

**ICANN Transcription
EPDP Initiation Request and Charter Drafting Team
Tuesday 19 June 2018 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the EPDP Initiation Request and Charter Drafting Team call on the Tuesday 19 June 2018 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-epdp-initiation-19jun18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording:
<https://participate.icann.org/p8r4hwueub2/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/3gA5BQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the EPDP Initiation Request and EPDP Charter Drafting Team Meeting on the 19th of June 2018. On the call today, we have Heather Forrest, Donna Austin, Rafik Dammak, Michele Neylon, Rubens Kuhl, Darcy Southwell, Susan Kawaguchi, Marie Pattullo, Paul McGrady, Tony Harris, Philippe Fouquart, Tatiana Tropina, Ayden Férdeline, Arsene Tungali, Stephanie Perrin, and Carlos Gutierrez.

We have received no apologies for today's call, and from staff, we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Ariel Liang, Caitlin Tubergen, Terri Agnew, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription

purposes and to remain on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Thank you ever so much and over to you, Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Nathalie, very much and thanks very much to everyone for being here. We seem to come together a lot lately and Michele, we only gave you the difficult task for it. Everybody else had an easy one. So we have on the right side of the Adobe Connect room, you'll see four points that we're hoping to get through today. I know there's been a bit of confusion as to what today is all about. So I think we'll start off right away with that. We'll talk about how today fits into the time that we have in Panama and what we're gearing up to for Panama.

We have an opportunity today to really put a structure and a framework around these discussions that we've been having for weeks now around broad topics and we'll do that with the actual documents that we need to be developing. We have a blank charter that is the template charter. It's got nothing in it. You would have seen this document but with draft text in there or samples, or straw men type text in there, but we'll look at the blank today just to come to an understanding of what topics are in that charter as headings and if there's anything else that we need if we think something is missing. It's an opportunity to identify that.

And then in order to carry this forward to the next step, once we figure out what our topics are, what needs to go into that charter, I think it would be helpful to have a call for volunteers on leads for each one of those topics. So we can have someone, a responsible person to crack the whip and gather discussion. So ultimately, today is another opportunity to gather input from councilors but do so in a more structured way and the structure comes from the charter itself.

So that gives a sense not only of the four agenda items but the purpose of the call. In terms of the Panama schedule, Donna has the best sense on the leadership team of what we have ahead of us in terms of timing for this effort in Panama. So Donna, if you're happy for me to turn it over to you, I'll do that.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So can everybody hear me okay?

Heather Forrest: We can hear you, Donna.

Donna Austin: Okay, great. Okay. So what we've done in terms of - thanks, Nathalie. That's great. What we have in terms of time available in Panama for this EPDP drafting team, which is a very difficult acronym to say, is that on Tuesday we have a substantive of time between - I'm really sorry, this isn't - but we have substantive time between 8:30 and -- I'm really sorry folks -- between 8:30 and 3:00. Is that correct, Nathalie? Am I reading that properly?

Nathalie Peregrine: This is Nathalie. It's actually 9:00 to 3:00, 8:30 to 9:00 is the GNSO Policy Briefing.

Donna Austin: I see now, yes, okay, I've got it now. Really sorry, folks. A bit early for me. Okay, so on Tuesday, we have substantive time between 9:00 and 3:00 to work on the drafting of the charter and the initiation request. With, and I'll note that (unintelligible) feedback. Thank you. Thanks, Terri. And I'll note that we have to take time out (unintelligible) 11:30 and 12:30 because the Council has a meeting with the GAC. So that will take time out for us.

I believe we do have lunch available. So that will be provided for us on the day. So Tuesday is our substantive time to do the drafting. We'll hopefully make some significant progress on the drafting. What we're also trying to do and I think we have agreement from the rest of the SOAC planning committee is that we will likely have a cross-community session on Monday

afternoon between 5:00 and 6:30 and this is an opportunity for community input on the charter.

What we recognize as a leadership team is that this will be - it will be a GNSO Council effort that does the drafting, but in order to enable community input to the process, we thought it might be helpful if we could have some session in Panama to do that. We've been able to do a swap - it's not confirmed yet, but we think we have a swap for the session we have planned on Thursday from 5:00 to 6:30. We've swapped that with the (HIP) session on the update on RDS WHOIS to Monday. So that will give us an opportunity to discuss it there.

I think we also have a placeholder on Wednesday morning from 9:00 to 10:15 and it's a possibility that we could use that time as well for the drafting. So Heather, I think that's all we have in terms - and I'm only speaking specifically to the time available for the drafting team, notwithstanding the other council sessions that we have in terms of the meeting and the working session on Monday. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. It's perfect. So from what Donna's done in taking us through the schedule, what we can understand is we have opportunities we have today. We will come together again to the extent that you're available to gather input from the broader on the community. And as Donna said, it's an opportunity to meaningfully engage with the other SOs and ACs and with the broader GNSO as well.

That will then feed into our drafting sessions on the Tuesday and we have the placeholder motion in the calendar on the Wednesday. The reason we aim to get that cross-community input and why - the extent that it works out, we're super appreciative of the swap if that's able to happen, is it notes or enables the feeding in of that input prior to the actual council meeting.

And Marie is noting that there's a high interest session on the accreditation model from 5:00 to 6:30 and that's helpful to know, Marie. Thank you very much. So quite a bit - Donna, your hand please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Marie, thanks for the reminder. So one of the other things that we might be able to do and we'll be expecting a conversation with Brian Winterfeldt is that we may be able to use some of the time on Tuesday afternoon. There's two sessions on GDPR. One is on accreditation but we may be able to use some of the time in one of those sessions to provide an update to the community on where we are. So that's still under discussion. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. That's helpful. So that gives us (unintelligible) the next week, what's ahead of us and the ultimate not goal as such. But there is a sort of important point in Wednesday's council meeting given that we have that placeholder motion on the table, and again, the opportunity for community input prior to that point was important. So hence, we tried to move the schedule around.

I know a number of the SCs and CEs leaders have asked for clarification on these RDS session and we'll make sure that we circulate this around. And as soon as we find out about the confirmation of the Monday cross-community session, we will let you know. And just so, again, so we're actually clear, it's that - I'm saying cross-community. It's (HIT). It's the 5:00 to 6:30 session that you see there on the Monday calendar.

Any questions about Panama and today and how it all fits? Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. Just very briefly, I assume you'll circulate something or somebody will circulate something after this just to summarize those various (unintelligible). I know a few people are missing on the call, plus I know for other people this is either the middle of the night or very, very early in the

morning and if they're like me, the caffeine probably hasn't kicked in for them yet. I don't have that excuse, admittedly. I have others.

Heather Forrest: All good points, Michele. So I think what we could maybe hopefully do is why don't we recirculate this schedule. It's handy to have this thing in the top of the inbox anyway. Let's recirculate this schedule. It's clearly noted here. We can highlight the EPDP sessions and we'll also highlight this (HIT) session as a possible swap if you like.

With that, that should suit, Michele. If not, please say so. Rafik, over to you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Heather. Just wanted to, if we can get the clarification about how the session on Tuesday, how we'll approach it for the session on Tuesday between (unintelligible) and the talks in the morning and those in the afternoon.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik. Sorry, I think I missed the very beginning of your question. I think what you've asked is how the sessions would be set up on the Tuesday. So we start - the only - the logistics thing is we've got to shift rooms from 9:00 to 10:15. We've got then the rest of the day in the other room. And I think what we do need to do and maybe this is also your question, Rafik, there are various conflicts, as you can see on this schedule. It's particularly helpful to have the schedule in front of us.

There are conflicts with SG and C meetings and I think what we need to do is we need to agree that we're not going to make decisions at a time - frankly, I don't know that these are decision-making type sessions. But we need to recognize that not everybody is going to be in the room at all times because of the overlapping discussions. It's fine to say (unintelligible) the PDP work but that may or may not be possible for some folks.

In fact, Rafik, maybe I've completely bungled your question.

Rafik Dammak: No, I think that's a classification I was looking for. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Cool. Thanks, Rafik. Paul, over to you.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. This is maybe something staff doesn't have time to do but it would be extremely helpful because this calendar is in flux if once this is all settled, if we could get calendar invites so that we are sure to be where we're supposed to be when we're supposed to be there. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Paul. Great idea and Nathalie has said noted and Nathalie is amazing at these things. So that's fabulous. That's great. So just to be very clear, staff are not going to invite you to all of the PDPs but we'll make sure that all of these EPDP sessions end up in your calendar.

Okay. Any further questions here on getting to Panama and what we might be able to accomplish in the next seven days? No, all right. Hands. Michele, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Madame Chair, sorry. I don't know whether this is appropriate to raise this now or not but I think it is something we're going to have to raise at some point. ICANN's little present to us that they published in the middle of the night.

Heather Forrest: You mean the elephant in the room, Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes, the great big massive element that I am more than happy to address head on because, to be perfectly frank, I am working on restraining myself on not using ungentlemanly language, but let us say that my choice of language would not be parliamentary if this call was not being recorded. I'm less than impressed.

Rubens Kuhl: Can you explain, Michele, please?

Michele Neylon: Sure. Late last night at about 5:30, 6:00 in the morning my time zone, ICANN management, executives, ICANN Org, whatever they want to call themselves, put out a document about discussion, blah, blah, blah for providing universal or something with their access to non-public data. In other words, this is something around the entire accreditation piece, which in my understanding and my - it was something we were meant to be dealing with as part of the EPDP because it was something that was clearly touched on in the temporary specification.

Now, I'm looking at that document and I have absolutely no idea what to hell to think about it because it's not part of the temporary specification, yet it obviously impacts the temporary specification. I don't know what we're meant to do with it. I don't know how we're meant to work with it. I don't know what that is meant to be. I don't know whether this is something that we are meant to address in the GNSO or we should just kind of throw up our hands and go, well, it looks like if somebody is going to cause a problem for ICANN to wrap their little heads around that it's going to start doing this top down stuff.

So I just don't know what the hell we're meant to do with that.

Heather Forrest: Michele, thanks. I think Donna's got her hand up so we'll turn right to Donna.

Donna Austin: I wasn't going to talk about elephants, just to note that if we do get high interest topic session on Monday, we probably - well, we will need to do some planning around that. So that will need to happen in short order. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Michele, back to the elephant. I think the elephant certainly is something we should discuss, I think particularly - I think it would be very easy for us if we had two hours, we could talk about the elephant. I'm conscious of the fact that other people have their hands up. To the extent that we can tailor our comments here to what impact the elephant has on the EPDP I think that would be helpful and we can channel our rant into that.

So with that, over to Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady. So I guess when I saw that, I thought that maybe - and then again I don't have confirmation on this because it's new to me too. But I thought that maybe what's happening is that they're looking for some stopgap measure between now and the year or so that this PDP is going to take us.

And if so, maybe they intend to amend the temporary specification to shoehorn it in and/or to do an emergency policy or some other means to get this out there. So I don't necessarily think that what was published is meant to be to the exclusion of what we're doing any more than the temporary specification is meant to be an exclusion of what we're doing. But that was just my initial read. I don't know. Maybe I'm totally wrong.

But I think it's definitely worth us lobbing a note over to senior staff and asking them what they think it means. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Paul. That's a good point. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Heather. Can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: We can hear you, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay, great. Thank you very much. So I was just about to type into chat, I think one of the questions for the council on this, and actually for the GNSO more broadly, is where the uniform access model is a subject for a PDP or not. And if so, it needs to be incorporated into our planning for the EPDP or a parallel EPDP or PDP. Sorry for all the PDPs but I think this is one of the questions before council.

I think we as a community should look at the work that's been done by the IPC and BC group around their accreditation and access model as constructive development of inputs to this community conversation. I think we should look at the ICANN approach or the ICANN document that I frankly haven't reviewed yet as yet another input to the community conversation.

But at the end of the day, we need to decide as a council as we feel and whether our GNSO community feels that this is a subject for a formal PDP or not and then decide how we're going to actually incorporate that into the work of our group over the next year plus. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Keith, and I'll just make a note before turning to Donna that the notes from this discussion are being captured under the heading scope. We're not yet looking at the charter, although I think we can probably safely switch to the charter while we're having this discussion. And with that, I'll turn it to Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather, and I haven't had an opportunity to look at the document either, but I think at a principle level it does create problems for us in the sense that it may be viewed as a work around of the council, the GNSO, and the PDP itself. So I think that's something that we need to be mindful of as well. It will be very difficult for us if ICANN Org pursues a community discussion on a topic that we believe a PDP should be happening on.

So I think at a high-level principle, this will create some challenges for us because if I want to draw some parallels, this looks like the small group board effort that tried to do a work around of the curative rights PDP. So at a very high level, I do have some concerns about the way that this has come about. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. So a number of comments on the same thread being raised from various parts of within the GNSO community here. Let's ask this. Does this impact our pursuit of this EPDP in principle let's say? Is the legitimacy of

the current EPDP to you or does this send any sort of question about us doing an EPDP? Not the scope of this EPDP but does it call into question our taking the EPDP? Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. To answer your question directly, heather, I think that we would have had to include it in the scope of this EPDP anyway. It's part of the annex to the temporary spec and it's very necessary from our constituency perspective that we address this sooner than later. I know there's a lot of rhetoric going around about how nobody is requesting WHOIS information but that's not true in my world and not true personally for me. I've done quite a bit of request - sending off requests for information because when you just get the registrant org and the country then you - there's not much to work on in brand enforcement.

So to me, I haven't read it, I just woke up and attended this meeting first but I think that though it may not be perfect, it's a step in the right direction because the accreditation model is absolutely essential to round out all of the policies.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. Any further thoughts, any responses to Susan's comments? I see there's quite a bit hopping in the chat on this. I suppose what I'm asking is do we progress with our review of the charter here, the draft charter, the template charter and try and capture these discussions in scope? Is that something that we're able to do or do we need to have more time to discuss this before - am I putting a cart before the horse? Michele?

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. I'm not going to get into a religious argument with Susan and others about this, but I think the key thing here is a matter of process is this access accreditation was included in the temporary spec, which ICANN put into effect the 25th of May 2018. And the ICANN Board, when they engaged with GNSO Council on several occasions in the last couple of months made it pretty damn clear to me, and I believe to others on Council that fixing, in air quotes, the mess was something that fell clearly

within the remit of the GNSO Council. Now, ICANN Org senior execs are sending mixed messages.

My fear and my concern is that if they're going to start doing this with one thing that's what to stop them from trying to do it with another. And it's either they're working within the structures that exist and that they are so damn proud of, or they miss - they're incapable of working within those structures. But they can't have it both ways. So I think we do need to get clarity on what exactly is going on. Because either it's one or it's the other. It can't be a mishmash of both because otherwise, I don't know why a lot of us will give up time to invest in this multi-stakeholder thing if ICANN senior management are just going to ignore it completely.

I don't know, maybe I'm being very, very paranoid but I just don't see how they can throw these things out over the edge when it's in the remit of what we were meant to be doing within Council, which the Board gave us a mandate to do, or at least that's what I understood. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. So to the points that you're raising, can we just very quickly - Nathalie, could I trouble you, could we put that ICANN 62 schedule up again quickly? Fabulous. Thank you. I'm just looking - let's place this discussion that we're having now in the context of when our meeting with the Board is. And you'll note that that is actually a working lunch on Monday from 12:15 to 1:15. That's during our working sessions and we will - leadership is just in the position of putting together the agenda for these sessions.

To my mind, it makes good sense to discuss this with the Board now. Do we want to raise a question, let's say, in writing with the Board in advance of that meeting? We'll have to provide our list of questions for that meeting. Does that make sense? Michele?

Michele Neylon: Madame Chair, Heather, I would be fully supportive of us putting this question and other questions to them. I mean the thing is, I just don't think we can

proceed if the lines, the goalposts, whichever metaphor you're comfortable with, keep moving around. And I can understand that for some parts of the community there are many things that they get very excited about and they start sending letters to people and everything else.

But either ICANN is following its own procedures and processes coherently or it's not. It can't have it both ways.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Understood. So I wonder then - thinking on the fly, there's quite a bit of chat in the chat box that's relevant to this discussion as well. I wonder if what we need to do here is repurpose this discussion. I'm just mindful of time because folks are going to start getting on planes.

The best use of our time today, how do we want to capture these questions to the Board? Do we want to simply gather them on the list after this call? And yes, Michele, I'm flying tomorrow too. Do we want to use this call to put down those questions to the Board, which essentially signals a we're (downing) substantive tools until we get further information, which is what I'm seeing from some but not all the comments in the chat.

Or do we want to capture those questions on the list after this call and use this call to have a look at the charter and see if there are other things in this charter that we might want to ask the board about? I guess the question in sum is what do we want to do with the next 30 minutes? Paul's vote is for let's get started on the charter. Does anyone disagree with that? Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. I think we note the angst and we understand that there's some challenges. We agree that it will be helpful to perhaps write a letter to the Board and just say, you know, what the heck. But I think we need to draw a line under this and therefore see if we can make some progress on what we understand to be our responsibility now in developing a charter and initiation request for an EPDP.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Look, I'm inclined to agree if only because the sooner this gets into our hands, the sooner it's in our hands. And the way that it actually gets into our hands is via commencing this EPDP. And we have full control over what's in and what's out of this EPDP. I realize, yes, of course, that's modified by what's in the temporary specification. But we have a great deal of flexibility here.

So I see lots of comments in support. The action item is noted. Before we get on planes, we'll draft a letter to the Board and get that out. And what I would like to suggest as well is that we have a volunteer. Michele, by any chance, are you willing to volunteer for a rough cut on the question to the Board around this? Thanks, that would be brilliant. And we'll also capture, as well, our outstanding question about the picket fence because I think that might be an opportune time to talk to that.

We'll go back to that list of questions where we last left things with the board and see if there's anything else other than picket fence outstanding in that list and do that. And Tatiana, in terms of the group, what I would suggest is, Michele, if you're willing to put together a draft of what that question might look like, and then circulate that around and everyone can comment on it. I think that would be ideal rather than have a drafting team just to put together one question.

Cool. All right, good stuff, and everybody will have an opportunity to comment on the list. All right, so with that, so that will be then for the lunch with the Board on Monday. Michele, to the extent that it's possible, if you're able to kind of - you take the lead on that. If you're able to wind that up by, say, Saturday, that would be super helpful. I know folks will be traveling and I think the Board will want to have that list of questions as soon as possible. If that works, Michele, that's great. I know it's tough because of the travel.

Cool, and Michele has got a Google Doc going. Great. Then, Nathalie, back to the (NC) charter if you don't mind. That's brilliant. Thank you. And

Rubens, I think the answer to your question is over the weekend but I'm not 100% sure. There you go, Donna says Sunday. The document that you see in front of you, it looks a little bit funky on the first page. That's not at all intentional but for whatever reason, we ran a test run on this just before this call and it looks funky there too. But it's only the front page that looks funky. Everything else looks normal and the front page is really the administrative stuff, which would identify the GNSO, it would name the liaison to the EPDP, it would set out the GNSO Council resolution that commences the PDP.

What is, let's say, on this front page that we want to think about other than the purely admin stuff there in Section 1, is mission, purpose, and deliverables. So this would set out a bit the background and context to the EPDP effort and the purpose, what the thing is intended to achieve, and what the key deliverables would be, and the metrics around those things. Does anyone have any issues not necessarily with the substance of those but we're simply looking at this point into the draft charter to identify is there anything missing or are there any headings in here that we actually don't think are appropriate to the EPDP?

I can't imagine - I don't mean to speak out of turn but I can't imagine that we would think that mission, purpose, and deliverables weren't appropriate here but it's important to question these things and just make sure. All right, I see no hands but I see Rubens is typing and just to make a note here that Marika has said this template is really the base template that's used for a PDP. So the expected PDP is a PDP but the language is very slightly different.

Stephanie, please?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Stephanie Perrin. Just wondering what that word in front of metric considerations is on Page 1?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. I think it's key but Marika will correct me. There you go. There we go.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks.

Heather Forrest: You're welcome. Any other questions? So if you notice over the page, on Page 2, there are specific boxes as well for objectives and goals. Makes good sense here that we clearly outline what those are, particularly in this case, and deliverables and timeframes. So timeframe, of course, going to be a critical effort here in that that's somewhat set up for us, which will be very different from a PDP, a standard PDP.

But in terms of principle, anyone have any objections to any of the headings that sitting in Section 2. Anyone see anything that they think is missing in relation to mission purpose and deliverables?

So, Stephanie's asking budget. So, Marika, as we normally spoken to budget in a charter and, if so, where does that sit?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe there is a section that talks about resources. I think that's normally captured under - I'm trying to see - I'm not sure, an empty - it's hard to see but there's one section that talks, for example, about staff support that's provided and that usually talks, as well, about resources.

But, usually there is no budget associated with the PDP work. So, as such, there is no separate section provided. And, you know, having said that, of course, you can add it but that is probably a separate conversation that would need for the ICANN board as currently there is no budget set aside for this effort.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. Stephanie, your hand is still a. Is that a return for Marika? No. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Marika, I think this is something that is going to need to be addressed. This topic is going - well, ICANN already is

spending a lot of money in the entire GDPR thing – thing – as a collective catchall.

This EPDP will need to be sufficiently resourced or it will fail. And that's the bottom line. I mean, the thing is, no matter what policies the members of the EPDP come up with, if those policies do not marry well with the law, then they're going to be open and subject to pretty much an immediate challenge.

So, it is going to need more resources in terms of legal advice than you would normally associate with a PDP. And while I appreciate that it wasn't in the budget originally, specifically, we are going to need something there.

And I just think we need to put that question to whoever that question needs to be put to. And if the resources aren't there, I'll expect we're going to have headaches.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. So to be clear before we turn to Marika, I have three topics now for questions for the board. The one is on the discussion paper on the model which Michele is -I'm going to start us off on.

The other one - number two is the picket fence which we have already in - from the previous discussion with the board. Number three is budget. With that, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think in relation to this topic, it probably would be helpful if you can first discuss what you think is needed because my guess is if you ask if there is a budget or do you have budget for us, they will, indeed, be asked, like, what do you need?

So, probably by having a conversation around possibly scope as well as the working method for the EPDP team, you may be able to work through what you think is needed.

And that may make a conversation with the board easier as you're able to specifically say this is what we think we need in order to complete this work in a one-year time period. Are you able to assist us that?

And that may make that conversation easier than saying we need resources without being able to say what it is that you're actually looking for.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. And Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So, this is another chicken and egg conversation because, yes, we need to develop a scope, but one of the challenges that we have is we don't understand what these resources cost.

Because ICANN can't give us an indication of what it costs. But we do know that for the, you know, consumer and competition trust or whatever, that so far they've spent X amount of dollars.

Or we know that \$700,000 is kind of the limits that is set aside for the review teams and they have a membership of X number, and that \$700,000 is based on so many face-to-face meetings.

So, to the extent that we can get some indicative - you know, if that information is available, that might help us in understanding what we're going to need. And that's notwithstanding the fact that some, you know, police that we will need some additional expertise for legal.

And I see Stephanie has mentioned conflict resolution, so you know, it's one thing to say, yes, we need to understand what the scope is, but unfortunately, we don't know the cost of the potential resources that we think we need.

So, it will be helpful if we could get some of that information, as well, because that might help our thinking and understanding of what we think we're going to need, if that makes sense. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Is it possible, Marika and team, to note that as an action item for her or him? Are you able to get us some data as Donna has suggested on previous efforts?

For example, CCT, you know, other sort of contained efforts like that. We can get that data on specific reviews, as well. I think that would be helpful. Is that possible?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I believe that for all of the review teams, they actually have quite a detailed budget document available. I don't know if it goes into detail what is spent on what, but I do believe it kind of says, okay, this is how much was spent on the report.

This is what was spent on the face-to-face meeting. And I do believe, as well, that you know, ICANN itself works on it but has kind of ballpark figures for certain things like, you know, meetings or, you know, facilitation were things like that.

So, we can definitely look into see what is available. And having said that, of course, if there's any specific indication of what you think may be needed or, looking at it, and may make, of course, getting that information easier, but we can definitely look at the - at some of the general information that I believe is already publicly available.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. I think that would be very helpful. And, you know, to Donna's point about chicken and egg, what I think we do is let's try to get that data.

Let's continue our effort here to work through this document. And that may help us plan to flesh out our thinking a bit. I don't think we're going to get very far, but thinking a bit on, you know, what we might be asking for money for.

With that, any final comments on Section 2 and the stuff that's in Section 2 or anything that might be missing from Section 2? If not, let's turn to Section 3. All right, Section 3 deals with formation staffing an organization.

And I believe, to the point that Marika made before about where information about budget is traditionally captured, it's here that there is an indication of what kind of staff support will - the PDP will have an so on.

So, this is a place where the typical PDP charter would have some mention of budget, certainly not to the detail that we're requesting now, that we're contemplating now. But that is where some of that information would be.

You see the subheading under Section 3, membership criteria, group formation dependencies and dissolution, or how the group was formed. The dependencies that have a group would be dissolved.

Working group roles, functions and duties, so that's where it sets out the role of the chair, the role of the liaison to the extent that there are particular requirements of members, you know, and what they actually do.

That would be set out here. And SOI guidelines is normally around to say anyone who's participating is required to submit and SOI. It's normally not more details than that.

So, we've obviously talked about membership criteria in the list. We've talked about forming the group. We at least mentioned leadership in our earlier discussions.

Statement of interest, again, I don't think is a controversial one. Is there anything missing? Is there anything that needs to be added here? Is there anything controversial or?

So, Donna says what is the staffing element of this section? And I'm not sure what she means, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. So it said formation staffing an organization. So I'm just not sure what the staffing piece is, because there are some headings under there that don't seem to fit. So, is this about, you know, identifying resources or - I'm just not sure what it means.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. My understanding is that that we're the staff resources that will be devoted to the effort are identified and Marika can correct me if I'm wrong.

Marika Konings: No, Heather, that is correct. It usually - they've got lines, you know, what the staff assigned to the group will be doing, the staff that is assigned, and it usually also flags that, you know, which standard working group roles are part of the effort which usually refers to Section 2.2 of the working group. So that's the, you know, liaison, the chair and members, et cetera.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. And, Paul - okay, Paul's question is answered and Donna is asking, so that fits under duties. I think, Donna, where it fits is under working group, yes, roles, functions and duties.

It's under that heading. It normally fits there. Is there anything anyone sees missing from Section 3 or has any problem with anything that is sitting in Section 3? I mean, having talked about all of them, it seems, you know, the stuff that's here if necessary.

And now folks are shifting into substance on the chat. I wouldn't want anybody to get lost in substance, so we can get through just the charter and fiscal, and then I think we'll transition to substance by gathering some leads on each of these topics.

So, sorry. Oh, I thought someone (cut) in. All right, so I don't see any comments on Section 3. On Section 4, the subtopics under rules of engagement are decision-making methodologies, so we have an option here to adopt the working group guidelines decision-making methodology or come up with something different.

But that's what normally sits there. Status reporting, how and when that will happen. Problem is you escalation and resolution processes, again, that's something that fits traditionally in the GNSO working group guidelines.

We can use those are not. And (closure) and workgroup self-assessment, so how we wind up the effort. Anyone see anything missing in terms of rules of engagement, how the PDP operates?

I suppose here might be a place where we want to add something about this face-to-face discussion that's happening. Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'm not sure exactly where this fits but I think it's something that we definitely need somewhere to make it very, very clear that members of this working group need to be willing to work towards consensus.

And they need to be willing to compromise. They can't just be restating fixed positions because I just don't see how that would help anybody.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele, and that's certainly a key point that has come out of the inputs that we received in relation to PDP 3.0 project is, you know, not just in a separate, but more generally, and I'm confident, you know, that we can find a way to put that in.

It might be under the tendencies on the group. I'm not convinced that it needs to say its own subheading. But we made a note to make sure that it finds its way into the document. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: I agree with Michele completely. And another point, I think we, you know, I don't know how you would do this, but some sort of agreement to of responsibility level because this is not going to be a PDP (week), and in and out and sort of, you know, when the part of it that you're interested in but you're not interested in the whole thing.

And in a way, if you're on this PDP, then you need to understand your responsibilities are to work for every meeting, every agreement. And it'll be pretty - it'll be intensive work.

And people need to understand that and agreed to that because, you know, we see that in working groups all the time where people, because of life, you know, come and go. But that can't work on this PDP.

Heather Forrest: So, Michele, it looks like you're onto a winner there. Not only does Susan agree, it looks like a lot of folks agree. So, there, we'll make sure to capture that point.

I haven't heard anyone screaming on anything in the chat has really moved away, moved into substance and away from the topic stuff here. I haven't heard anyone screaming on anything that's missing from Section 4. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes, just very briefly, I see some - there's been a push from some parties to have a lot of GAC members. I don't have an issue with them being observers. But then GAC themselves have said that they're not particularly interested in engaging on this.

And this is meant to be a GNSO effort, not the GAC effort. I think we need to be pretty clear on where they sit or don't sit within this entire thing. Tanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. I'm going to use that as a way to shift this with the last four minutes that are remaining. The - each of these topics that we've just gone through, council leadership at a discussion in preparation for this call and

thought it would be helpful if, you know, for each one of these topics that we signed off on, if someone were willing to take the lead.

I have a feeling, Michele, what you're discussing their probably comes under membership criteria and/or group formation, probably more membership criteria. Is there anyone willing to volunteer?

I know there's a lot of chat going on, on this particular topic. Is there anyone willing to volunteer to facilitate the discussions when we're able to come back and substantively discussed these things?

To Paul's question, are we going to talk substance? We're clearly not going to have time for substance today because it's scheduled as a one-hour: we've got three minutes left.

When we do, and we would like to have individuals take the lead on each one of these topics. And it's clear that a lot of people feel passionate about this - the membership and the composition of the group.

Would anyone like to put up their hand to be easily on membership criteria? Anyone feel strongly that, you know, that's a discussion that you want to do? Keith says he'll volunteer for one of them. Doesn't have strong feelings. Which one?

It would be great if you to have strong feelings about something that you speak up. So, for all those who put a lot of comments in the chat on membership criteria and what it should look like, can we get a volunteer?

Keith once membership criteria. Brilliant. Thanks, Keith. That's very helpful. So, by way of example, then, Keith, when we come back to discussing this on Tuesday and, you know, we'll have some opportunities to discuss these things perhaps earlier in the week, when it comes to discussing membership

criteria, Keith, if you're willing, you'll leave that discussion and collate everyone's input.

Staff already has the documents that are started on input on each of these points and that's how we'll run. So, Keith, thank you very much for taking that first hit.

While we're here, while we're in Section 3, group formation dependencies and dissolution, any volunteers to facilitate the discussion on those items?
Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm just asking for clarification. So, because at least in the draft we started membership criteria only talks about criteria and the actual composition comes in the next section.

So, are you intending for those two to be separate or Keith is covering both, you know, the criteria and composition?

Heather Forrest: Yes, thanks, Marika. It's good question. I wonder if – so, Keith, did you capture that? It's not for (unintelligible). What's your thinking here? It seems like (we'll get it) for efficiency sake.

I think so, Keith, if you're willing, I think that would be helpful. Cool. Thank you. All right. That leaves us - next one, working group roles functions and duties, we said that have to do with leadership of the PDP.

That has to do with discussions around what they're - the liaison and the staff support. Would anyone like to put up their hand for volunteering to facilitate the discussion on that? Again, the responsibility lies around just capturing discussion points, gathering input and so on. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, sorry to do this again, but actually leadership typically covers part of the group formation dependency and disillusion section. So that is part of kind of the EPDP team or a subsection of that.

Although, you know, even of course, moving them as well to the (unintelligible) rules but that typically in the charter we've had it's covered more the staff side of things and just refers to kind of, you know, follow the rules as they are outlined in the working group guidelines.

Heather Forrest: Understood. Understood. I wonder, in light of the time, you know, ideally we wanted to be able to get some volunteers on this right away because the time between us and Panama is slipping.

But I wonder if the best option here is to put out a Google doc and have people sign up to these topics in the next 24 hours. Would that be a better way to go about this rather than go one by one or do you want to take ten minutes and just get people to put up hands? Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather, in the interest of time I think, you know, a Google doc could be a good way forward although, of course, it'll take ten minutes to knock it out.

The other thing I just want to remind folks of, if we do get this (high interest topic) session up and running, then those that identify as leads on these topics, it will be great if you could also be a panelist on that (high interest) topic session. So that would be Monday from 5:00 to 6:30. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Yes, thanks, Donna. That's helpful. If Paul doesn't mind if we take ten minutes and not get out, I think we can at least do that for the big one. Yes. We have four sort of really big ones on our list. And one of them is scope which sits there in mission purpose and deliverables. Pardon me. Yes, I agree, Paul. Scope is a big one, again, sits there and mission purpose and deliverables.

We have some draft (techs) already around mission and focus. So, there's not really drafting that needs to happen on those two items specifically. Anyone want to put their hand up for scope?

So, anyone who was passionate about the stuff we discussed in the beginning of the call around the elephant in the room, this would be a good place to put your hand up.

So, Keith expects to have a draft scope or framework document. Keith, you can't volunteer for everything.

Keith Drazek: Heather, I will get in the queue here. Can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: We need to share the pain but I do want to let folks know that, so, internally at VeriSign, we've been looking at the, you know, sort of the possible scope of the EPDP.

And I expect in the near future to have something to share just as a draft or a recommendation, you know, as a starting point for conversation, you know, ideally within the next few days.

But it's something we're also trying to coordinate with the contracted party house or the GDPR subgroup and wanted to make sure that we have, you know, input from others before we just mop it over to the council for consideration.

So, I just wanted to put that out marker down. I'm not volunteering to necessarily lead this, you know, this point, but I do expect to have something substantive to share. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Keith. That's helpful. And now, whoever does volunteer for this will have a neatly packaged piece of input there from you guys. So that's very much appreciated.

Anyone willing to put their hand up on this one? The reality is, if you're going to get this EPDP done by next April, we're all going to have to put her hands up at this point and subsequently, too.

Susan's going to volunteer. That's brilliant. Thank you, Susan. That's great. So, scope is one of our big ones. (Composition) of the team as one of our big ones that have been taken on by Keith.

Deliverables and timeframes, I suppose that comes out of scope. Do we want to make that a separate section, separate volunteer, or is that something that comes out of scope?

I don't hear anyone clamoring and Donna is typing. Yes, I think it comes out of scope as well, Donna. So, Susan that would probably put you under that umbrella topic of scope and see how that goes.

All right, let's then move, again, objectives and goals probably falls under scope. Keith has membership criteria and group formation. Working group roles functions and duties, Marika, could you remind us what's in that section?

Marika Konings: Yes, that's basically staff support and usually as well a reference to the working group roles that apply. So, under there, you could include leadership if you want, although it could also be part of the group formation section.

But, again, it's easy to move things around as long as you identify what the focus of the topic is.

Heather Forrest: Cool. Thanks, Marika. And Paul, you're volunteering for that one, I take it? If so, that's brilliant. Thanks, Paul. Much appreciated. SOI guidelines, I think that's probably an administrative point that goes than their to say anyone who (unintelligible) have an SOI, so I don't think we necessarily need someone to take a lead they are.

Decision-making methodology, so someone to work through discussion of, you know, take the lead on discussing that we adopt the GNSO working group guidelines or do we do something different?

Anyone would like to take that one on? And I don't know if we need anybody for status reporting. Probably don't need anybody at this stage for closure and routing group self-assessment. We certainly could do with someone to look at resolution processes. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, on - this is Marika. On the decision-making methodologies, I think they're the question is, you know, is there a sense that different rules need to apply?

Then, you know, what is the standard method for making decisions? So that's, you know, the consensus - full consensus, consensus, strong support by significant opposition.

If there's no sense that the council needs to deviate from that, you may not want to work on it. So, again, it may save you time if there's a sense to leave it as is.

But if there is, of course, you need to have a conversation around how it should be different from what is currently applied. And of course, it may also link early to the membership criteria.

You may need to kind of refinement depending on if it was just, you know, members that define the consensus. There may need to be reflected. I think

the general way it's written up could apply as well, whatever the structure of the composition of the (group) is.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. That's helpful. And Rubens you're my hero. Well done. Michele, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Yes, just very briefly, I think this is some - I mean, I think it's a valid question and I think it's something we definitely need to look at, so I think that something that we probably need to get a bit of input from, and also maybe something that, as council, we may need to revisit.

So if whoever is acting as liaison between this group and council should be able to flag, you know, that there's a particular issue there or whatever needs to be addressed. I mean, I think traditionally council had been kind of hands-off in many respects on the kind of day-to-day running of working groups.

But with this, we might need to be a little bit more hands-on than we would be normally, if that makes sense.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. It does make sense and it also makes sense that in the context of status reporting. This is something that the council has been a bit passive on and that was really, again, a key output out of the three - in the PDP 3.0 project that perhaps we need to take a bit more of a motivated role here.

Anyone who particularly if you thought that was, you know, the action point in PDP 3.0, anyone willing to take on officially taking the discussion around status reporting? It's not one of our hot button items.

And it's not one of the four big ones but, nevertheless, it needs to be discussed. And to (Darcy)'s point, (Darcy) is exactly right. We need to make sure the existing guidelines can accommodate the timeline, so this is going to have to take into context the timeline.

So, (Darcy) is willing to take that one. I appreciate that (Darcy). That's brilliant. Thank you. All right, and lastly, issue escalation and resolution. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. That usually also refers to the standard provisions that apply in the GNSO working group guidelines as well as, you know, external missions - external mechanisms that exist.

So, again, I think this is the one where if there is a deviation from those, then work needs to be done on that. If not, usually the standard things apply. And if I can also make one point is working methods.

And that may be something as well that someone may want to start thinking about as we're on a one-year timeline, that the normal working methods may not apply or may not be optimal for this situation so there may also be - we also need to put some thinking into that I now this work can be squeezed into that one year timeline.

Heather Forrest: Yes, thanks, Marika. It held. I'm - so, Stephanie, yet a number of really interesting inputs earlier about conflict resolution. And, of course, you have the experience coming from the RDS PDP to give some (heft) to that recommendation.

A chance, Stephanie, you would be willing to champion this one and lead the discussion on problem issue escalation and resolution? Stephanie's typing. That's brilliant, Stephanie. Thank you. I think it's fantastic because you had some really detailed input on an earlier and that would be great.

That takes us through this document. What I propose that we do, could we add an action item? Please, Marika, I think you're taking notes. Can we add an action item to circulate this list of volunteers?

Let's circulate all together in one place so that folks have it in one email. Circulate the list of volunteers. Circulate the (black) charter. Circulate the pre-populated kind of (policy) point charter that came around in advance of this call in circulate the document that Caitlin has produced that captures the inputs to date on each one of these point.

And if our leads on each one of these points could have a look in that document from Caitlin to see what comments have already been made, so Caitlin's been working to take the stuff that's already been posted in the list, to capture it as a single document.

That perhaps what we could do is make Caitlin's document of Google doc and that we each one of these leads could then again their respective inputs that they get from folks into that document.

Does that make sense to everybody as a path forward? We've got some leads for discussion items. That'll kick in next week. In the meantime, feel free to kick off discussions on each of your individual topics.

If we went to capture that unit will doc, you want to work (unintelligible) how to do that, I'm sure staff would be, you know, happy to help you with that. And anything that we can do on the leadership team, I'll volunteer all three of us here.

And anything we can do to help you, you need only shout and we will help you. And a note of thanks to each of the folks who volunteered. I think that's brilliant. Donna, Rafik, anything we need to say before we wind up? Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. So, we only - we have less than a week to put a session together for Monday. I think we should assume that that's going to happen. I'm happy to coordinate that and hopefully with you and Rafik we can work out a plan.

But I think we will need to call on the leads that we've just identified to be part of a session on Monday. So, we'll do some further work on that and be in touch with the folks that have just volunteered. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. And to the extent that someone has a conflict that they just can't get out of, I think what we'll have to do to manage it is, you know, they're going to be times in the week where that happens.

And we'll capture the feedback that comes in, so just as a reminder to everybody, Monday is this opportunity that we hope we're securing for a high interest topic that allows the community, as an unconflicted spots, that allows the community to come in and feed into this process.

So, it would be ideal to have all of the leads there. If you're not there, will make sure that that feedback gets back to you so that for a Tuesday discussion, you have all of the information at your disposal.

Any last comments? Rafik, you're happy with things? Anyone, final comments?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes. Sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So, yes, I'm happy with how we end up now and (unintelligible). We're here to help and we will try to, as much as possible, that we can get progress within the coming days and we can touch base and coordinate for – yes, for the next date.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks very much, Rafik, and thanks, Donna. So, what we'll do with, the leadership will just have a quick look at the - not the blank - completely blank charter template.

But, you know, if there's anything missing in here that has to find its way in, we'll make a note of that and find a way to make that work into the charter. I have a feeling in, you know, working method like how the group is going to work for this face-to-face question, I think it's going to have to sit in here somewhere.

So, we might have to (slop) that in. But, we've done a fantastic effort here. I very much appreciate everybody's attention. I know it's odd timing and everybody is about to get on planes.

Donna's posted a reminder that we do have a dedicated mailing list for this effort that helps streamline things and keep things out of our regular council list box. With that, I will say thank you and safe travels to everyone.

Happy travels. Comfortable travels. Healthy travels, all of that good stuff. And very much looking forward to seeing you on the ground in Panama. So with that, Nathalie, you can close the recording and we'll wish everyone a good day, good afternoon, good night. Thanks everybody.

END