framework is, you know, in each of these phases, you know, when we need to determine if, how and when the IRT is involved and how does that consultation with staff take place. And, you know, is there a specific guidance needed beyond, you know, what we currently do.

I think as most of you know, you know, in certain cases there are, you know, monthly calls or calls every two weeks where we share an agenda, where we walk through the plan, where we share documents. You know, is there further guidance needed on that or not? I think that's the first - or one of the things to consider. Then in relation to the implementation review team, you know, I think as we already raised as well in the chat is, you know, should these be mandatory?

Per need their optional, you know, should a recommendation be that these are actually mandatory or these are, you know, standard practice and only if the Council specifically directs that no implementation review team should be created then there is none. Also, you know, how are IRTs especially - expected to operate? You know, what is their decision-making methodology? And, you know, currently it's a group of people that comes together, you know, to interact with staff.

But of course it doesn't have a traditional working group model whereby you have a chair, a chair who sets the agenda, you know, decision-making methodology. So that currently doesn't exist, you know, is that needed and if so how should that look? And are there additional mechanisms that are

needed to have those implementations for later discussions? For example now, you know, the interaction is really with the implementation review team.

And I think most of the times as well once we get really to the end phase of, you know, the implementation then I think staff typically puts it out as well for public comments to share with the broader community. You know, is that sufficient or should there be other mechanisms foreseen by which interaction with, you know, the broader community takes place beyond the implementation review team?

Then I think there's as well the question of how does the interaction between the implementation review team and the GNSO Council take place? And there for example a recent thing we've starting doing is - or the Council started doing is actually having a Council liaison appointed to an implementation review team. Like they also have two PDP working groups where, you know, potentially that liaison could serve as a kind of, you know, messenger between the IRT and the Council.

But again it would also ask the question like when does the liaison know when they need to go and, you know, put out the red flag? Is that, you know, one person in the IRT doesn't like something or doesn't agree is that a group decision? So again those are some of the questions that may need further clarification. And then you have the Council aspect of that and, you know, if issues indeed then come back to the Council what processes should the Council have or process or processes for addressing implementation or policy-related issues?

And again, you know, what role does the Board play in that in addressing those implementation concerns that maybe flag to the Council and maybe address? So as I say I think these are, you know, basically some of the ones that at least came, you know, to my mind when trying to draw up this picture. And I'm sure there are others or there may be further details that we want to add to either - each of these.

But I think the idea is we need to try to as well, you know, show visually where I think that the focus of the working group should probably be in completing the overall picture of how implementation should work in practice. You know, looking at I think some of the principles we've identified at the outset as well as looking at some of, you know, what we've identified in practice where are currently gaps and no guidance in existence.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you so much Marika and as everyone is probably fully aware we're running out of time very quickly. But we have two hands up and so let me ask them to be brief but Anne you're first. Are you on mute Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry, my question is about - it's a great chart, thank you. My question is about the box where these guidance processes that we've already charted sit.

And it looks to me as though in the middle there where we have GNSO implementation review team and then there's the third box on the right says what additional mechanisms if any to implementation related to discussion should be foreseen. Is that the box where our guidance processes go or is it some other box? I'm just trying to understand how it all fits together and I, you know, that's the question.

Chuck Gomes: Good question Anne - Marika do you want - go ahead and respond to that please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I think, you know at this stage at least the process we are talking about is something completely separate. And those are really, you know, additional mechanisms that the Council has as it's availability to deal with questions that, you know, may come from the Board or input that they want to provide to certain questions.

However I think if you look at the box right underneath the Council that talks about what processes are or needs to be used for addressing implementation policy rated issues. And I think there indeed the question is do some of the processes that we've identified would they also work for this specific scenario? Right, Council indeed identify an implementation or a policy question coming out of implementation-related conversations does that same process or one of those processes also apply to that?

Because you need to take into account that I think the process as we've designed and currently they all go back to the Board. While here presumably if it's an implementation-specific item maybe it would go directly to staff. Or maybe not, maybe it would go to the Board. So I think that is indeed something that, you know, the group would need to discuss or think about.

And as I said, you know, the other box on one additional mechanism that is really more talking about, you know, beyond talking to the GNSO implementation review team and the Council, should there be any kind of broader consultations that take place in relation to implementation plans or questions that may arise.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and keep in mind that these are decisions we're going to make where it fits - where each of the new processes fit and so forth. So this helps us see where we need to get to and the questions we need to ask and answer in the next couple of months - Alan your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you and this isn't a question so we don't have to have an answer. (Amber) in the chat said that Marika's presentation was awesome. That's not a word I generally use but I think I agree in this case.

I hope we will capture when we get the transcript because Marika raised a whole slew of issues that we need to think about as we go forward. And it was a - it was like they talk about proverbial trying to drink from a fire hose, but there were a lot of issues that she was talking. One of them struck me

that I don't think we've ever discussed is that if a PDP working group comes to a recommendation but there wasn't unanimous support for it, you know, whether it was just grudging support or actual disagreement, the IRT is a potential place where you can try to get a second kick at the can.

And, you know, make sure that the implementation goes the way you really wanted it to as opposed to what it said. So things like how do we run an IRT if indeed this is - these are contentious issues, not everyone working together as a team are going to be really interesting things we need to look at so thank you Marika.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Alan and thanks to everyone. I know we're a little bit over time - we'll wrap it up really in a couple minutes here.

The - we need to talk about next steps. First of all with regard to this chart and with regard to the GDD framework, if you have anymore comments and if staff would please send out a message to the whole list requesting people not on the call to also provide any feedback they have. Understanding that nothing we have right now is final, we'll have additional opportunities to refine and improve a change and so forth.

But if we could by the end of this week get any additional feedback on the list, suggestions, questions - whatever so that we're pretty well prepared going into the (RLA) meeting and with both of these documents that would be very helpful. Now with regard to next week, people especially those that aren't nice - and relative close like me - for once I have an hour and fifteen minutes flight to the meeting in LA which will be nice for me. But I know for a lot of you that's not the case, you'll have longer flights and so forth.

So we're assuming and we know that Marika and Mary are both traveling next Wednesday that we will not have a meeting next week - if there are no objections to that. And so our next meeting will be our in-person meeting in LA. And also there will be a review for the Council, a 30-minute review for the

Council on Saturday morning at 11:00 in LA. If any of you are there then you're welcome to join us in that session. Those sessions are open for - to everyone.

Not just the Council, not just working group leaders and so forth, so everyone's welcome. No logistical thing, everything was awesome about your chart Marika except for one thing, apparently the white font is hard to read and I agree, so we may want to change the font of that to black - something that makes it a little - especially on screen. I have to print these things off and look at them in a hard copy to be able to read them very effectively and I have a fairly big monitor. So that's just a minor point that we can fix.

Any questions, comments before I adjourn? Thank you very much everyone, a very productive meeting. I think we're getting down to where we really start doing the rec- we're very close to starting to make specific recommendations and I believe that everything we've done to this point really lays a very good foundation that should facilitate that work. So with that said and not seeing any hands or hearing anyone - oops J. Scott you're up.

J. Scott Evans: Yes I was trying to hit agree.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Sorry, that's not comments that's incompetence.

Chuck Gomes: Right, so thanks a lot. Thanks to everyone, we had a great meeting, good participation today. Hope to see most of you if not all of you in LA but remember there will be remote participation if you can't attend in LA. Thank you very much.

Woman: Thank you Chuck, bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Coordinator: This now concludes today's meeting, all lines may disconnect at this time -
thank you.

END