

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Webinar on Policy Development Process 3.0
Tuesday, 11 September 2018 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 available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-pdp-webinar-11sep18-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p1s5rcio69b>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: Excuse me, recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Grace). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Policy Development Process 3.0 Webinar on Tuesday, 11th of September, 2018. As a reminder, this is a webinar for GNSO councilors and GNSO-appointed Board members only. An audio cast will be made available for non-councilors and the URL can be found in the pod in the bottom left of the Adobe Connect room.

This call is being recorded, so please remember to state your name before speaking for recording purposes and also for participants on the audiocast. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Nathalie. And thank you very much to everyone for joining this webinar. Particular thanks to Matthew and Becky. We know that

the GNSO PDP and how it works and how it could be improved is on the Board's mind so we thought it would be perhaps helpful in those discussions to have you hear our latest on this project, PDP 3.0. And for everyone else, this is just one of these things that just won't fit into a 15-minute block in a GNSO Council agenda. And I think we'd already sort of had the September agenda filled by the time we left Panama in terms of thinking about what would be coming up, so hence for having this webinar as an opportunity. We have a whole hour to work through the recommendations that have now been commented on by the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies and use this time to discuss those, collaborate on the feedback and figure out how we go forward.

Now, the way that Donna, Rafik and I will run today's conversation or facilitate various conversations is I will get us started, take us through about the halfway point and then Rafik will take over, Donna is on the call, so you have the full GNSO leadership team here. And I'll say in starting out that our thinking on this, and I think it's the case, Nathalie will say if I - Nathalie, do I have control of the slides?

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes you do, Heather, as do Donna and Rafik.

Heather Forrest: Great. I think you can let people - I think you can spring them loose.

Nathalie Peregrine: All right.

Heather Forrest: Let folks go on their own and that way I don't make anyone sea sick if I move back and forth and I'll be sure and remind everyone which slide we're on, and I think all I need to do is press stop sharing, although that might have done us in? Nathalie, what have I done?

Nathalie Peregrine: No, Heather, that's - oh, hold on.

Heather Forrest: Just when you thought it was safe to let me touch Adobe Connect.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: And now all have scrolling rights.

Heather Forrest: Super. Thanks, Nathalie, appreciate that. So if you - if I can just say one thing about how we've decided to structure things today, and going forward indeed, our proposal for how we think we could go forward, is we put things into three buckets if you like, the recommendations that we have coming out of the PDP 3.0 project. One is on the basis of the feedback received, the recommendations that have in principle support. There might be some tweaks to a recommendation, but broadly speaking we've looked carefully at the feedback and said it looks like everyone agrees with this.

We have a few recommendations in another basket which is recommendations that don't have in principle support, in some cases it's the case that one SG or C has commented flat out don't agree with this and others have supported, in other cases it's a bit more nuanced. The third basket is we have received some recommendations that are new, that go beyond the scope of the draft report that we sent around for comment. So we've categorized those as a different basket which is new recommendations.

In terms of the background you see in Slide 2, I think everyone largely knows where we are, where we've come from. This of course is a project that commenced with our strategic planning session. We've been chipping away at it slowly over the year on top of a very heavy ordinary workload so I think it's great that we've gotten this far. You'll notice that last point there on Slide 2,

we've received input from the constituencies and stakeholder groups listed there as well as several of our PDP - active PDP leadership members, Chuck, Phil and Petter.

And it's largely from those folks that we're getting some comments that go beyond the scope of the existing report and give us some new recommendations to consider. You'll notice that that sort of triage approach was taken in the supporting paper that went out, it should have been Friday on your time zone I think, to serve as background and context for this webinar. And one of the things that that background paper does is it provides an executive summary of all the feedback that's been received and it gives the actual feedback received so that anyone can go back and look and say make sure his or her or SG, C or individual comments were captured.

With that, there are, in addition, let's say five groupings if we might say, of recommendations. So we have on Slide 3 those five set out. One is around working group dynamics, there's a cluster of recommendations around working group dynamics. There's a cluster around working group leadership. There's a cluster around complexity of the PDP subject matter. There's a cluster, not surprisingly, around consensus building. And there's a cluster around the role of Council as manager of the PDP.

The - I will say this, out of the 17 recommendations that were set out in the report, based on our reading of the feedback received, I would suggest that we have in principle support for all but two of them, which is super promising, getting this far in the discussion process.

And I think that leaves us in very good stead for what we propose to you all, let's say, is that we take these recommendations with in principle support, we refine that thinking today, confirm that there is indeed in principle support for

each of these recommendations that are identified, and if so, we move ahead to prepare a motion for the GNSO Council in October that would enable those recommendations that are agreed upon to be moved into implementation and the remaining recommendations, those that do not at this point in time have in principle support and the new recommendations that have been made to expressly turn those over to the 2018, 2019 Council to ensure that those get picked up by the next group of councilors.

So that's the aim for our discussion today. And if anyone has any questions before we get started, I'll be happy to take those. If not, we'll get started in looking at the first block of recommendations that have received in principle support. So I'll just pause and see if there are any questions.

No? All right, I don't see any hands. Becky, you're on the phone so please feel free to chime in any time you would like to; don't be shy.

Becky Burr: Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: All right, so let's then, for those on the AC, if we have a look at Slide 4, Slide 4 captures the first two of those clusters, working group dynamics and working group leadership. And each of the three recommendations in those - in those clusters we consider to have in principle support. And I would suggest that we work through each one, one by one just to test that conclusion and see that everyone agrees.

The first one deals with terms of participation for working group members. And this is of course something that we actually - in practice right now because it's something that we adopted for the EPDP. In essence the EPDP has been a sort of in vivo experiment with some of these - soft experiment for some of these recommendations. The idea around the terms of participation is

to require those who sign up to a PDP working group to agree to some sort of commitment outlining the terms of their participation.

And the comments that were received all suggested that this was worthwhile. We need to think about what those participation requirements are, how we articulate those and how we ensure that they're taken seriously. Is there anyone on the call who disagrees with, has concerns about this Recommendation Number 1 in requiring terms of participation for working group members? And bear in mind at this stage we're not concerned about the mechanics, the implementation of how we go about drafting that statement; we're really looking at this point for agreement as to the concept. So anyone have any comments, thoughts, concerns about Recommendation Number 1? Donna. Donna, you might be on mute.

Donna Austin: Is that better?

Heather Forrest: There you go. Well done.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks. Yes thanks, Heather. I just wanted to flag for folks that Heather, Rafik and I have had a conversation with Herb Waye about the participation - it came up in the context of another conversation we were having with him and we have got some feedback on Herb about the value and perhaps how we could strengthen what we've used for the EPDP. So I just wanted to flag that for folks here that just let them know that we've actually had a conversation with the ombudsman about this one. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. This is Heather. That's an excellent point and I think we can also add to that and say that the ombudsman was very supportive of the idea and having participated in various processes in relation to GNSO PDPs lately.

He was of the view that that could be a pretty significant improvement, so good point, Donna, thanks.

Anyone else with concerns, comments in relation to Number 1? Donna, I suspect you're an old hand, and I will interpret the silence on this to be that everyone is of the mind that this is something that should be pursued and we'll work on the actual mechanics of it in implementation so we'll consider that and move that forward.

Let's then consider Recommendation Number 2 which is considering alternatives to the open working group model. So the comments that were received in respect of this recommendation were again in support in principle with some differentiation as to how it actually works. And I think the comment from the Registrar Stakeholder Group saying, Council really needs to consider each PDP as a case by case basis rather than a one-size fits all model, seems to be, if you like, a good summary of the comments that were made by all, not exactly those words.

But I think we're given enough latitude in the way that this recommendation is worded that we can consider alternatives and do so I think that's the recommendation from the Registrars is a good one, do so on a PDP by PDP basis so that we don't get ourselves locked into a particular model. Of course we have already experimented with this live in the EPDP which is in and of itself an alternative to the open working group model, so we have a certain degree of precedent there.

Any comments, questions, concerns on this recommendation? I see Julf is typing. No, and Julf says he's not sure the EPDP is a good indicator of anything. And now Marie is typing. Well I think - I'm not suggesting that the EPDP is a model; however, the EPDP has been an opportunity for us to

experiment and Marie's made the comment, which also came out strongly in the BC's comments that there needs to be a balance of participation and effort. And I think that comes out in the mechanics of who we go about using an alternative, when we use an alternative and what that actually looks like. And of course we had some difficulties, you know, ultimately came to agreement but had some difficulties with that in relation to the EPDP.

But in terms of concerns around considering alternatives, does anyone object to this recommendation that would have us at least consider alternatives on an ongoing basis? So Jul's followed up with a comment just for Becky who's not on the AC, "Yes, I agree, the EPDP has helped understand some of the issues," and Marie and Keith are typing along similar lines. We'll learn from the EPDP and consider improvements. And Marie, I think that's an excellent point, we need to at least consider improvements and that's what the fundamental aim of PDP 3.0 has been.

So I don't see any comments against, I don't see anyone with hands up, with that I suggest we confirm that that one's in principle support and we'll move that one forward to put it to Council formally.

That takes us to the last recommendation in this particular cluster, which is limitations to joining of new members after a certain time. And we have a range of comments in relation to this. The concern that's live here has to do with new members who join long after a PDP has already advanced in its work and the sort of flow-on effects from having those new folks come in, reopening discussions, reopening dialogue and not being present in those early discussions.

So the comments that were received, again, in support for the concept, there are definitely variations in how we might go about doing that. And what the

consequences, let's say, might be. So my suggestion here to take account of the various bits of feedback that we've received is we had initially articulated that recommendation as limitations on - limitations to joining of new members after a certain time. And I wonder if limitations is the right word; maybe we reword that as expectations of new members joining after a certain time. It might be that restrictions doesn't fully capture everyone's sentiments here. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Good afternoon. Michele for the record. How about requirements or criteria for joining or something like that? I mean, I don't think it's - I don't think we're trying to make it to restrict membership but we are expecting members to have certain - well certain membership criteria, to meet certain requirements and this repeatedly, repeatedly has caused problems in several of the PDPs that I've been involved with and we need to be able to get that balance between allowing people to get on with their lives, deal with the fact that they're changing jobs and everyone else and rotate out of a PDP, whilst also having people joining a PDP who are able to actively contribute without being disruptive.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. This is Heather. I think you've got some good support in the chat and I agree, I think your suggested wording there around criteria is a good one. And I'm just making a note of that myself in the notes in the background so that we can come back to that one and do some rewording there.

With that in mind, anyone have any objections to working towards this recommendation of criteria for new members joining a PDP after it's already begun? Michele, I see your hand but I suspect it's an old hand. Marie is typing. Okay, good, no worries, no need to apologize, Marie. Michele and thanks Marie for your comment.

Great, that takes us through the first basket which is fabulous. That's Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 that we can put forward to Council in October and leadership will take that on to word those and capture them in a way that captures all the nuances. So let's move onto the next cluster, which has to do with working group leadership. The first one in that cluster is Recommendation 4. Recommendation 4 has to do with developing some sort of playbook that might help working group leaders, members, participants, in identifying tactics that are not helpful to advancing the work of the PDP and to consensus building.

We saw quite a bit of - quite a few comments come out in our session that we held in Puerto Rico, we had our whiteboards out, folks saying, you know, there are people who are not working towards consensus, and we need to figure out a way around that. So some sort of playbook, and here this is clustered under leadership, to give the working group chairs or leadership team the power to identify problems or, you know, the skills to identify problems when they see them and the power to do something about them.

Universal support for this one, lots of comments saying this was a positive development to the point that I think this was one of the ones that received some of the strongest support in all of the feedback that we received. With that in mind I would suggest, you know, we could to the extent that everyone agrees, this is one that we can move to implementation pretty quickly with a small team maybe to work on this, maybe even in preparation for next year's strategic planning session if that's something that you feel would be useful.

So any questions, any concerns about this one or do we all agree that some sort of playbook for working group leadership to help them carry out their role more efficiently, more effectively would be a good thing. Okay, green tick

from Ayden, that's great. Thanks, Ayden. And no objections from anyone, lots of typing, Darcy agrees, Donna's typing, it looks like we're in a good position with this one as well. Just wait for Donna's comment and then we'll move onto Recommendation Number 5.

All right...

Donna Austin: Heather, rather than - sorry, it might be quicker if I just say rather than type.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks. I just wanted to note for folks that the, you know, discussion around consensus and how to get consensus has been a conversation that's been going on in the GNSO SubPro working group for the last I'd say maybe the last three meetings and perhaps there's some things that we can take out of that as well, you know, just to note that this is a truly live discussion now but some of our working groups are facing and, you know, Jeff and Cheryl are looking at it from a slightly different lens and that's causing some problems for people that have been through a PDP and consensus is being done a certain way. So this is, you know, it's a live issue so I think anything that can help our chairs moving forward would be really helpful.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, that's extremely helpful given your support of that PDP as Council liaison along with Keith. And Marie's comment says, "Can we ensure that former or current chairs of PDPs are engaged in the drafting experience?" I think for sure, Marie, in terms of implementation that sort of thing we need to not look a gift horse in the mouth.

We need to seize opportunity and experience where we can get it and I was really delighted in that regard to have the comments from Chuck and Phil and

Petter because these are the folks with really the day to day experience of some of these problems. And in some cases, you know, some thinking already about solutions and how to fix them. So I definitely think, Marie, that that's a worthwhile effort.

Excellent, so I've seen no objections for Recommendation Number 4. Let's move onto Recommendation Number 5 which has to do with the role of the Council liaison to PDPs. So this was something that we'd really been slowly but surely thinking about refining in our discussions since the strategic planning session and it's clear that over the course of the year we're all of the mind that we need to have some sort of clear understanding of what the role of the Council liaison is. We've had some tests to that, let's say, some questions around that in a number of our PDPs over the last few months. And so it seems that we could do well to carry this forward.

So we have developed a clear role description but I think we need to figure out how better to utilize the liaison, let's say. We understand what the parameters of the role are that was a key deliverable of the strategic planning session but I think what we could also do is something like an implementation review the Working Group Guidelines to highlight the existing relevant provisions, you know, anywhere - I've actually had a look at the Working Group Guidelines myself and found that the liaison popped up in places that I wasn't quite anticipating so in terms of authority.

So I think that's one that we've been talking about throughout the year and had in principle agreement for and formally throughout the year but this is an opportunity to confirm; is there anyone who's not comfortable with moving forward on clarifying the role of the Council liaison and let's say better understanding that within the scope of the responsibilities of working group leadership?

Okay, silence tells me we are all in a happy place on that one, which is fabulous. The last one in this bucket of working group leadership is Number 6 and that recommendation has to do with documenting expectations for the working group chairs and other leadership team members that more clearly outlines their roles and responsibilities but also in addition to that, because it is the case that the GNSO PDP Working Group Guidelines, which form part of our GNSO Operating Procedures, there are some very clear provisions in those Working Group Guidelines around the role of PDP leadership.

It speaks very specifically to a PDP chair and doesn't maybe capture some of the nuances of the models that we've been working with lately with work track leaders and co-chairs and so on, so that's one improvement we might think about.

But also thinking about gaps, let's say, what can we do to fill existing gaps in those documents and to better utilize the - or better understand, better capture document - the skills and expertise that are needed. The Working Group Guidelines don't actually say anything to what we're looking for in our GNSO PDP chairs or leadership teams. Anyone - comments on that?

You know, we have as it is sort of two methods for appointing PDP chairs, one is the Council does this, another is that this happens within the PDP. We have experience with both methods. We can think about those methods but we can also think about how we can make that process a bit more robust in terms of perhaps documenting a - not a position description but something a bit more like the liaison roles that we've done through the effort of documenting those. Any concerns around that? Anyone disagree that that's a worthwhile thing to pursue?

Again, warring silence, which is success as far as I'm concerned. So that gives us six things to put forward to the Council in October. Leadership will take those up. With that we're at roughly the halfway point and I'm going to turn it over to Rafik to carry us through the rest of the webinar. Over to you, Rafik. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Heather. And so we can move to the slide Number 5 and that cover the two last categories of buckets. So the first is the - in consensus building and its Recommendation Number 9, provide further guidance for Section 3.6, which is about (unintelligible) for decision making. So here the idea is to provide further guidance to the working group chairs and the members of the working group and the definition of consensus and how the consensus designation is made and what tools that we can use or not.

And in relation to that also providing further guidance for the appeal of the Section 3.7. So I think this is related to previous recommendations, with regard to consensus. And I think this really can be contentions in working groups so I think the basic idea here is really to learn, I mean, to provide more tools to help the working group leadership but also to learn from other experience on how they're finding consensus decision making (unintelligible). So I think this is the kind of tool to help the working groups and how to move forward when a time comes from designating the consensus. So any question or comment on this one? I hope that we can continue to be on roll approving all recommendations.

Okay. So I see that people - okay, okay so I don't see any objection and I think we can assume that we have support for this one. So we can move to the next recommendation and there the role of Council as the manager of the PDP. I think that's something important for us as the Council. And this was recommendation, is related to enforcing deadlines and ensuring bite size

pieces. So I think - how to say - the idea here is that we really need to have more narrow scope for the PDPs and to break them - to break it in more manageable pieces to ensure that we can enforce the deadline and to get things done in a timely manner. And so this is - the limitation of the scope we can put for more pressure for using data and also how to say, defining the different (unintelligible) between the different pieces.

So this is also - will impact or imply that the Council has to review more regularly the PDP working group work plan. So that with that we can have more clear expectation regarding the deliverable and also to have more leverage to manage the scope of the work on the PDP working group.

So, yes, there are some proposal on how we - and possible implementation and how we can do that is that in the beginning at the Council leadership or the Council meet with the PDP working group to explain about the charter and the expectation and so we can set that from the beginning to help the working group focus on its work. And also to have more discussion with the PDP leadership to help the working group and therefore I think that's something that we're having already.

Okay. Sorry, just I think I saw there are several comments in the Adobe Connect, I'm trying to catch up. The first from Keith covering in fact Recommendation 11 and 12, so, yes, so to have a clear milestone that can be measured and any change to the work plan need to be communicated to the Council. So I think that's the purpose here. And there is agreement in the chat for that.

Okay, and so about accurate reporting back to the Council, and if things are not working out we need to know and the sooner the better. And I think I can guess here that's related to the role of the liaison about the reporting. Okay, so

I assume here unless there is some strong opinion on this, we have support for this idea that enforcing the deadline and having a lot of scope and probably we can include more language regarding having clear milestone and measuring that. Any comment?

Okay, Donna is typing. Donna is typing in the Adobe Connect. Okay, so here if I understand the challenges there really about understanding the time it takes for things to get done. So yes, maybe having better project management skills at the beginning and maybe having this kind of resource or expertise to support the working group on its work because I think that's specific skills that is needed. Okay, I think we can assume here there is support for this recommendation and we can add any language here from the comments to clarify.

Okay, so I think we can move quickly to Recommendation Number 12, which is also in relation to what we were discussing about milestone and work plan. And here it was notification to Council of changes in the work plan. And I think that the purpose here is that working group notify the Council when a work plan in particular the expected delivery date for the PDP milestone are revised or amended and giving explanation why those changes were made and how it can impact interdependencies.

So this will help the Council and in terms of managing the PDP and ensuring that doesn't go off the rail here in term of timeline. So based on previous comments I think we have likely support for this and it's something, Board, you can implement I will say as soon as possible. Okay, any comment or question here?

Okay thanks, Marie. So yes, I mean, I think it's fair question here in how we create a balance. I think the deadline or timeline set some constraint and

(unintelligible) everyone to reach and so I think here is maybe - it's really - the working group leadership in how they can handle this and create a balance and ensure that all input are made but ensure also that we can move towards delivering the work.

Okay, any question, comment? Okay I think that also outlined what we were speaking before in previous recommendation regarding enforcing the deadline. I see that Michele in the queue and also Carlos want to speak. Michele, please go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks Rafik. Michele for the record. It's not directly related to this but it kind of comes back to some of the stuff we were - well it is - it's indirectly related, it has to do with kind of PDP management and working group management and all of that. When we met in Los Angeles earlier this year, one of the asks we had coming away from that meeting was to see if we could get some level of transparency around the financial aspects of the PDPs, I mean, what their total cost, how much is budgeted both in terms of kind of clear tangible costs and softer ones around resources, etcetera, etcetera.

Have we had any progress on getting any of that? Because I think that also needs to feed in here as well if you're looking at like timelines because obviously running a working group for six months has a very different cost than running a working group for three years. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Michele. I think I can give here to response. One I think in term of the resources I think that can be related to Recommendation Number 17, which is about resource reporting. And also for like the EPDP we are working on the FAQ sheet about all the, how to say, the budget we have and how it - how much it was used and so on on a monthly basis, so I hope I'm not maybe,

yes, I mean, it will be shared soon as information so we are working to get that done and sharing with the Council.

And I think give a better, how to say, image of how much resources are spent for that working group. And so something I think what the Recommendation Number 17 is suggesting so I hope I respond to your question.

Michele Neylon: No, not really Rafik. I mean, the - it's not a question of a report; it's more to do with when we launch a PDP or another working group or another activity that we know what the costs are associated with them and how much budget can be allocated to it. There's no point in looking at the expenditure after the fact; we need to know what we can allocate to it at the beginning. Now it's not a question of making us into micromanagers or anything like that but giving us all a better understanding of the costs of running these things is something that we did section in LA.

I'm not talking about the reporting after the fact, this has to do with, you know, there is budget available for XY and Z, there's a cost associated with this, there's a cost for that, there's a lot of these things that realistically people don't kind of look at and because there's no kind of visibility around that it's very easy for people to constantly ask for more things without - because they don't have to worry about it because it's not coming out of their own pockets.

Becky Burr: This is Becky. Could I ask a question?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Becky. Please go ahead.

Becky Burr: Yes, I guess my question is, is what you're asking for, Michele, (unintelligible) reasonable more information from ICANN or more information from the leadership of the PDP to the members of the PDP?

Michele Neylon: Becky, it's Michele. It's - this is an issue for ICANN, not for the PDP leadership.

Becky Burr: Okay, so I mean, for example, we saw some budgeting information going back and forth on this EPDP but what you're looking for is really a much more detailed look at available resources and resources allocated to it?

Michele Neylon: Becky, it's not specific to the EPDP, the conversation was more around...

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: No, no, I understand that, I'm just saying that in general that's what you're asking for? I just want to make sure I understand this ask in particular.

Michele Neylon: Yes, I mean, the thing about it is, Becky, is that realistically speaking ICANN as an organization is meant to act as the coordinator for a bunch of technical resources including creating the policy. If you're able to highlight this I think it works at multiple levels in that when people ask for things they have a better understanding of why there might be pushback on some things and not others, and also I think it also could help us as a broader community and ICANN Org to understand that, you know, spending money on certain things that might seem like a really good idea it means that resources that aren't being channeled to what is much more of a core activity, if that makes sense.

Becky Burr: Got you. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Michele. So we have Donna and I think Carlos and Donna and maybe I can comment later. Yes, Carlos, please go ahead.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Thank you, Rafik. This is Carlos for the record. I didn't want to interrupt your very good presentation, Rafik, this was more a general comment, but it goes very much in the same direction to Michele's worries. In a way we're doing a great analysis of all the elements that are important for a successful PDP like the liaison to the Council, like the consensus role, like the project management skills necessary, the introduction of conflict resolution from an independent party and of course resources, time, money and staff we have not discussed that.

But I'm starting to worry that we are deconstructing the word "leadership," I mean, if we have the perfect liaison, the independent conflict resolution person and the money, we don't need leadership. And all these elements that we are discussing are also the key factors of success for leadership. So at some point I want to come back to this point because yes, we might be going in a very, very different direction than the PDPs have worked before; they have worked based on the qualities of exceptional people because - not because they're exception but because they could see that they had to deal on a case by case basis.

If we developed all these set of rules we might be killing the leadership possibilities by default. So I want to stop here. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlos. Donna, please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Excuse me. Thanks, Rafik. So I guess I just wanted to underline a point here maybe for - because I'm seeing, you know, in the chat from Mary and Marika, I think one of the things that we recognized is that certainly with the review teams they are allocated a budget so that must be based on something and Heather's quite correct that we did discuss this at length with Finance. And I think in budget comments that we sent back we said that, you know, we are

willing to be responsible for, you know, the money that we spend or that the GNSO spends in a delivery of products.

So I think maybe - maybe it's just time for ICANN to take this on notice that we really are serious about this and we do need - we do need the numbers if we are going to be responsible for budget. You know, the review teams have a budget, I don't know how they come up with those numbers but they do. So why can't we have the same thing with the GNSO?

And I think one of the things that we also discussed is that, you know, that the chairs of the working groups would actually be responsible for the management of that budget and I think that would help us in terms of enforcing deadlines and meeting those milestones because I think - well I would hope that if a chair realizes that, you know, the money is going to run out a certain point in time that the only option to the Council after that is they either have to go and seek more money or perhaps it's time to terminate the PDP. So I really do think this is an important conversation and it pretty much fits in with a lot of the other things that we're talking about here. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Donna. And I think we have several comments that we will take in account later on. So we have 9 minutes left in this webinar and several condition to go through and also discussing about the next steps. So okay so maybe going through quickly those Recommendation (unintelligible) there is any specific comment or question on them.

So Recommendation Number 13 about reviewing of the chairs, so I think here is to really just to review the - to have regular review of the working group leadership through a survey amongst the PDP working group and to obtain feedback on the chairs regular basis. So this is one of - this is the basic recommendation here.

Okay, sorry, Donna, is it an old or new hand? Okay, Recommendation Number 14 is to make better use of existing facility in PDP 3.0 for (unintelligible) and termination when it's clear there's no consensus can be achieved. So, sorry, here is to encourage more the PDP to do data gathering in the beginning and to see, I mean, hear from the Council standpoint to see if we, yes, sorry. So here is to really to do the work in the beginning to ensure that we succeed in the PDP in term of data gathering and also to have a clear charter question that lead the working group to deliver and so on. So here is to, I mean, the main objective is really to give - how to say - the requirement for success to the PDP.

So the next recommendation, Number 15, is to have an independent conflict resolution by - to - in the way to - in order to prevent, I mean, to avoid conflicts that can prevent the progress in the working group. And one of the ideas here is to have the Council liaison to be more proactive in - with regard to identifying any issue and also that - to intervene more in term of conflict resolution.

Sorry, I'm trying to go maybe too quickly through this recommendation, something here if there is any comment or any objection about consensus. Okay, I see none. Recommendation Number 16, the criteria for PDP working group update, so here the Council to provide a criteria for information that need to be provided by PDP working group leadership with regard to their update so we can - in order for us to track the progress and identify any issues at an early stage. And this is really kind of standardize the information provided by PDP working group. I think it's quite clear to previous recommendation like regarding notification on changes and so on.

So and I think on previous discussion the Council list is something we are looking for, so we can get to - in order for the Council to get useful information to manage appropriately the PDP. Okay, any question, comment, objection?

Okay, so the last recommendation here is this was (unintelligible) for the PDP working group which is regarding that the PDP working group provide a regular resource reporting update in how the resource and the budget is consumed since we are giving the working group leadership more responsibility in term of managing those resources, so that objective is to have the Council to track and oversee those resources and also to enhance more the accountability.

That was the last recommendation that have support in principle. I hope I didn't - I know that was maybe too quick but just giving people to say if they have any comment, concern. Okay, I see none. So the next slide, Number 6, which regarding the three recommendations that didn't receive support. And we have to (unintelligible) subject matter, one was about the creation of cooperative (unintelligible) which is the purpose was to help members to catch up what's going on in the working group but it was not necessary by some of the comment we got.

And I think the same for the PDP plenary or model, Recommendation Number 8, which is also that's an update or a presentation from the working group leadership for - so for members or newcomers and so on. So we didn't have enough support. The last recommendation, it's with regard to PDP consensus building, document position at the outset which was supposed that we all - we put all our consensus position in the beginning but, yes, it was - didn't get enough support so I think that position can evolve later on and we maybe it's not necessary in term to help for (unintelligible).

Okay, so I think we reached one hour but we need to go through next steps in order that - leaving to the EPDP call and should be my case to - but so Heather, can you please take over here? Yes.

Heather Forrest: No problem, Rafik. This is Heather. And let's go ahead and cut the call now so we can get staff and EPDP team members off. I've essentially summarized the next steps at the start anyway. So thanks very much, everyone. Thanks, Rafik, and brilliant call, great result, and we'll follow up on these next steps and carry this forward. So thanks very much to everyone. Enjoy the rest of your day and all the best to the EPDP team. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: You can end the call now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, everyone, for joining. This concludes the GNSO PDP 3.0 webinar. Operator, you may now disconnect the lines. Have a great remainder of your day, everyone.

END