ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO EPDP Team Meeting Part 2
Saturday, 09 March 2019 at 13:00 JST

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

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Phil. Let's start the recording and our meeting. So just also want to remind everyone to speak closely to the mics or we can't hear you and also for the transcript please state your name before speaking.

Okay we will spend most chunk of time this afternoon with a brainstorming exercise as you - it was I think raised in the morning about the question regarding the resources, the pace for phase two and so on. All those questions are being asked and the object is to get input and response for that. So I would pass here to Marika. She can maybe present the process and explain how we will proceed.

Marika Konings: Yes. Sure. Thanks, Rafik. This is Marika. Indeed we shared this information in advance of the meeting so hopefully you all had a chance to look at that, but we put together a couple of objectives or, you know, the hope for this exercise. You know, we already started a conversation this morning, you know, making sure that we have, you know, a list of all the issues to be addressed in phase do we already started our conversation and the mind map of course is a starting point in that regard.

The hope as well in relation to brainstorming exercises that we're able to - the group is able to agree on a prioritization of the issues or at least agree on an order for discussion going forward. Another objective is to identify

interdependencies among the issues of any and determine the effect of those on the prioritization.

The ultimate goal of course is to develop approach, work schedule and work plan and as well as meeting cadence that is associated with that. And I think, as we mentioned already this morning as well, it's important to identify any resource requirements that the group identifies. The original resources that were provided for this group were specifically linked to the phase one deliberation so as such, you know, there's a need for the group to identify if there are any specific requirements.

It has, you know, a couple of items that were already mentioned this morning and of course those requests will need to go through the GNSO Council and, you know, will subsequently, if there's support for the resources identified, make a request to the ICANN board for additional support to make sure that those resources are made available.

So what are the rules? We set up three workstations around the room. Number one is here, number two is on the other side, and number three is there in the back. For each of the topics we've identified a number of questions to, you know, get your input on. They're posted on each station and some pens, so please write your responses on those because that will make it easier as well to kind of, you know, group maybe similar ideas together or, you know, reorganize things or at least it takes up less space.

You know, there's no need to repeat if someone has already put up something that you agree with. You know, you can either add a plus one or just note that, you know, or elaborate on the response. You know, there's obvious linkage between, you know, the different questions. You know, when you talk about, you know, dependencies that may also link to resource so there's no need to be too rigid about, you know, where you write things down. The important thing is that we're able to capture everything and have a, you know, full picture of that.

So what we'll go and do is kind of count off to three and then everyone can read out their number so that we have three, you know, fairly equal groups. But no worries, everyone gets to go to each station. So basically, you know, those that have number one will start at station one; number two, station two; number three station three; and you each get 15 minutes there. So we'll start a timer and when the timer goes, the idea is that you move on, you know, to the next station.

Obviously, you know, there will already then be some ideas written down so you can maybe first take a couple of minutes to look what others have suggested and then start adding your own input and suggestions. Once everyone has gone through the three stations we'll probably have some additional time and we'll have some little Post-Its so people can actually go around and see all the ideas and suggestions that have been made and kind of select your favorite.

So again, that will help then, you know, staff and the leadership team to kind of go back and say, "Okay, you know, these are really ideas and suggestions that seem to have a lot of traction." And they, you know, we hope as well, you know, for the next phase of our conversation to see if we can, you know, pull some of that out as kind of preliminary agreements or directions where, you know, the group may want to go.

And, you know, then of course the rapporteurs for each station will work report back as well and aiming to provide a high level summary of the main ideas, suggestions, as well as the level of support obtained. So we'll spread - staff and leadership will basically spread out over the different stations and, you know, hope to guide the conversation a bit.

So we have put together here, and again all these questions come back as well in the workstations, but of course if there are additional questions you

think, you know, should we answer, feel free as well to add those to the document or the paper that hangs there if there are things we've missed.

So the first workstation is really focused on working methods so it's asking questions about, you know, how many hours a week are you willing or able to dedicate to this phase. It also asks a question about, you know, whether you're planning to participate in the IRT which may affect your availability, how much time do you think is necessary between meetings to assess results and prepare for the next meeting on the same topic?

And I think, you know, we had some comments earlier this morning that, you know, there is a desire from team members to have time to consult with their respective groups, but is that time, you know, are there any working methods that the team should consider or change based on what was done in phase one? You know, what is the best way to tackle the different topics? As you've seen there're, you know, quite a number of different topics in phase two. Should these be managed in parallel or consecutively? You know, as we said before, are there any topics that should be prioritized over others?

Also important, you know, development of the phase one initial report too, if you count all the hours, you know, about 100 - over 100 hours of conference calls, plus, you know, 50-plus hours of face-to-face meeting time. So keeping that in mind, you know, what do you think will be a realistic timeline for the publication of the phase two initial report? And again, it's just to get a sense of, you know, what people think is realistic and feasible as well as desirable.

Workstation two focuses on dependencies and interactions. You know, on the mind map we've already tried to identify, you know, some of the dependencies that the group identified in the phase one deliberations. You know, if there's anything that we've missed, you know, add that to it. And how do you expect that dependency to affect the timeline?

You know, there were a number of legal memos received in phase one, you know, which ones of those and how should those be further considered and, you know, how can we prioritize the discussion, you know, given that there are dependencies and interactions listed, not all of which may be within the control of the EPDP team to complete or finalize.

And then the last station focuses on the resources question so, you know, what resources are needed for the EPDP team to deliver its initial report for phase two in a reasonable timeframe? And we really would like you to hear as well focus on, you know, the justification or rationale for additional resources.

You know, don't just put down, you know, we need legal counsel but, you know, be specific on what legal counsel is needed for, you know, what kind of topics, what kind of engagement do you envision because, you know, we anticipate that whatever resources the group identifies and asks for, you know, a rationale will need to be provided and that's something that, you know, the GNSO Council will consider because, you know, obviously there are other initiatives going on and in order to, you know, prioritize some of the resources here, you know, justification needs to be provided which will then also need to be provided to the ICANN board.

And then the related question as well on the resources is, you know, how to ensure a common understanding of the topics in phase two amongst all EPDP team members, you know, what briefings or trainings may be required? There was a specific need identified phase one, does that suddenly exist here? There are, you know, maybe some technical aspects that, you know, need to be more fully understood or at least broadly understood that the group may need to think about.

And I think that's all I had on the workstations. I think Alan - I see a couple of cards up so I don't know, Rafik, if you first want to go through those and then…

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Thanks, Marika, for the explanation of how we'll proceed. So I think we have Alan and then (Ashley), Kavouss, okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Kavouss. We have Alan, (Ashley) and then you right up here and I think - yes. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Workstation one you asked how many hours a week are we willing to put into it. Can I suggest we focus on how many hours of week of meetings, how much time each of us put into it separate from that varies heavily and obviously it varies depending on the topic, but the hours a week committed to meetings I think are - we can extrapolate from that in our own lives.

                 But if we use that as the measure you're asking for then I think we'll get a common measure that we can compare. Otherwise, you know, if there are six hours of meetings per week, I may put in a total of five hours, someone else might put in 30 hours, and I don't think we can compare apples and oranges that way so I suggest we look at meetings.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Alan. (Ashley)?

(Ashley):   Thank you. And I'm happy to continue this question I'm about to ask in the actual group. But in terms of resources, and we're talking about, you know, our ability to continue participating and what timeframe, I'm a little bit concerned that there might be the maybe even the need to reduce substantially, like, our workloads.

                 And my concern is is that I don't want that to happen at least in a way that people are just fatigued. I understand that there's a lot of fatigue and we've worked at an incredible pace and I'm not saying we need to continue the

pace, but I'm concerned that we're getting to the point where we're getting dangerously close to amending the charter because my understanding is that the charter there are expectations expressed with respect to the ability to participate and how many hours were expected.

And I know, at least from my perspective, I'm willing to continue that and I just hope that we all look at this exercise as an opportunity of not undermining that and if there is fatigue that folks consider rotating out for someone who is less fatigued. But I just wanted to make sure and, you know, recognize that we don't need to have the exact same fast pace but I just also want to avoid a situation where we retreat so much to accommodate the fatigue amongst those who have been participating -- and I mean that in the most constructive way. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: I see we have a queue forming but also I'm mindful that we need to do the exercise itself to get all this input so we'll go and I think I would like to close the queue so to allow the time - allocated enough time for the brainstorming, but. So we have Kavouss, Alex, Amr and then Alan. Okay? Kavouss, please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Thank you. First you have to understand what we have been asked to answer. I understand that in phase two we are dealing with three items, one, two, three is mentioned in part of the text. Then the question is that when would be a suitable time to deliver?

I think we have to work it backward from the 20th of February 2020 if this work in phase two is directly related and associated with phase one. If it's totally different, you have to have a different timeframe. So I would like to know the link between phase two and between phase one with respect to coming into (unintelligible) because you said February 2020. So this is for question one.

Then in the two words you refer to phase one, what phase one we are dealing with? In the first bullet somewhere in the middle it says that phase one to deliver its initial report for phase one. What phase one? Phase one is already passed unless I have not properly read. And then in bullet four again we have some reference to phase one, what sources are for the EPPD to deliver on phase one. What phase one? What is this phase one and phase two? I don't understand this. Is it a mistake between phase one and phase two? What is the phase one here? Two times phase one mentioned. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Kavouss. This is Marika. I'm not really sure what you're exactly referring to but on this slide, you know, to the resources I think we're only referring to phase two. I think in an original or an early draft of the agenda, we may have put in one place I think phase one where we meant phase two. The other reference, you know, to phase one is in relation to the time that was spent in phase one on the initial report as a kind of benchmark to give people an idea of how much time was spent there that may help inform people's consideration of, you know, what time may be needed to deliver the initial report for phase two of the work.

In relation to the implementation timeline, I can just, you know, give you my best guess. I don't think there's a direct link between those two, although, you know, some of the work that may take place in phase two may eventually overwrite or replace some of the, you know, phase recommendations.

I'm specifically thinking of, you know, purpose two that was specifically identified as a placeholder. That could change as a result of the phase two but there's no dependency as such that, you know, that work would need to be completed by that date. Otherwise there would be an issue or problem, or at least that's my understanding of, you know, the current situation.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So can you - what do you want, Kavouss? Maybe you want to respond briefly about this, or?

Kavouss Arasteh: Still I'm not clear of the situation. If we take one of the activities of phase two, which is a standardized unified access, if there is no link between that, that means phase one date of bringing to use or effective date is 20th of February 2020 and then maybe there is no time that we complete the unified access or sometimes we have phase one in operation without any unified access.

So how many times? So how long would - so that is - I think there are - they are linked together. We should have this not unified access available for implementation of phase one. Otherwise it would be phase one implemented without any unified access. So what do we do during that period?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Kavouss. So I mean at the charter so we divided between phase one and phase two. So phase one it will go into implementation soon, so informally for now because we need to wait for the board approval of our recommendation. So that will continue. That effort will take time. And we will start phase two as planned, so there is no change here.

There is no - so we will discuss maybe about some it's not dependency but the impact in the workload but there is no dependency per se between the phase one implementation and the discussion in phase two regarding the - at the policy level. I hope I was not confusing, but okay. We will continue the discussion maybe later on but let's hear from others in the queue. So we have Alex, Amr and then Alan.

Alex Deacon: Thanks. It's Alex. Yes I've been trying to wrap my head around the logistics of the IRT part of this and can you - what assumptions are - have been made with regard to the IRT? Is it a separate team? Must the members come from this team? Is the - are we going to be constrained by SO/AC again? It's just not clear how that's going to work. I assumed it would be separate and EPDP would continue our work but I just don't know. So hopefully Marika can explain it all. No pressure.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Alex. This is Marika. I'm actually happy to report that I'm not responsible for the IRT but I can at least - I don't know if actually is Dennis in the room? Oh actually Dennis Chang I think will be talking to us a little bit later.

But I can maybe explain from the general perspective IRTs and the guidelines that are in place for IRTs that, you know, they typically draw their membership from the group that originally developed the policy recommendations, mainly to ensure that those participating in the implementation were clear on the intent of the original policy recommendations and as such are able to guide staff to make sure that, you know, the implementation is confirmed the intent of the underlying, you know, policy recommendations.

However, the IRT's usually not closed. There's as well I think a specific guidance to ensure that, you know, people with relevant expertise, especially operational expertise, are able to participate in those efforts because, you know, it is about implementation so it's important that that expertise is available. And I think as such, you know, the GDD staff that manages that effort, you know, will look at the composition of the group and make sure that there's sufficient participation and expertise available to participate in those conversations.

So, again, it's a question I think here and probably particularly, you know, contracted parties, you know, whether, you know, they will assign other representatives to participate in implementation or whether they themselves expect to participate in those conversations and similarly as well for other members of course of the group to give an indication.

I think, you know, I said there will be some conversation later today more about the thinking of, you know, that group. I don't know yet if they have any thought about, you know, the pace of the group, what is the intensity expected which, you know, obviously may impact as well, you know, people's

answers to these questions. But it's at least, in general terms, how IRTs have been formed.

I don't know if there's any different thinking at this stage and, you know, as you noted, you know, of course the composition of the PDP working group also took a different form compared to other PDP working groups so I don't know either if that is, you know, a point of discussion or conversation, should it be organized in a similar way or should it just follow the, you know, the standard IRT guidelines in that regard. So I hope that at least was a little bit helpful.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Marika. And also I closed the queue so to keep I mean that we have enough time later on. So we have Amr and then Alan. Yes, Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. I just wanted to confirm my understanding of the charter regarding, you know, the pace of work we're expected to move with and either to be - either to confirm that my understanding is correct or to be corrected. So my understanding is that, you know, the EPDP team was expected to consider not adhering to the traditional pace that normal PDP working groups follow and consider longer calls, more calls per week than normal PDP working groups conduct and hold. And this was supplemented with a timeline for the EPDP's work in phase one of its mandate.

But, again, I thought this was specific, and this is where my question really - I thought this was specific to phase one and not phase two. And what I've been hearing on council calls recently is that, you know, that phase two will be conducted more similarly to a regular PDP working group where the EPDP team will come up with its own timeline and its work plan and not necessarily stick to what is in the charter. So this doesn't necessarily mean that the charter is being amended, it only means that that portion of the charter is referring to phase one, not to the entire EPDP process. So if I'm mistaken on this I'd appreciate being corrected. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Amr. Yes, you are right. I mean the council's clearly asking us as a team to come up with a work plan and all what we need in terms of like the request for resources and so on. So we are tasked to do that work to come up with the timeline, the work plan and so on, and that's why we are trying to do here and to start that discussion.

So I am hearing many comments and questions and so the idea is really to go to have that exercise and everyone to put the comments and so we can later on compile and consolidate that and see if whether we have agreement or not and to continue the discussion. But, yes, we were tasked by clearly the council is asking us to do that work and to bring it the council for consideration.

Okay. So we'll end with Alan.

Hadia Elminiawi: Perhaps a comment on what you were saying actually.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. One thing we haven't discussed is when we reconvene in earnest. Normally for anything other than this EPDP, groups have taken the week after ICANN off to try to recover on their real life. Here we have the added issue that we are bringing some new people on board and it may take them a little bit of time to get up to speed. So I guess I'd like a little bit of discussion before we finish on, you know, when do we start meeting, once we decided what the meeting schedule is, when do we start. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Alan. That's - we have nothing scheduled yet so it's all open for discussion and taking into account these comments. Okay.

Hadia Elminiawi: Rafik, I had a comment on what actually you were saying.

Rafik Dammak: Hadia, sorry. Please wait. Please. Okay. So just I'm checking. I think we have enough time. I'm mindful that we need to go to the brainstorming itself, I mean that work. I said that I closed the queue so just I am mindful that people want to continue further the discussion but just I want to keep that for a short time, so I'm checking here who - I see you, Hadia, and (Georges). I'm not sure if - (Ashley), sorry. I'm not sure if Alex wanted to comment further or if that's - okay.

So, Hadia then (Ashley).

Hadia Elminiawi: Thank you, Rafik. Hadia Elminiawi for the record. It's just a quick comment because you responded to Amr by saying that definitely the council asked this group to come up with a timeline for the work and well yes, but that doesn't mean that this timeline has to be more relaxed than the, well, than the timeline that we had in phase one.

So in the council asking us to come up with timeline that does not necessarily - that does not mean actually that we can come up with whatever timings we want and instead of being an expedited policy development process, it would be a regular PDP. We might as well change the name of the whole thing. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Hadia. I think there is a confusion about the meaning of expedited PDP. Does it mean that it's a quicker or, like, the understanding in terms of pace but it's just that we are moving some steps from the whole - yes. But at the end, the main bulk of the work is the same. So it doesn't mean that it will kind of fast track or something like this. I don't want to preclude what we will conclude here.

Really that's why we are trying to get input and see how - what the team will reach as a conclusion and we will have to balance. So we'll hear from everyone and that's why we are getting input and see how it can work so we

need also to think. It's not just about the timeline or the plan but also think about resources. And we have to think about other dependencies.

So maybe we need to wait for other input that's coming from other groups or also, you know, we have to care about now the implementation and we know that probably there will be overlap in terms of participation. So we have to take all this into consideration and that's what we are trying to do now. So I'm just asking everyone to not kind of reach conclusion for now. That's what we are doing this. It's really to collect input and to later on so we can have maybe a discussion and see how we can reach a compromise.

Okay. I hope - okay. I think (Ashley) you will have the last word here.

(Ashley): Yes. Thank you. And I appreciate everything that's just been said and I believe Hadia asked something in line with one of my concerns. I just hope that we're careful here because a lot of us here don't or did not have any say in this charter and it's been - we've been upholding the terms of the charter and there's certain things that we don't but we recognize that's what the charter is.

And it just seems that there's a lot of assumptions that are being made now and it comes across sometimes as getting very close to changing the charter or at least what the expectations were starting into this work and that we just be careful not to do that because there are oftentimes when we're being asked very clearly to respect the charter when it comes to the role of observers and the balance there yet there seems to be flexibility in other areas. So I just ask that we do our best to be fair with respect to adhering to the charter moving forward. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, (Ashley). In terms of the charter I think we heard this morning from Keith about that we - the council is not planning to re-amend the charter so I think most of - Keith, you want to - okay. I think so in principle we will go

with that but we are also going to get guidance and probably sometimes we have traction in some area. Keith, please go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Rafik, and thanks to you all for hearing me out again. So I think the question before us and before you as a group as we start talking about timelines, right, and target dates for delivery is going to -- especially the question of timelines -- is going to be determined by the work plan and determining the work of the group.

And so I think the exercise that you're about to undertake is designed to start to identify the component parts and all of the things that need to be addressed in phase two in order to be able to move towards the delivery of policies that will inform the development of a standardized system for access or disclosure of nonpublic data, whichever term you want to use.

So I understand the concern that there's a feeling like there's a concern that we may be moving away from, you know, a deadline and the urgency that we had in phase one, but to be clear, the EPDP working group was chartered with two phase, recognizing that the first phase had an externally imposed deadline, an actual date that was determined by the boards imposition of the temporary specification. That temp spec could only last for 12 months.

The second phase of the work does not have a hard end date. It does not have a externally imposed date for delivery. So I think we as a group, and you as a group, need to start looking at what are the steps that need to be addressed from a policy perspective, this is a policy development process, to help inform the work that is going on in the TSG and perhaps the TSG's work is going to inform you and, you know, questions that need to be raised about, you know, what are the right legal questions that need to be asked and need to be posed about the viability of a uniform access model or standardized system.

So again, urgency is important here, right? There is an urgency but we need to have an informed work plan that will determine the timeline. I don't think at this stage we can pick a date, a date certain of, you know, and I understand, Kavouss, your comment about February, the end of February 2020 because there's a component of that for implementation of phase one.

So I understand the correlation but I think there's still so many unknowns at this point about the work in phase two and how it's structured that I think picking a date at this time would probably do a disservice to the group. I think you and we as the council need to look at this and try to figure out what is the work plan and that back into that based on the number of hours we think it will take to conclude that work.

So there is an urgency. The council expects this work to be done in a timely fashion, not to lose the momentum, but I think we need to have an informed discussion and you need to have an informed discussion about the work that needs to take place to be able to get us to that end date. And to be clear, your work is to focus on the policy discussions, the policy questions that need to be resolved around this issue.

The whole implementation of this system when we get to it is yet another component, right? So I think this group needs to be working right now on answering the policy questions that revolve or are associated with this work. So thanks. And I'm happy to take questions but I just wanted to add my two cents.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Keith. I mean it's kind of an unusual situation. So I think here is what we are doing is like in project management approach. We need to achieve something. We know we need discuss maybe about the scope to be sure and then two identify the resources and to do some estimation how much it will take.

It's more complicated when it's about policy because it's hard to estimate but that's why we are going to come up with the work plan and have an idea maybe what are the different I'm not going to say milestones but some proposal date and so on. So that's what we are trying to do here and getting input for that purpose.

Okay. So let's see. I think I said that to close the queue but - okay. So a brief comments, or? Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: It is clear that time is not as - so critical as the phase one but it should not be an open ended either so we need to have a target time. This is important. We should not say okay leave it as it is, two years, three years, I don't know. So I think we should have a target time. This is important.

Alan Greenberg: 2029.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. You are quite optimistic, Alan. So, yes. I mean, okay, I don't want to get, like, stuck here in the chicken/egg issue but we know that we have work to do. We know what's the scope. We are - we need to also discuss about the dependency. This is interdependency because this is kind of a factor impacting our work that we - I would say it's kind of a known known or a known unknown, so we are not sure what can be the impact so we have to factor that in our planning.

Let's say we are kind of here, we are still the project, we doing that initiation phase of the planning. So we are trying to see how much it will take us. So we cannot impose like a date and, how to say, in a arbitrary way. The timeline is going - should be based on how much work we can do, like in which pace we will follow and with which resource - what resource we will get and so on and so on.

So I understand about the urgency. I think that's taken into consideration but if we are going to come up with a work plan, we'll put all those elements and

we'll see how we'll end up. So again, I don't want to preclude or to what we will achieve. We may end up with different proposals and see what's the best one, best to take. So let's be here open minded and try to go through that process and put your comment, question, and input and afterwards we will continue the discussion based on the consolidated input we have.

Okay. So I guess it's a good time to start so we'll do the one to three. I guess we start with Alex you'll be one and then. One. No, no, it's - I think how to do it. One to three.

END