

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN Panama City  
GNSO ePDP Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data  
Initiation Request and Charter DT Meeting Session 2  
Tuesday, 26 June 2018 at 10:30 EST**

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://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Heather Forrest: Okay. Let's recommence our discussion on our deliberation as the drafting team of the EPDP Charter initiation request. If I can have a thumbs up from the Tech Team that we're ready to go, that will be brilliant.

Thanks, guys. So this reconvenes our drafting team discussions. As you can see from the agenda here on the screen, we are ahead of schedule which is brilliant. Lovely to start the way - the day that way.

What I would like to suggest that we do is council leadership has asked Julf if he wouldn't mind coming out of the GAC room to give us an update on their discussion so that we are as prepared as possible for our discussions with the GAC.

Now by way of time check - if we can have the discussions in the room a bit quieter please. By way of time check, it is now 10:35. We need to leave here at 11:25 in order to be at the GAC room in a timely manner and seated and all of that.

So what I propose that we do is we'll have some input from Julf on what's happened in the GAC room this morning and then we'll turn over to Rubens for next topic.

So with that, Julf, thank you very much. Over to you.

Johan Julf Helsingius: Thank you, Heather.

I apologize that this will be a bit chaotic because I'm going to read from very temporary notes, so which are random notes.

So there was - the morning was really a GDPR discussion in the GAC room where the issues they brought up one of the important ones that's (unintelligible) by a lot of people there was that they want access and accreditation to be part of the EPDP and really has to be faced by the time the EPDP goes in effect. That was a very strong opinion expressed.

They want us to hurry up with things like separation of the natural and legal persons and see if that's - if that can be a makeshift solution based on that. And also they were wondering if there are ways to - shortcut or short track access for law enforcement specifically.

Heather Forrest: Julf, just a question, shortcut or short track in relation to what?

Johan Julf Helsingius: EPDP as we come up with temporary solution for that first instead of going to the full process. I think that reflects not full understanding of our processes.

Let's see then. They (unintelligible) especially when they go and - both when they want to discuss with us and with the board, they want to discuss the scope entirely. Of course, they really want - of course, it turns into (unintelligible) access and accreditation going to be an integral part of the EPDP and there is very strong feeling that it has to be.

They're also discussing some ways to have a liaison with the European data protection authorities. So that could be an interesting development.

And then - so after sort of general discussion, there was a long and interesting session where the IPC actually ran a panel looking at the problems with the temporary specification and then looking at their proposal for access and accreditation mechanism. So that's pretty much what happened this morning.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Julf. That's very helpful as we prepare to meet with the GAC in under an hour.

Colleagues, any questions for Julf in relation to the update that he's provided, how this might impact what we want to say? I think, to my mind, we're largely in listening mode when we go to the GAC, so.

So I see Stephanie followed by Erika.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. Just a question, Julf. Was there any discussion of giving that interesting panel discussion on the problems they're having to us?

Johan Julf Helsingius: No, but, I mean, it was a GAC session. So they wouldn't have discussed I think that picture at all.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, maybe. Just seems a logical thing to bring here, seeing as how we're responsible for the PDP.

Heather Forrest: Thanks. I have Erika followed by Susan.

Erika Mann: Erika Mann. I will have to go to the ccNSO concerning the option perceived. So I will not be in the GAC meeting but I believe the GAC meeting has the leadership anyhow.

Okay. But I think it is important to remind them that law enforcement, of course, always have access to - even if the data would be completely hidden because at least if they have a warrant, they always have access. So what

they want to talk about is it's about an easier approach and easier access to the - to those data which are going to be hidden, if they are going to be hidden.

And I think it is important to remind them that there are processes in place and they might want to look at it like at Internet companies are handling this already today and maybe that's something one can learn from - in the ICANN environment as well. So it's not like one has to invent everything completely, you know, as new procedures.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Erika. From a procedural point of view, could I suggest this? So, Erika, you're right to say that there's a - let's say a dialog between the leadership, so council leadership will sit up at the table with GAC leadership, but it's always the case that councilors have the right to speak, so to speak, in the meeting. Now, that tends to be a bit tricky because the GAC tends to occupy those tables with microphones.

(Marika) and (Natalie), is there any way? Can we contact our support colleagues in the GAC to make sure that there's a roving mic so that councilors are able to speak because we've done such great work here with leads and people taking the lead on particular topics. To the extent that a question arises that it is best answered by one of the leads. There's absolutely no reason why leadership should have to speak on behalf of that person. So if we could make that happen, (Marika), that will be awesome and for the record, (Marika) is nodding, so that's brilliant.

So, thank you, Erika. I'm - I have Susan followed by Julf.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. Just wanted to clarify. Stephanie, you just wanted to hear the presentation the IPC and the VC did. I mean, we could arrange that but I could give you the short version, too, if you'd like, you know, at the next coffee break or something.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. Julf?

Johan Julf Helsingius: Julf Helsingius for the record. Thanks, Erika, for actually bringing up something that I should have mentioned. But yes, it's all about ease of access. And to the extent that they are also concerned about greatly anything for bulk access to data, that was definitely something that came up.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Julf. That's a helpful clarification.

Council colleagues, any further questions or comments before we transition to Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I thought really our job, I guess -- and certainly not mine -- to go and tell the GAC how to do their law enforcement access. But possibly, it might be interesting and useful to sort of jump in the rhetoric a little bit to come with the list of possibilities of how this, A, happens now without too much impediment, how one could expedite what it would take in terms of resources, you know? For instance, in Canada, they passed legislation many years ago -- about 15 I believe -- that permits the embedding of law enforcement intelligence folks in all kinds of telecom environments. That's an option. It takes one guy, you know?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. So your input makes me think about something procedurally, logistically that we might want to have in mind and if you disagree with me, this is an opportunity to say so.

I would like to think that we can focus our discussion with the GAC, not on the substance right now but on the process. Otherwise, we're going to divert ourselves into doing what the EPDP team is supposed to be doing and frankly, we're not at that point ourselves and it's not fair, let's say, for a part of the community to sort of super advance us to a place that we are not. So I think when we open our discussion with the GAC -- and I see lots of heads nodding around the table, including Julf -- when we open up that discussion, I

understand, Julf, that the GAC has some substantive concerns at this time and we can say that those are noted. However, we're not at that point in the process and this is really a discussion around charter and initiation drafting. So I have Julf followed by Mikayla.

Johan Julf Helsingius: Julf Helsingius for the record. I would encourage you to then also think about how to answer the question, "Okay, but how do we get our concerns heard in the process?" We just need to have an answer for that. That's all.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. Michele for record. We have covered kind of a quick refresh here maybe on the preparation for that meeting with the GAC or - because we seemed to be on that topic, maybe it makes sense just to do that now and get it out of the way at which case I'd ask that we bring up the agenda for the meeting with the GAC.

Just following on from the previous comments, we don't want to get into the weeds on substance. It's the kind of thing that if somebody has a specific concern that they want to voice, let's take that offline. Let's deal with that somewhere else. We're short on time and every hour that we spend in this room going into the weeds on substance is time that could have been spent trying to recruit and select people who actually do the work.

So we have the agenda up there. I mean, the first bullet points I think what we've been discussing so far, is there - are there any specific questions coming from the GAC that we know of beyond what Julf is kind of talking around? I mean, you know, the fact that they discuss issues is fine and dandy but are they coming to us with a specific set of questions? I'm seeing Heather shaking her head which doesn't work very well for transcripts but okay.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. So Heather for the record. We have not received specific questions. We've had dialog for the last two weeks about which topics would find their way onto the agenda. We raised some concerns on our end of that

subsequent procedure in the sense that they have updates directly from sub pro and whether we're really, you know, needed there.

I think the thing that we've emphasized to Julf at all point in his dialog of crafting the agenda is if they have specific questions, can we find out what those are and to date, we have not received specific questions. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks, Heather. That's helpful. Michele for record. So I just - I suppose the concern I have is that if we work this item on the agenda and we have an hour, while from our perspective, it's probably fairly clear where we're going, I can easily see this becoming a - what is - I think about something circling the drain or something and it's just - it could get very ugly. So would it make more sense when we're there to try to deal with the other two items before getting to that? Because, otherwise, I'll be afraid that we won't get to them. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Michele, that's an excellent suggestion and it's one that we actually proposed to the GAC and we were told this is the order that they wanted topics in. But I think we can revisit that as a starting point and say, you know, in view of the fact that the bulk of our time will be spent on the first item, if we start with that one, there's a risk that we don't get to the other two. So I suppose we turn it over to them.

As I say, I'm personally, as a view, that they've had direct interaction with sub pro. I don't think that that's very much more that we can offer substantively in relation to that one. Certainly, PDP 3.0, we are in a position to say something about but, frankly, from our side, it's pretty brief which is to say that the SGs and Cs are considering that report. So in substance, in essence, Michele, if they do - first, it'll be a quick, you know, one liner at the end on the others.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. I think, you know, the fact that, you know, they are insisting on a particular order and, you know, one of those kind of symptoms of an imbalance within the force, we need to just make sure that when we're having

those interactions with the GAC and with other groups that we don't end up with one overarching topic sucking all the option and not letting us get other things done which even if they are literally, here's a 30-second update but, you know, making sure that actually happens is important. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. That reminder of sharing the oxygen is a very good and timely one. Thank you.

Julf, thank you very much. I know you've had a busy morning. Thanks for coming back to give us that update.

Any final thoughts, questions on meeting with the GAC?

Seeing none, staff, thank you very much for your fast work on pulling this agenda back up for us. Could we turn to our substantive slides for this session and to - not the slide I guess but the charter document, please? And if we can put that to the relevant section for Rubens and with that, we'll turn it over to Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Heather.

During our consultation session yesterday, we heard that people don't want us to make that many changes from the decision-making principle that already - that are already established with the GNSO. And probably I have a meeting with them. We are already changing our (unintelligible) how this PDP is structured to make sure we achieve its goals.

So what we could look at is looking to situations where those specific designations could be used. So (unintelligible) that occurred to me was first effort by be PDP using only full consensus to do some kind of fast track of what nobody disagrees with and that could quickly generate consensus policy that we move the way we are (unintelligible) at least those topics that everybody agrees. So if we follow like the call center agenda model, it's

there and I think that people - anyone who doesn't want that is taken out. And that probably accounts for like 80, eight-O, percent of dispositions in the - of clauses in the (unintelligible). So that would move this ICANN compliance (unintelligible) that they can enforce those provisions regardless of time.

After that phase, we'll probably come to a PDP phase, a consensus data phase. In case we are dealing with the consensus policy, we should probably strive to catch consensus on anything because anything other than consensus might not be binding on contacted party contents. But if for some reason we can't find consensus in some area, I feel that there's still value in having group output that has only strong support because that could possibly (create) some voluntary specification. We have history with volatile adoption in specification (unintelligible). While meaningful work has been done and even though it's not binding good number of parties follow that, so that would come with presumptive compliance which is of interest with contracted parties.

So we shouldn't just abandon a theme just because it couldn't get consensus because sometimes the work is worth even without consensus. So that's what I have thought to that but specifically what we ask about decision-making methodologies that people told us to not share anything, I doubt that we should change anything either. So we're probably (unintelligible) to the whole community.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Rubens. Would you like to manage your queue or do you like me to do that for you? I'm happy to help you. Yes, okay, you want me to do that.

All right. Any questions for Rubens? Rubens, I might start, if you don't mind, with a classification. Yes? So if I can rephrase what you've said and put it in the language of the working group guidelines, what the working group guidelines tell us is the methodology of how consensus is calculated, let's

say, or how it's achieved, yes. What you are suggesting based on what you've heard yesterday and our deliberation to this point is that those methods will suit the EPDP fine and that there's no reason to differentiate - to deviate from those. But in addition to those, there could be an effort at the start and it would likely be easy to capture in the charter that there was a possibility from the beginning to look at the temporary specification and if there were items that the group came to agreement on that was acceptable that those could essentially be part kind of a triaging exercise. Is that correct?

Rubens Kuhl: Yes. That's fine.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Rubens.

Any comments or questions for Rubens? So this was an aspect that we got, you know, unanimity on yesterday from the community, as Rubens has said, and we certainly haven't had anything necessarily to deviate from that. And, Michele, you're going to go ahead and do that.

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. Since we all agreed, can we just move on?

Heather Forrest: Take this one as a win and move on. So let's talk about process. Rubens, this one shouldn't be too difficult by means of drafting. Would you like to - in drafting some straw man text or are you happy to do that?

Rubens Kuhl: I'm happy to do that.

Heather Forrest: Great. Rubens, that's brilliant. (Marika)?

(Marika): Yes, this is (Marika). One thing you may want to consider is that, you know, this specifically talks about decision-making methodologies. I think what you're talking about is maybe something more and maybe fits in the scope section because I guess it's something what you do kind of at the start when

you have the scope that the group looks at it - I think you just may need to see if this is the appropriate place to put what Rubens is proposing or whether that fits some more better because I think if I understand, people agreed that the existing decision-making methodologies apply and that text is already basically there from the working group guidelines, so.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Marika). That's a helpful clarification. So as we see here, it's a good point. If you look on the screen and in the AC room, what we have is the language that would normally appear in a PDP charter. Can I suggest to this while we have it in the parenthetical there in italics the explanation about where this material came from, I would suggest that we put in an explicit reference that stays that says the EPDP shall follow the working group guidelines, the relevant provisions of the PDP working group guidelines? Yes. That significantly gets you off the hook, Rubens, let's say, in the primary part of the drafting task.

To (Marika)'s point about how the group will go about triaging that work, that may well fit better in scope. So it's really that language, Rubens. No need to do this language, the sort of nuts and bolts but it's that language.

Rubens Kuhl: And so I work with Susan on that.

Heather Forrest: Fabulous. So we'll make a note that Rubens and Susan - have you been voluntold? You're happy with that?

Rubens Kuhl: Because Susan's in charge of scope, if I remember.

Heather Forrest: Understood. So Rubens will have some language to filter in to scope. I think staff can probably handle that, let's say. If you get the documents, the text to staff, they'll find the relevant place in the document for that. Susan, for the record, Susan's face is just as surprised as mine. That's good. So, Rubens, if you could work on that text for us by this evening and hand that over to (Marika), she'll put it into the document in the relevant place.

Rubens Kuhl: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous, thanks. Win, A-plus, move on.

Next in the queue, remind me from yesterday who followed Rubens, was that Stephanie? Who came after you, Rubens? Yesterday.

Stephanie. Darcy. Excellent. Darcy, over to you. We're going to move the charter to the relevant section here and over to you.

Darcy Southwell: Thank you. Darcy Southwell.

So I think we heard a number of comments yesterday that focused on the need to be transparent and to have good reporting, I think, you know, "communication" was probably really the better word than "status reporting" because this will be a regular thing. We're talking about four months of work that needs to be communicated to the community on a regular basis.

There were some suggestions that I think are rather - they're very processed oriented but I think they work today. There are PDPs who do monthly newsletters I think they refer to them of and, you know, if we can do those on a more regular basis, that would help. I think Scott helps prepare those. I think someone did raise a suggestion that, you know, we have to be careful and balance the work of the PDP working group and make sure they're not spending time preparing status reports and not working on at the material of the PDP.

Other than that, there were no suggestions to change what we do. I think we talked a little bit about the council liaison. I think that my personal opinion is that we do need to decide what the cadence should be and set those expectations in the charter in order to avoid a mishap where all of a sudden we have - a ball has been dropped and we're not aware of it until three weeks

in. And when you consider that we really only have - material work to do this, we can't afford a delay like that.

So I would definitely suggest we have some parameters and requirements for what is communicated to whom and to when, what timing.

So welcome any thoughts on that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Darcy, very much. So a question for (Marika) really and for Darcy as well. What this document says here, status reporting, it says presently, as requested by the council, taking into account the recommendation of the council liaison to the group. What we live with this language, let's say, could we have this kind of generic language? I think to Darcy's point, there's a real value in being more specific than this I think to the extent the council can start to flush these issues out rather than make it a sort of forward-looking as we determine. I see Darcy nodding and (Marika) has her hand up.

(Marika), thank you.

(Marika): Yes, thanks, Heather. So yes, it's definitely - this is (Marika). Yes, it's definitely up to the council to add anything you want here. And I think something just to factor in this - I think at this stage you're suggesting that to the EPDP team or - so you could write something, you know, there is an expectation that the EPDP team would provide regular status updates both to the council and the broader community. These could take, for example, the form of a newsletter or a regular Webinar I think someone had suggested previously. So you may be specific but still provide some flexibility to the EPDP team to decide, you know, what works best within the context of work that they're doing and the resources available. So that may be a possible approach.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, (Marika). It's Darcy. I think that having flexibility is important. But if we do have any specific requirements of the liaison, we may want to call it out

here rather than rely on the sort of generic nature of this timing that's in our - whatever it's called, sorry. I can't see it very well. The working group guidelines.

Heather Forrest: Darcy, thanks. To that point, I'm - (Kate) and (Marika), could you just go us to it? I've actually added some language into the charter, specifically on - so there's a section that deals with the role of the liaison, the broader role, let's say, beyond just status reporting and what we have, as draft text here, is role of the council liaison -- we'll make that bold -- responsibilities in addition to those set out in that document that we developed earlier this year. So that's the broader context, Darcy, could be captured there but I agree with you that anything specific about status reporting cadence, as you say, could go into that other section.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks, Heather. Just very briefly, I think one of the things that maybe just it's - whether this goes into the charter or this is communicated somehow when this entire thing is announced, you know, people should be reminded that as a general rule, the mailing list archives of any PDP working group are publicly accessible, so people can read all that. They can also access transcripts, recordings, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

And I would go for the - in saying that, you know, as we've done with the GNSO council mailing list, if people -having the option that people to subscribe to the list in order to receive the e-mails without having posting rights if that's an option and doesn't add any extra burden, I mean, why not? I'm sure (Marika) can now disagree with me but, you know.

Heather Forrest: So, Darcy, I'm sorry. I fell into a rhythm of managing the queue. It's over to you.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Heather. I think that, you know, if I'm not mistaken, (Marika), Michele - don't we?

(Marika): Yes, this is (Marika). I think all GNSO mailing list, including the council mailing list, is set up into joy that they can have observer. So people receive the e-mails but are not able to post. And if I could add one more follow-up comment to indeed allowing people to participate, one thing that we also implemented, we already did that forward the council meeting but we've also started doing that for the related drafting team meeting, is to provide audiocast. That is a relatively low cost, as well as low-staffed, resource and method that would allow people to kind of live listen to the meeting without being actually on the call or being in Adobe Connect Room. So that is another mechanism that you can consider to ensure that people have the ability to, you know, be up to date and follow the conversation without necessarily having that seat at the table which I think was mentioned before. So that is something, if that would be helpful, staff could relatively easy - easily implement without any significant cost.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Marika). Anyone else?

Stephanie, sorry.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. I realize what I'm about to say makes me sound like, A, a former bureaucrat, and B, a spindrift, but I've been - yes. Well, I'm not a spindrift. But I do - I worry about the intensity of this PDP and the responsibilities that are going to fall on the management team and on staff and things falling between chairs and I think that managing the schedule is a big deal and reporting in a concise way because I'd be reluctant to tell people in my constituency "Go swim in the swamp," "Go read all the e-mails" because this is going to be intense. And they can read the e-mails and not necessarily get the gist of it. All is to say we need a reporting function that is in plain words on a regular basis. So who's going to do that? We need a project manager, not staff. We don't want to load that on staff. We don't

want to load that on the execs. We just need a plain old project manager that would remind people constantly because it's our accountability as EPDP members to manage our time and be accountable and responsible for meeting the deadlines, not staff's job to keep us to that.

Therefore, this really is a separate function that you don't want to load because it's going to be intense. Does that make any sense?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. It definitely makes sense to me from a - when you think about project management. I guess my initial reaction to that is why should it not be a staff member? I think we'd be - we're trying to project manage, right? We're going to have a work planned that's going to fit in with the timeline which I think we've already discussed it really needs to be in the charter. Part of what we're doing is making sure that from a policy manager perspective that that work plan is being followed. So - management is a skill. It is something that - it's not random. Yet, you have to really be monitoring this. I'm wondering why maybe it wouldn't be into - in staff's world.

Stephanie Perrin: And if I may respond to that, it's Stephanie again. I think it definitely could be. It's my perception that we're not also burdened with staff here at the GNSO as compared to certain other areas. So I would - I just want to make sure they get the extra staff to have a dedicated project management person and then it doesn't get loaded on, oh, say, (Marika).

Heather Forrest: (Marika), do you have thoughts on staff's ability to offer that support or...

(Marika): This is (Marika). I think in the end of the day, that will also depend on scope, size of the group and those kind of aspects. But I think at the moment, we're probably equipped to provide, you know, the services we also provide to all the working groups which, indeed, include the reporting work plan follow-up. But again, you know, of course, at the end of the day, it will depend on the overall workload. But I think we will be able to find some assistance on those specific aspects of work if needed.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Marika). Anyone else?

Susan, sorry.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. I want to go back to the liaison role because I think we really need to flush that out. My experiences in the last few months as liaison to PDP has given me some experience I would have preferred not to experience. But I think - and I'm not sure how we do that in, you know, sort of park it somewhere. You know, maybe it's not crucial to date to do that. But to give some thought to how involved this liaison should be, I think it's - in my opinion, the liaison should have - should be an active participant in some way or active listener maybe, I'm not sure. And then - so that we can detect issues before they go as far as (unintelligible) for one thing.

The other issue that we need to address and get some thought around is the 3.7 and because this EPDP could be hijacked very easily using the 3.7. And, you know, although it's - from the (unintelligible) quote the language, I can't quote that language to you, Stephanie, but I just see that quizzical look on your face but essentially, in the IGO, NGO curative rights, whatever that one is termed, that was filed and all work stopped for three months on this PDP. We cannot have that happen here. I mean, not - and I don't think in the group as I think all the communities are very vested here to get in and compromise and work hard and deal with each other. But we do not want to set ourselves up for failure by not thinking about this and addressing it prior to the launch of the PDP.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Susan. I think that's an excellent point to speak to the real-time role. I mean, I think we're talking about a four-month process. And part of me would say that that means the liaison needs to be attending every meeting and needs to be reporting to the council probably every couple of weeks. I'm

just throwing that out there because that's really eight reports in a four-month time frame, so. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Darcy. Donna Austin. Just to Susan's point, I think it's important for the working group to understand the role of the liaison and respect that role. I think it's really important.

I know that, you know, I've recently taken on a co-liaison role with the PDP working group and it's - sometimes it's a little bit of a challenge to know when it's appropriate to speak or not. But I think it has to be a two-way thing that the working group understands that the liaison does have - "power" is the wrong word but does have the ability to, say, to come back to the council and say, "We have a problem here and we need to look at it and we need to fix it." So I think that needs to be - it's a two-way street that needs to be acknowledged.

To the project management skills that we were talking about earlier -- and I think Darcy mentioned it depends on the scope and size and all the rest of it - - that's going to become important. Oh, it was (Marika), I think.

But I actually see that project management as a skill for the chair. They really have to understand that, you know, this is the timeline that they're dealing with and it's their responsibility to keep on top of that. So I actually see that as a skill - one of the skills that we've been looking for from a chair that they are the ones that are going to drive the work product and get to the end. So I think it falls there.

Certainly, there could be an organizational role for staff in supporting that but, ultimately, it's the chair that has the capability to have it on track.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Donna. And I think to our discussion earlier about leadership and probably should - if we were going to ask that and ensure that's sort of a key portion of the chair's role. In addition, I think we talked about facilitation and

a couple of those things. So just to make that clear to the chair so the expectation is set from the beginning. Thanks.

(Paul)?

(Paul): So, Darcy, in response to your note that the liaison will need to be on every call, we need to report back every couple of weeks, I just wanted to officially - - and this is my personal position -- say not yet. Thank you.

Darcy Southwell: I understand, (Paul). Thanks. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Darcy. I'd like to take Susan and Donna's comment a little bit further and be a bit more specific on this. I think one of the things we specifically need to deal with here is the situation of what happens when the liaison disagrees with the chair's view of the timetable of whether this thing is on track. I think there's a possibility that our chairs could be optimistic or pessimistic and the liaison might be the opposite, let's say. So I think we need to specifically - maybe I'm putting a final point on Donna's intervention. We need to empower that liaison and make it very clear from the beginning and have the leadership of this PDP entirely onboard with that principle that they understand that there may be times that the liaison comes to the council with their own view and that they need to be empowered to speak.

As a liaison, it's not a poor reflection of the chairs and so on. I think we need to be specific there. And I see Susan nodding. I think this is logically channeling our PDP 3.0 discussions and the experience that we have in ongoing PDP. So let's not forget a bit of a plug for PDP 3.0. This is an in vivo experiment of some of the issues that we're raising in PDP 3.0 and here's an ideal opportunity. We have the flexibility to be able to implement some of these things. Thanks, Darcy.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Heather. And I think that's a good point. We've talked a lot about improvement in our PDP 3.0 concept and we definitely - I think it's probably

even more important even if some of them are tried and maybe don't work so great, we just need to try them here because we have such a shortened timeline.

Anyone else? Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: The one other thing I'd like to recommend and I don't want to create busy work but in the review team, factsheets are published every month and those, to me, are really critical because it's a real, you know, I take a look at them each month and maybe we need to - it might need shorter time span for this but I take a look and you sort of know where you are, how much resources have been used. And so you know "Oh, look, staff hours, 500." That's a lot of hours. And, you know, this is the amount of dollars that were spent, you know, whatever key factors we want to track but I think if we look at this from a project management point of view, those - a lot of that would be tracked anyway and then just getting that out to - for anybody to see really. But I think it would really be helpful for the council, too.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Susan. When you think about what to track, you have specifics or are we looking at how much time is spent? Are we looking at - I mean, are we looking at a total - my question is, are we looking at a total sort of cost analysis or are we just trying to understand the amount of effort that was put forth from a work perspective?

Susan Kawaguchi: Well, it does track. You know, for the review team, it does track. You know, did the leadership attend the leadership call? Did the members attend the call, the, you know, face-to-face meetings, you know, all of that? So you get a synopsis. But it also tracks - and we can pull those up and, you know, and use those as examples. But it also tracks how much travel funding we've spent and then it does get into staff hours which I think we need to do a better job as a community to acknowledge how much we rely on staff and how many hours they're putting in because, yes, we think this may be a lot of work but, you know, it's going to be a team, you know, staff that will be working

during the hours that we're working on this and then into the night to - and bring something back to us the next day or two. So I just, you know, I wouldn't want to make this a lot of work. But if we could track some metrics, I think it would be healthy for the process.

(Marika): Thanks, Darcy. This is (Marika). So there's actually a need - an action item, I think, that came out of the strategic planning session to look at adopting that factsheet and make it fit for purpose for, I think in general, PDP working groups but this may be a good reason to start using it as well in this context. So we started looking into how to make it fit for purpose because there was, I think, a very good template that is indeed used by the review teams that we may just easily be able to adopt for this specific purpose and then also maybe continue using it or start using it as well for some of the other efforts that are underway and that may also facilitate in council's oversight of these efforts and make it easier to track where they are in their work although I think we had this conversation, of course, for our normal PDP working group just to begin our budget associated. But in this case, that may obviously be different.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, (Marika). Heather?

Heather Forrest: (Marika), just a follow-up so we can be clear here. You say staff has been following up. Is that implementable? Is that possible in time for this EPDP? (Marika) is, for the record, nodding yes. Yes. Good. "Yes, why not" I think is what that gesture is internationally recognized as. Good stuff.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks. Anyone else?

Does anyone have an opinion about what frequency we should set for the council liaison reporting?

Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Darcy. Can I make a suggestion? So let's start from a baseline. Council meets monthly. Do we want to have a stemming item in the agenda or do we want more frequent than that?

Darcy Southwell: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. Heather's suggestion makes sense to me.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: I was going to say monthly is nowhere near and off, I think, on this one.

Darcy Southwell: (Carlos)?

(Carlos): If it's going to be more than monthly, then every member is free to follow the calls. I mean, we have only one monthly call.

Darcy Southwell: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Can I just call a spade a spade? I mean, this is getting a bit ridiculous. Let's face it, who in the room has no vested interest in following the progress of this EPDP, please raise your hand.

Okay. For the record, nobody moved. Okay, so, look, it's not as if nobody is - everybody is going to be suddenly disengaged from this. Our council's role is to manage the PDP process, not to micromanage the PDP process. Getting more than monthly update sounds like complete and utter overkill. If there isn't issue that needs to be addressed, then that is the role of the liaison to bring that to council.

Seriously, I don't think, you know, we all have day jobs or most of us have day jobs and having more information about the PDP that's going to be ongoing, then we already will be getting - doesn't seem to be particularly

productive. Standing item on the council agenda to give an update to council in the formal fashion makes perfect sense to me. It is incumbent upon the liaison to, well, liaise and to bring updates and raise issues should there - should that happen. But I don't think we want to be getting more frequent updates than there was. It just becomes farcical. Thanks.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Michele. Philippe?

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. Philippe Fouquart. Yes, certainly, agree with that. Let's just not turn this into red tape, if that means anything here. We don't want to overload this with weekly reports of sort. It's always possible to a liaison to alert council on a daily basis if that's necessary. But in terms of report, I think we should keep it lightweight. Thank you.

Darcy Southwell: Thank you, Philippe. (Unintelligible)? Oh, sorry, (Carlos).

(Carlos): Remember the discussion of the liaison was to have somebody available we - before we had chairs and working on the charter, et cetera, and keeping contact. If we go back to the previous discussion how to set up the leadership of the expedited PDP in case we decide to have two co-chairs, one from each house, I don't see the need for having specific liaison. We have a chair. We have two co-chairs reporting to their houses, if necessary. And I don't know it's in the expedited model with such a demand for full resources. We want to add another layer. Thank you very much.

Darcy Southwell: Thank you, (Carlos). It's an interesting point. We need to consider that, obviously. We have time - we have a time constraint here, so. Thanks.

Anyone else?

Heather, you want to...

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Darcy, very much. So we have two minutes to wind up this session and pack up our things and head over to the GAC room for a meeting with the GAC. Any final comments or questions in relation to reporting?

So, Darcy, from a logistics point of view, you have - let's say we want to put on you the obligation although it would be helpful. Any thoughts that you have from this discussion that you've captured in relation to the role of the liaison, let's say, additional responsibilities above and beyond?

Susan, I wonder -- I'm not voluntelling you but -- if you have any input into that extra responsibilities of the liaison if you're willing to give those to Darcy. Darcy, you have notes. Would you like support? Do you want a buddy through drafting or you have to carry on?

Darcy Southwell: I can do the drafting and probably a little bit of staff's help.

Heather Forrest: Fabulous. So, Darcy, if you will do that, you'll be naturally liaising with staff in that process. If it's possible to have that straw man text to (Marika) at the end of the day, that would be brilliant and it will find its way into that Google Doc.

So a reminder then of the poses, what will happen is that Google Doc will get updated as and when the text goes to staff. So keep your eyes on that Google Doc. (Marika) has circulated the link. Let's circulate it again so that it's at the top of everyone's inbox at the end of the day. (Marika), I think when we wind up this session, let's circulate that. And we'll turn it to (Marika).

(Marika): Yes, this is (Marika). Just to know that I just send around another document as well. We just got the input from the general counsel's office because as you may recall, there's a section in initiation request that they are expected to fill out in relation to the scope and relationship with ICANN's mission. So they've completed that task and that was just sent around to the councilors for your information.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Marika). Very helpful. So you can pack up your things. You can leave your (tent cards) because we'll be in the GAC room for an hour and we will come back here.

Councilors, on your way back into this room, there will be a boxed lunch for you to pick up and we will resume after our meeting with the GAC.

So what we have arranged is that there are open places in the front of the room with microphones. If I can suggest that our leads on particular topics get priority for those seats. That way, you have a microphone ready. There will also be a roving mic in the room. Councilors, please feel very free to put up your hand and look for one of those mics.

Thanks very much. We'll reconvene in the GAC room.

This ends this session for our tech folks. We can shut this one down.

END