

**ICANN
Transcription
Webinar: Next steps temporary policy GDPR compliance
Monday, 21 May 2018 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-gdpr-compliance-temporary-policy-next-steps-21may18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p9az32xuzvu/>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Hello and welcome to the Informational Webinar on Possible Next Steps Following the Adoption of Temporary Specifications for gTLD Registration Data taking place on Monday, the 21st of May, 2018.

As a reminder, access to the Adobe Connect room and audio bridge is restricted to the GNSO councilors and SG and Cs' leadership. An audiocast is available for any community members who wish to listen in.

This webinar is being recorded and the recording as well as the transcript will be posted on the GNSO master calendar shortly after the end of the session. With this I'd like to turn it back over to Heather Forrest, GNSO Chair. Please begin.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Terri, very much. And let's start off by thanking staff, the Secretariat team, the Policy team, for getting us back on Adobe Connect. This is super brilliant. And with that I'd like to turn to Terri to do a bit of housekeeping for us. Terri, what do we need to know now that we're back on Adobe Connect? Thanks.

Terri Agnew: Certainly. And just as a quick reminder, the housekeeping was this is only for GNSO councilors and SG and C leadership. And an audiocast is available for other members of the community who wish to listen in. As a reminder, if you're on the telephone, if mute is not available you can press star 6 to mute, pressing star 6 a second time will unmute your line. If you've activated your microphone on Adobe Connect, if not speaking, please remember to mute your microphone. Thank you, Heather, back over to you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Terri, that's fabulous. Much appreciated. So thanks very much to everyone. This is our webinar on the topic of next steps. What I propose that we do - we have a bit of background and explanation but before we get to that, let's look at our agenda slide, and I control the slides so bear with me as I work through the slides. So here are the things that we'd like to cover today.

As I say, we'll start with a bit of background essentially just the context of how we got to where we are today, then quite logically what it is that we want to do today, why we're here. We'll move onto what I hope will be the bulk of our time today, we do have 90 minutes scheduled in discussing immediate next steps and then a number of questions that come out of those next steps.

You'll see we've included some reference material in the back of this slide deck. That is in large part drawn from the briefing document that was circulated at the time that we sent around the invitation for this webinar so this is not information that you haven't seen before but it's helpful just to have that to hand I think as we - as we work through today's discussion. And we also have in the background the briefing document to put up into Adobe Connect if that's helpful at any point during today's discussion. So that's what we have to start with.

And let's then turn to background as a context-setting for our discussions today. You may recall that this essentially kicked off, if that's the right way to describe it, on the 11th of April when we received an invitation to have a chat with a group of Board members, in particular it was the Board members

connected to the GNSO, and the Board Chair and Vice Chair and CEO of ICANN Org. That was the Council leadership team and the RDS PDP leadership team.

Just a small group at that point in that discussion to get a sense for what it was that the Board wanted to speak to us about. That was a very early exchange of ideas about the potential impact of GDPR on our ongoing RDS PDP, what GDPR might do to the work of that ongoing PDP, which of course now has suspended its work in view of all of the things that we're talking about today and have been talking about in the weeks since the 11th of April.

We discovered in that discussion perhaps discovered is the wrong word, but had a better sense from the Board that the Board was considering adopting a temporary spot of policy or a specification. The origin of that as an action by the Board is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the RAA. It was presented to us at that point as we reported back to you in our briefing note, which came out the Friday after on the 14th, that that was one option that was being explored. It appeared at the time to be, if you like, a favored or a preferred option but we did have a bit of a discussion around what other options might be available.

You may recall seeing our briefing note that went out to Council, as I say, a few days later prepared by RDS leadership and Council leadership, Donna, Rafik and myself, and the briefing note then provided a background for discussion that happened in the Council meeting in April, which took place on the 26th.

Of course since April between our April meeting and our May meeting, our May meeting of course at the end of this week on Thursday on the 24th of May, we had - have had a number of things take place, not least of which the Board workshop in Vancouver and the Board on the 17th of this month enacting a temporary specification.

And the question at this stage is, what do we do now? What is our responsibility under the bylaws? And what is it that we want to do in response to those? So with that as background, let me turn us to where, let's say, where we are today and why we wanted to have this call. And at that point as well I'd like to open the floor to, you know, first of all Donna and Rafik, so that they make sure that I've said all the things that we wanted to say, and then start to open this for questions.

As I say, the primary driver today is just to get this background material out of the way and turn the floor open to discussions. The intention is that this be a Q&A type thing. So you see here that what we think is appropriate to happen next is to get everyone on the same page in order to figure out what our next steps are, we need to have a common understanding of what the options are, let's say, to us as the GNSO Council.

The rationale for - and I see Susan's note and I'm going to ask Terri just very quickly - Terri, can I ask you for an audio check? Do you think it's on Susan's end or my end? Nathalie and Marika are...

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Heather, this is Terri. You're coming across great for me, all clear and it has not cut out as of yet.

Heather Forrest: Super, okay all right very good. And don't hesitate to ping me if it - I see everybody saying, "Fine," so that's great but don't hesitate to ping me if it drops. So Susan, we'll figure out your - am I loud? Michele, I'm sorry, it's 6:00 am, I don't know how I can be loud. You had to turn down the volume. Sorry, Michele. I'll move the phone away from me.

All right, let's see, back to business, right. It could be your headphones, very good, Michele. All right. So just so we're very, very clear, I don't want this to be any misconception as to, you know, how we've structured the call today.

We're very keen to get information from the SGs and Cs and we're conscious of the fact that there was a very narrow time period as we were let's say thinking about developing this webinar.

We looked at the sequence of events in May, we saw, you know, Board workshop followed by GDD, followed by Council meeting. And not a whole lot of time between let's say where we knew discussions would happen within the community and the Board about RDS and GDPR and next steps and the Council meeting of May 24. And we thought it would be helpful to get everyone together and not just councilors but get together the leadership, you know, get together the SGs and Cs but in particular try and channel that feedback from SGs and Cs through leadership.

The intention here is very much to engage the SGs and Cs. Our concern was if we had an open - a fully open webinar that we would risk not having all voices heard and so hence, you know, it's the effort here is not to exclude anyone, the effort here is to be as inclusive as possible, hence we've got the audiocast open as we normally would for a Council meeting. We've invited councilors and have a number of councilors here today. So if you like this is in prep for the discussion that we have to follow this Thursday and then what comes from now, so this is preparatory for all of us, if you like. And I'll turn to that sort of immediate next steps in the next slide. But that's a bit of background and explanation as to why we've structured the call the way that we have.

The other very key point to say right from the outset is that the purpose of today is to talk about the process, the procedure that we have at our disposal via the Bylaws, via the Working Group Guidelines, and related documents. We're not here to talk substance. I know that this is a topic about which there are very passionately held views and we have a number of experts on the Council, folks who have lived, breathed and died this issue a number of times over. And I'm very keen to keep us on process.

I know that there are times that process breeds into substance, but it's going to be, let's say, my job to try us and keep us on track so please forgive me in advance if I let's say, interrupt an intervention to try and get us back on the track of the process. We have a number of procedural steps that have to be followed or decided upon, if you like, and then followed and that's really what we're here to talk about today. So as I say, forgive me in advance if I interrupt you to try and bring you back on track of process.

There will be time - I wish I could say ample time - but there will be time to talk substance, but that's not today's call and of course at the time that we talk substance we want to make sure that we have all the folks in the room that we feel are appropriate to be able to do that.

So with that as background, we see here again a reiteration, right, the Board adopted that temporary specification on the 17th of May. What that does in essence, right, the heart of why we're here now, that started a 365-day clock for the GNSO to complete a PDP. That PDP has a very limited scope. The scope in essence, as we understand it, and this is one of the things that we need to discuss, is to confirm whether that temporary specification becomes a consensus policy; in essence, what happens after that 365-day run lapses.

Now Council is the manager of the PDP and so Council then is ultimately responsible for setting it up, we'll speak to that in a moment, managing it and oversight, so a number of the questions that we have in today's webinar to discuss is effectively how; what is the vehicle to get us to the end of that temporary specification and in the - be in a position to have operative policy after it expires.

As to the scope, I've said in speaking about scope, we have a degree of uncertainty here and the reason for that is let's say multifold. First of all, we need to better understand from the Board as you know we have a temporary specification but let's say what the PDP looks like specifically and what the PDP does is a matter of let's say wordsmithing and refinement.

We need some follow up communication with the Board that's foreshadowed in the Board's latest communications to really refine that scope, refine timing and the various procedural requirements we're talking about today. In essence, the logic behind having this webinar and the discussions that we'll have on Thursday in the GNSO Council meeting, are to prep ourselves for that discussion with the Board, that really is a next step.

Another reason for why the scope is unclear is there is discussion you know, in the last few weeks about the possibility of changes to the temporary spec along the course of its lifetime and we don't necessarily know what that does for any efforts that we put into place in response to it. So that means then that we might think right from the very beginning about that possibility and how we want to manage it going forward for example, building some sort of - building some sort of flexibility into the charter right from the beginning for dealing with that.

Donna, please go right ahead.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So just as a point about, you know, the flexibility in the event that the temporary policy or spec changes at any point in time, just for those on the call that may not understand this, but there's a 365-day clock. The Board has to reconfirm this policy or specification every 90 days so, you know, they get - I'm not going to do the math because I'll get it wrong so I think they get four opportunities to reconfirm the policy. But once that 12-month mark hits, that's it.

What is - what we're unsure about, and this goes to Heather's point about we need to have a conversation with the Board, in a webinar that took place I think last Monday, I specifically asked on Jeffrey whether you know, when they reconfirm on that 90-day basis, whether, you know, they would do some evaluation about the spec along the way and then maybe there's an adjustment made at that 90-day mark. John seemed to suggest that that was

a possibility but we need to confirm that with the Board because I know that there are others that have the opinion on that 90-day mark all they can do is reconfirm the actual temporary policy that they have approved.

So you know, that's just an example of some of the challenges that we know are out there and some of the things that we need some clarity around.

Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, very much. Perfect timing and super helpful. Look, as you can see from the final point here on the slide, with all of this as background, there are a number of things that we need to do. Now when we initially set up this webinar, we were somewhat anticipating, hoping, I'm not sure what the right word is here, that this webinar would come before the temporary specification but that let's say the timing is what it is. We're not so much at preparatory work anymore; we're now at, you know, at actioning work.

So the discussion that we have today, let's say, will set us down a path that we hope will end us at that 365-day mark that Donna's described and have us with operative policy at the end so that is the ultimate goal.

Good opportunity for me to stop and check in with Donna and Rafik, make sure that any points that I may have missed or that they want to make get captured, and before we turn to immediate next steps, ask for any questions from anyone out there.

Donna Austin: Nothing from me at this point, Heather, thanks.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, Donna. Just check in with Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Same, nothing for me. I think it's all covered.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, Rafik. And Michele, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Donna. Michele for the record. I think the question I have - well it's a two part thing. One is whether people can share my concerns about the possibility of this temporary policy morphing over the course of the year which I do think will make our jobs extremely difficult, and the other question is by modifying it, it's - by modifying it hypothetically, does that mean that they could actually circumvent any restrictions on the extension by basically saying that the modified policy was a different policy, a different temporary policy? Now I'm not expecting Heather to be able to answer that immediately but I think it's something we probably do need a bit of clarity on. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. It's Heather. I'm glad you don't expect a precise answer from me. Look, I think this is one of the things that I don't want to read the Board's mind. I think it's probably top on our list of discussion points with them in that next phase discussion is, you know, what is their intention? How does that, let's say, legally interact with what it is that we are doing, there have been a number of questions in the chat there about, you know, what is the impact on our work? Does it restart the 365-day clock?

Keith's made a good point in the chat, his understanding is that a PDP triggered by the Board's initiation of a temporary policy can confirm, amend or replace the temporary policy of specification. That's broader than confirming a temporary policy becoming a consensus policy. That raises the question of what happens if the temporary policy changes. Do we change course in midstream or how does that happen? I'll open it up and Graeme's agreeing with that. Michele, that's not an answer so much as a speculation and putting a pin on it to say we have it on the top of the list of questions.

Any further questions on this, otherwise I'm going to turn us to let's say immediate next steps and then we'll kick off our substantive discussion and take on questions in a much heartier way. No? All right.

So immediate next steps, again, this is very much an encapsulation of what we tried to spell out in the briefing document. You see of course Number 1 on

our to-do list is this webinar taking place today, try and get everyone informed before the Council meeting on Thursday of this week. We have somewhat unusually dedicated the better part of time in the monthly Council meeting to one particular topic. We have some business that came off of our agenda in April to deal with; we had just a huge number of things that were trying to go onto that April agenda that we ended up pushing to May, so we'll deal with those things and then we'll spend the bulk of our time on let's say a continuation of the discussion that we're having today.

And again, this webinar helps to get the SGs and Cs on board for those that do instructions and need to give councilors some input; this is a quick way to get everyone up to speed at the same time.

Next proposed possible step, as alluded to in the previous slide, is the follow up call with the ICANN Board to ask amongst other things the question that Michele has asked, what do we do if the policy changes in the course of that 365 days? And we would suggest that this get done as soon as possible. There's a strategy here about who joins the call, when the call happens, so on and so forth.

I would suggest to us that we put on our to-do list for today and if not today then the Council meeting on Thursday, figuring out who best to be on that call, as I say, the initial call on the 11th of April was the RDS leadership and the Council leadership. At the time the RDS leadership made sense - RDS PDP I should say - made sense because that PDP was live and active and looking at related issues.

That group is not - is not meeting at this point and has recommended - now I'm bleeding into substance, so I'm going to hold myself back and leave that for questions. In any event, let's say, from a process point of view, we need to decide as a group who is on that follow up call with the Board and get that group together pretty quickly.

Step Number 4, in all of this, these are roughly in time order here, you see based on the rough timeline that we have at the end of the slides, we need to put together a team that's going to - if we are going to go down the road of an EPDP, an expedited PDP, and indeed that is one of the key - two key discussions that we need to have, two key decisions that ultimately we need to take. One is if we are going to do an EPDP, an expedited PDP, and two, what that is going to look like, how that will differ if at all from the way we run a traditional PDP working group.

If we do decide to go down the road of an EPDP, the bylaws give us let's say an outline for what the EPDP initiation request looks like and it is a bit different from the standard format of, if you like, preliminary issue report and then so on, how we kick off a regular PDP. I will just highlight for you, and I might at the risk of making everyone seasick, I'm going to scroll through - scroll ahead in the slides and you'll see that we have a section here, a reference slide, and the slides as always will be posted and available after the call on the GNSO page.

We have the reference slides, which include this highlight, if you like, schematic of what needs to fit in the EPDP initiation request, what the elements of those things are. So that is when we start getting into substance, when we have that group together to talk about what goes into that EPDP and how to meet those requirements so that will be - that drafting team's primary responsibility, let's say, meeting those requirements.

Item Number 5 is the way that GNSO - the GNSO Council will deal with this, whether we do this in our regular meeting, which of course pushes us out to June, which will be a face to face meeting in Panama City, or whether we do this in advance of June. I think generally speaking the thought in leadership is, you know, the sooner that we respond to each of these things, the less we're eating into our 365 days. So hence there's a question mark, I guess, in our minds as to whether we hold a special GNSO Council meeting which

would probably best take place on the 14th of June to factor in travel to Panama and other broader issues of timeline.

In those reference slides that I just referred you to, after that initiation request schematic is a timeline that you would have seen in the - or a proposed timeline, I should say, in the briefing document and we'll talk more to timeline as we go.

So that really is the introduction, brilliant that we've gotten through that in half an hour, which gives us a full hour to open the floor for questions before we do that and we have a slide to guide us, let's say, in our questions and what it is that we need to be thinking about. Before I do that I'm just going to check in with Donna and Rafik and see if there's anything that they wish to raise. I don't see any hands but just check in to make sure.

Donna Austin: Heather, it's Donna.

Heather Forrest: Silence - yes, Donna, yes please, go.

Donna Austin: I think we're okay to move forward notwithstanding there's been a, you know, some chat that some folks may not have seen in the audiocast, and it relates to the fact that there is some confusion about whether the intent of the PDP if it is to confirm or not the temporary specification or whether it goes further, so that's obviously something that the Council will need to understand and work out a path forward.

There's also a recognition that the specification itself does have a number of open ended suggestions in it as well so that might also lead to the possibility that whether we need one PDP or with multiple tracks or whether we need, you know, to different work efforts is something else that we will have to consider as well, so just to - that's just a quick wrap of what's been going in the chat while you've been talking, Heather. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, I appreciate that. While Adobe's been offline, sadly, my multitasking skills haven't gotten any better and I saw a few comments in the chat but wasn't able to follow it fully. Terri, can I just confirm with you please, as a point of order, I assume - I think I know the answer but just to reassure everyone on the audiocast, will we be able to make the full chat record available to - when the recording gets sent around?

Terri Agnew: We certainly will and we'll go ahead and get that posted on the GNSO calendar as well. Thanks for checking, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Fab, thanks, Terri. And sorry to put you on the spot, I appreciate your quick reply. Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Heather. And so just to follow up the comment from Donna and what we have in the Adobe Connect chat, so I guess it dependent of this call and what will come from the temporary spec and the changes but maybe in term of process we can try to get some common understanding the maybe the EPDP the kind of the approach that we should follow. It may we need the role of that, I mean, several EPDP but maybe something that we can agree on because it's also - it has its own timeline and milestone so just maybe something we can try to see if people have the same understanding and kind of consensus around it.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik that's helpful and also to note, let's say, as a cap to the interventions that have been made here, that, you know, one of the things we're doing in the background is keeping a running list of questions and anything that seemed like something we need to follow up on will form, let's say, a special action items list or questions list. And I think we probably need to think about from an admin point of view, running whether we add these to our action items list, anything that comes out of today, or we run a separate list and how we manage that so we'll think about that going forward.

All right, let's turn then to some proper discussion - oops, apologies - here are our if you like, four main questions, which I ultimately would boil down to two. One is, are we going the route of an EPDP? And if we are going the route of an EPDP what is that thing going to look like? How are we going to deviate if at all from the - from the regular PDP Working Group Guidelines and methodologies and so on?

I don't - the intention is not on this slide to try and force the issue of an EPDP but the reality is if we go down the path of a, you know, A, I think we need to talk about what the options are if we don't go down the path of an EPDP. The EPDP seems an appropriate vehicle at least on the face of it in that it's built around a one-year timeline; it's inherently built for a quick response, hence the name "expedited."

Also, you know, let's say the obvious other option would be a regular PDP, and if that's the case then we already know what that looks like. So that's just an, you know, an explanation to say why we have a bunch of questions here about EPDP, we don't have those same questions if you like, I mean, in essence, we know how a PDP works and we know what the challenges are.

So in broad baskets, you know, do we go down the path of an EPDP? What does the leadership look like? How do we compose the team? And I asked staff who are experts at our procedures on this, why the use of the word "team" and that's the word that's used in the relevant documentation, "EPDP Team" rather than "EPDP Working Group," and working methods.

So we've made some points to each of these things. What I suggest that we do, leadership, Donna, Rafik and I will run these things as a team if we have anything, you know, in particular that we want to push you to think about, we'll interject at appropriate times, but I'm going to open the floor to questions from anyone. And again, you know, our SG and C chairs, this is a great time to give your input from your stakeholder groups and constituencies to help inform our thoughts here. So I'm happy to open the floor, anyone willing to

pick up on any of these questions? I suppose we could logically start with the question of do we go down the path of an EPDP?

Michele and then Donna.

Michele Neylon: I'll cede to Donna and I'll go after here.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, Michele. Donna, over to you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So on the question of, you know, whether the expedited PDP is the path forward, I think we identified a number of options in the briefing paper if I'm not mistaken, but the expedited PDP seemed to be the only one that could help us in terms of the time table that we're working to. So I don't know that there's any other option available to us except the expedited PDP at this point in time. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Well I think Donna's covered that bit. I think the one area around this that we have discussed previously and I think it's something we need to make sure that we don't slip up on is around the composition of this team or working group or whatever animal we want to call it. In order for this to succeed it needs to be a relatively small committed group and the other thing as well as that they need to be committed to driving towards consensus, not trying to maintain some kind of unreasonable status quo.

And if you look at the history of Whois related activities over the last, I don't know how many years, pretty much everything has failed in one shape or another. This time around there really is no room for failure. The other point as well, I put that in the chat, is that I had asked during the GDD Summit last week in Vancouver and it needs to be asked again, is that we do need to see some kind of list of the policies and contractual clauses that are impacted by

this temporary spec, because this EPDP will need to address those things specifically. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. I think it's interesting here that, you know, we are coalescing around this idea of an EPDP. I tend to agree with Donna and Michele's interventions that, you know, while we had canvassed a number of options at the time that we put all of this, you know, in that briefing document, let's say things have moved forward since then.

One of the things that I think we need to bear in mind is that an EPDP has to be initiated by Council; if we don't initiate - I mean, I guess there's an option for Council to do nothing and that is an option here. But if we do nothing the Board will initiate a PDP which puts Council out of the driver's seat. I'm not sure if I'm ever allowed to voice an opinion as Chair, sort of personal opinion, but to the extent that I am, I would like to see Council stay in the driver's seat here. I would like to see us take control of this and hence I'm not personally inclined to say let's do nothing just because I think the more that we can own this right from the beginning the better off we'll be.

The other thing to bear in mind about an expedited PDP is that Council has to approve doing one by a super majority. So that higher threshold really enlivens the need for this discussion to try and air any concerns that anyone has about an EPDP, you know, by holding this webinar and getting everyone together and specifically channeling in, you know, detailed feedback from SGs and Cs, through their leadership, we want to get a sense of whether a self-initiated EPDP is - is agreeable to everyone because otherwise let's say we're going down a path that if we can't get over that super majority threshold, that all of these other questions fall away if you like.

Just going to check in and see - I noticed Stephanie's comment about audio and just see if anyone else has audio concerns before we continue? Okay, secretariat says fine, okay all right good stuff.

Let's make a very pointed, you know, call for input here. Is there anyone that has concerns about an expedited PDP? Is there anyone that has questions about the expedited PDP, let's say as a concept? Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. Michele for the record. I suppose my question is - or concern is probably if we have only one EPDP or whatever we're calling it, is it going to be viable for that one thing to address it? Or are we better off looking at more than one? I know somebody was mentioning in the chat talking about working in various different things in parallel, I'm just concerned that we could end up in a situation where because of the - how broad the topics are around this entire thing that trying to wedge it all into one EPDP activity could pose massive issues.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. And I suppose again that comes back to the scope question, you know, what is it that we - I guess what is it that we actually have to do to get us to, you know, having something at the end of the 365 days and how do we respond to any changes? Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. So to Michele's point, I think what's going to be important is - is breaking down the specification and understanding what fits within the remit of what this effort would do because there are some open ended questions or suggestions within the temporary specification and we may decide that that is not for something that has to be done within this effort and that would put it outside the 12-month timeframe, but I think it goes back to our consideration of the temporary specification and how we're going to slice and dice it to some extent and that conversation with the Board of understanding what their expectation is as well.

So it's a valid point that we may need more than one effort but perhaps those other efforts don't have that 12-month clock ticking on it, so that's something else that we probably need to understand as we move forward. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. And kind of, yes, following up what Donna comment. So I understand that we have maybe several issues and that we maybe try to cover many fronts, but I think we had to prioritize anyway. There is limited bandwidth of how much we can work on within 12 month so I think it will be really a matter of prioritization at the end.

And so it's dependent of the scope so that's one of - it is coming from the temporary spec but I understand that maybe we need to fix for the long term at the end we have - we cannot do all the same even if it can be part of the tracks and so on but how much it will be really -how much it will be realistic knowing the workload and the time constraint because we have to deliver something within one year. So this is something we have to factor in our - our decision.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Rafik. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Heather. So first a comment on the first, you know, bullet point, the EPDP leadership, I understand why you would want somebody that was strong and experienced but with no strong position, that's going to be very difficult to find because most people that really understand this do have a position. Now whether or not we could find somebody that is - can be reasonable enough to, you know, I mean, it takes the leadership role in hand and not advocate for their position except when they make it very clear that's what they're doing. So I think that's going to be a challenge.

The other thing that comes to mind is, you know, in the current PDP process we develop the policy and then we do then have a second round of implementation so I don't think we have that luxury and I'm just wondering if we would - could develop sort of a implementation means or checklist type thing where as we're going along with developing the policy we're immediately checking in and going, you know, not just for the people developing the policy but with implementation so it's a parallel track but

maybe a separate thing that just lays in on that otherwise we're going to end up at minimum two years. And that's all I had.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. Sorry, Susan, thanks very much and you've got us thinking ahead about implementation which is helpful to think about right from the beginning, something that, you know, we need to do more of. Carlos, please.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Thank you, Heather. This is Carlos for the record. I have a process question about Board's approval of whatever comes out of this PDP, let's assume we all agree, we have only one track focused on privacy and we've solved everything, but it starts deviating from the temporary policy and we come out with a PDP that looks totally different from the temporary policy and then we go to the Board and the Board gets scared and doesn't want to take a decision. Will all that happen within the 365 days? Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Carlos. So I think the 365-day point - I see a number of people typing. The 365-day point let's say is from the commencement of the temporary spec. I think the question in the mind at this point is what if that thing changes? I won't - like Donna, I won't try and do the math here about all the renewals, but that 365 days gets us to the end of the possible renewals of that temporary specification. That of course is a backstop in there to make sure that policy comes from the GNSO and this mechanism that's been used by the Board, and this is the first time it has been used by the Board, is something that is truly temporary, hence the name.

Susan, please.

Susan Kawaguchi: Old hand, sorry.

Heather Forrest: And Carlos, to your point, so the outcome of our EPDP yes, it does need to be approved by the Board. And if I can just take us off of this slide very briefly and look at that timeline. Now let's not scrutinize the timeline because it's very much a rough thing, you see that at the end of this the - the end of the

timetable, if you like, looks similar to the end of the timetable of a lifespan of a regular PDP where we have a final report that goes out for public comment and that that then goes onto the Board for consideration. And that eats into our time, our 365-day timeline so hence you see that we have that, you know, that Board consideration sitting there at the end, but that means we need to be ready to run and not just handing this thing to the Board at the end of that 365-day window. So that - I agree, Carlos, it's a good reality check.

Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather, Donna Austin. So I understand that we have 365 days to do this and the timeline that we have in front of us is pretty reflective of what we know for, you know, how things would pan out if we were doing a policy process. I wonder, you know, it really strikes me that what's going to be really important here is that we as the Council set this up for success. So - and what I mean by that is that we identify all the questions that we have and all the variables and make sure we understand that and when we hand this - and I'm making some assumptions here that the Council or a subset of the Council is going to do a large amount of preparatory work here, and that could be the wrong assumption.

But when we hand this over to the PDP working group that we have done as best that we can to make sure that they don't have to keep coming back to the Council for - with clarifying questions or anything like that. So while, you know, I appreciate that we've taken a big slot between ICANN 62 and ICANN 63 for this, you know, working group, if we set it up that way, we shouldn't necessarily be wedded to that. If we think from the Council perspective that we need time in Panama for us to do more preparatory and make sure that it's where, you know, getting it ready so that the PDP is in a good position to kick off, then we should do that.

So, you know, we're saying that this PDP - expedited PDP gives us some flexibility, I also think that maybe the - our normal thinking cycle we should

think about flexibility in setting this up for success. So let's not be too hung up on the fact that, you know, between ICANN 62 and ICANN 63 is when the PDP itself will do the bulk of the work; it may be that they don't need that amount of time if we do the setup properly. So just, you know, let's be a little bit flexible in our thinking as well.

So when we had the baby over, let's make it - let's make sure that it's in the best condition it possibly can be for the PDP moving forward. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. And just to finish - to add to your point before turning to Farzaneh, the timeline does line up fairly easily if I can say that, with the ICANN public meetings. And when we come back to the questions slide I'll do that just check with Farzaneh if she wants to be on the timeline slide. One of the questions that we have is how do we optimize face to face time? And do we need to add more face to face time? So I'll leave that just as a question hanging and turn it to Farzaneh, please.

Farzaneh Badii: Hi. Can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: Oh really? That's great. No one could hear me until now. Okay, so Heather, just to make it clear I am - so I'm new to this discussion, but I see that from the documents that you sent us, you would like to discuss the format of this EPDP and I think in order - so I have no comments on the timeline, I think the deadline is a good thing, and as long as there is like a harsh strict deadline that after that nothing can be done, then I think people would work. But as to the format I can see that there is a CCWG style recommendation so that - so that there will be like members appointed by various stakeholder groups and then there will be participants and I think observers, but only members will be able to vote.

Sorry, I'm on - so I'm on topic here, right? You want to talk about - you want feedback on the format, right?

Heather Forrest: Farzaneh, spot on. And if I can just take the opportunity to interrupt you very quickly to say, staff, could we put up that briefing document in the background because that's what Farzaneh is very helpfully referring us to, the sort of options that are present there. So, Farzaneh, continue please and you've given us a good reference to exactly where we need to be. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay good. So basically from my experience and this is - I have not discussed this with the NCSG yet with the broader members, however I believe that from the past experience with a CCWG, and because we had a deadline that we had to meet so it kind of worked out. I don't know how comparable it is to EPDP but - and the issue that we have here, however I very much think personally that CCWG format might be the format to move forward with because not only - because we won't be exclusive but also we will have some rules that there will be members, there will be participants, and observers.

And sometimes when - and this kind of like weeds out sometimes disruption and this kind of format is good for sometimes some people just drop out and don't really participate and then the others should just replace them - not replace them but try to contribute as participants. So I like this, however with the caution that I'm just saying it from my CCWG experience, and the things that we achieved there, it's not NCSG position or anything, but I quite like the balance of the representation there. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Farzaneh, very much for really focusing or attention on that team composition question. Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks. Michele for the record. Just on this entire thing about how people participate, at the moment, for example, the GNSO Council mailing list is available to all GNSO Council members for full access, you know, the

words they can read it and post to it but third parties who are not on Council are able to subscribe so they can actually get the emails in real time. And obviously the archives are public.

And I think in terms of what we've seen in other working groups, or activities, you know, giving people the ability to read the emails so that they can follow what's going on seems perfectly reasonable and fine but if you left the mailing list wide open to everybody who whether they are a formal member or whatever the term is that people are using, that can lead to chaos and it's not particularly productive. So, I mean, I would be in favor of making the mailing list read only for people who aren't formal members of the group. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. So back on the slides, we'll stay on the document here, the briefing document for the moment, but back on the slides one of the points that we raised there was PDP 3.0. You know, that's our initiative that we kicked off in January and took various inputs from the community in San Juan on that. And an overarching message that came out of those inputs both from councilors and the broader community is that large groups are, broadly speaking, not working as well as they should. And I think that's something that's really captured in your comment there, Michele, that we need representativeness but at the same time we need effectiveness.

And that's the challenge for us here in terms of the various models the way of going about this, how do we get that ability for others to follow work without excluding? How do we - I should have said inclusiveness rather than representativeness, I hadn't really talked about representation, how do we get others to be able to follow so that the work is fully transparent but it's still effective? Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks, Heather. Michele again. I mean, I think - I think one of the issues we ran into, the RDS PDP, was that the mailing list instead of being productive at many times it devolved into a cat fight between various people. And also as well, you know, this activity should be - it's - it should be a GNSO

activity, I think we really need to own it and make sure that we don't end up in a situation where that - where the ball was taken away from us.

But there's multiple ways for people to engage, to provide feedback, to keep up to date on the activities of a group, but they don't need to be on the mailing list and having the posting abilities. You know, it's like with the GNSO Council, I mean, we represent our stakeholder groups and various parts of the community, we don't have - this call is not open for every Tom, Dick and Harry to turn up and start yelling at us or whatever. If people want to participate I think there has to be ways we can do that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: I agree with what Michele is saying and also wanted to add that, you know, I think responsibility and representation is key here. So, you know, we need all aspects of the community represented but we also - each of those members would have to almost sign onto a, you know, all of the responsibilities for the working group or PDP, I mean, this is going to take a massive amount of someone's time, you know, whoever is participating, but, you know, unless there was emergencies, but in general it could not be oh I don't have time this week or next week and to do that you'll have to wait and we need to re-discuss this issue because I wasn't here for two or three weeks, that type of, which, you know, it's just life, I mean, everybody - this is all volunteer, and people have their day jobs, but this year's going to go really quick, 365 days, and we need - so there's going to have to be a higher level of responsibility for participation.

And then I really think it's a representative, so you're not just supporting your personal views or your individual views, you need to go back to your community to get sign-off to, you know, move along with the work. I'm not sure how that can work but it just - it's the only thing that makes sense to me.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan, that buy-off from the start is - buy-in rather - from the start is a key point. Stephanie please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie here. Stephanie Perrin I guess I should for the record. I think it would be worthwhile even though we have very little time if the RDS Working Group more or less formerly - formally assessed how it failed because we all have our apocryphal views which we've heard a couple of and I agree with both Susan and Michele's assessment, but I think it'd probably we've got time to do this and we should be aware of all of the factors that led to our downfall the last time.

I think absolutely we need people who are on this to be representing their stakeholder group because this thing has to - has no time not to pass Council when we present it to them, so there should be no surprises, right? And surely one of our main problems in the RDS Working Group is that we had a lot of people who were not accountable to anybody and had their own agendas and were not regular participants at ICANN so they had no stake in finding a solution.

So I think that in the next couple of weeks if we sort of operated on the RDS working list we could come up with some of the key things. There's already been some discussion on the list; some people are of course claiming we didn't fail but, you know, those of us who might volunteer for a new exercise want to make sure we don't make the same mistakes. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Stephanie. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. I just wanted to follow up on something Susan said about, you know, representation is the way forward. So when the CWG on IANA transition started, I was the representative for the Registry Stakeholder Group in that CWG. And what we had sitting - we had a couple of other members of the Registry Stakeholder Group that were participating in the effort. But when it came to decisions or, not that we had votes, but you

know, what is the Registry Stakeholder Group position, it would come back to me.

What we had sitting behind that was a smaller group of interested people within the Registry Stakeholder Group so we would take time, I think we were meeting weekly, to go through what had been discussed and understand what the position was moving forward. So I think there are ways to manage that and certainly, you know, I thought it was - worked really well with the CWG on IANA. So but, you know, obviously that's for each individual SG and C to sort out their own mode of operation, but it is possible and it can be done so I think you know, I'd support what Susan said in that regard. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, very much. At the moment I'd say, Stephanie, old hand, new hand? Otherwise the queue is clear.

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry, old hand.

Heather Forrest: Cool. Thanks, Stephanie. Let's - while the queue is empty, let's not the list of questions is empty but the queue is empty for the moment, just try and recap on where we are, we're dialing back out to Susan. We've got a number of comments that have been made around participation and I'm hearing concerns that let's say we want to make sure that we have representation and active participation. We want to make sure that there's commitment so some sort of up front let's say requirement of commitment in the first place is helpful.

We want to be careful about limiting participation because that ends up maybe making too narrow of a focus of the group and doesn't represent sufficient number of interests. Look, I think we need to find a halfway house between when we say PDP 3.0, that acknowledges that there was a PDP - we're currently at 2.0 and that there was a 1.0 before us. One point I was very much a model of, a point of representative and the reason for shifting to the model that we have now, which is the full and open participation, was that

that narrow, you know, representative model wasn't at the time, seen to be very workable. So something between those two maybe, a halfway house, is what we need to try and find, that still gives us that representation but does so in a manageable way.

Comments that came out of PDP 3.0 that, you know, the folks there needed to be committed, they needed to be empowered to make decisions but the group needed to be sustainable. Other comments that came out of PDP 3.0 is, you know, we need folks that are willing to skill themselves up and maybe do so quickly to follow along with the documents and calls that get missed and so on and need a certain level of experience.

One thing that we need to consider here is whether it's possible for someone to come in cold on this at this particular point in time with only 12 months to run. So with that bit of a summary, Farzaneh, over to you. Farzaneh, now we can't hear you if you're speaking.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Farzaneh, this is...

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Can you hear me now?

Terri Agnew: Oh, yes, now we can.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay great. So I think that in my opinion from what I hear from others as well, it seems like that the CWG minus model is something that is kind of - it is not exclusive but also it is not too inclusive to be problematic later so that the group can come to consensus. And I think from what I'm hearing if we can discuss the details of the CCWG minus model we will discuss that - we can discuss all these models with our groups, I think we are going to meet with

NCSG this week, Rafik said, and then we can discuss it, but then I believe that if we can go into the - if we can start another discussion on the details of this model and the representation how many representatives should be there and stuff like that, then I think we could come to a conclusion quickly. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Farzaneh, very much. A number of comments in the chat, just to pick up for the folks who are listening, Stephanie has said she agrees, it would be difficult to accept people coming in cold. There are a few comments here around CCWG minus. CCWG minus, and Ayden is saying two members per GNSO stakeholder group, that's probably a combination, a blend of some of the models that are here, so there have been a number of things about CCWG minus, and I typed into the chat what that was but I realize that folks listening won't - and now there are a few negatives.

Folks listening won't understand what CCWG minus is that we're referring to. What that looks like is each stakeholder group would appoint a maximum of three, with up to two alternates. Other ICANN SOs ACs would be invited to appoint one member and one alternate. So that is what that looks like; that's what we're referring to here.

So comments on this? And what I might do, if I could trouble Terri, Terri, could you take us back just as a time check, we have about 15 minutes to go, could you take us back to the slides please to refocus our thoughts in the last 15 minutes. Thank you very much. And we're back to the question slide. And, Terri, if it's possible I'm very happy - there's no reason why I should have exclusive control of the slides at this point, is it possible, Terri, to let everyone - to let the slides loose so that everyone can scroll?

Terri Agnew: And everyone can scroll themselves at this time.

Heather Forrest: Super. Thanks, Terri, very much. So back to our list of questions here, if you're on a different slide, I'm looking at Slide 6, it seems to me that we've

spent a fair bit of time talking about team composition and I think that's very, very helpful. And at the end of the day I think the question there is the operative one, which option has the best chance of success? We - Michele, before we continue, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Heather, Michele for the record. One of the things that I think some of us have been discussing both in the chat here and elsewhere was around the work schedule for doing this and how being able to use face to face time could be helpful. So the concrete question there is, is if - please find out from staff whether there is budget for that or not because obviously if there's no budget then causes issues.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. So I think that's - I think that's an important point. Let's see, just looking for hands, just taking stock of where we are. We've got a couple folks typing. There have been some comments around members. There's a general sense of agreement in the chat of primary and alternates. I think that's probably helpful in view of the time considerations. Let's say this, let's go back to some of the comments, there were comments in the chat that folks wouldn't have seen from the audiocast around the question of additional face to face time or not adding face to face time meaning above and beyond the public meeting time.

One thing I will say is when this - when these discussions first kicked off one of the questions we asked the Board specifically, Cherine, was were resources there to facilitate you know, additional time or additional needs? And the answer was, well it depends; it depends on how many people and what we're looking at. And I think that's fair. But there were some interesting points made in the chat, I think by Donna and others, that until we know the scope it's going to be fairly difficult for us to determine, you know, how best to utilize time, how often these folks should meet.

And I think in terms of the comments about how do we get information out to the broader community, you know, again, we're working with a very fast

paced thing here. There is a possibility - I think there are several possibilities here that I'll throw out there as options. You know, one, I think there's good reason to think about putting this down as a standing item on the Council agenda for the next 12 months. That way we have, you know, a clear link back to Council.

I think we want to figure out another way to have a direct link, an immediate link to Council so that we're not sort of passively waiting for updates. I'm not - I'm - we need to think about whether the liaison role is the right one here or whether we need some other direct linkage to Council, you know, as - make that relationship back to Council as efficient as possible.

Another option maybe idea that we need to think about is some sort of a monthly general assembly or monthly update that maybe that facilitates that broader, you know, community involvement in a group that it looks like, you know, we're leaning towards not a full and open model particularly if we're asking for this quite, you know, serious commitment up front, but we need a way to inform the broader community so all of these things, let's say, maybe going towards working methods and picking up some of the comments that were in the chat and adding to those.

Any comments, let's say, with that as a sort of sweep up on working methods and the comments made in the chat, anyone want to add to those comments on working methods or disagree with them or agree with them? Farzaneh, please.

Farzaneh Badii: So I just wanted to agree with you but also I wanted to say that we really can use other groups like successful, other groups experiences in working methods, for example, they - each representative of the group itself would brief their own members and also sometimes they have like as you said, like a monthly call, but also they could meet face to face because they are appointed by the stakeholder groups and constituencies they can - by the stakeholder groups and other groups they could just meet I'd say before

ICANN meeting, I mean, kind of like how CCWG being functioning especially CCWG on Accountability.

And sometimes they can approve budget, I don't know for people - for the members to travel. So I think work method-wise we can come up with something solid looking at similar groups experiences. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Farzaneh, very much. Helpful points. Susan is noting in the chat, and I think it's an important one to capture if we appoint a liaison to this group, that would be a major responsibility. I think that's true and it's likely that the responsibility will maybe, you know, we want to reflect on how will that differ from the expectations that we captured at the start of the year when we met in January on the role of the liaison.

I think broadly that falls into a bigger basket which is to say, you know, in undertaking this EPDP how do we want to differ from what we do in a normal PDP environment? Are there things - we have a great deal of flexibility as was pointed out in January when we first came together to talk about the PDP Working Group Guidelines and so on, we have a great deal of flexibility in there, so I'm not suggesting - I'm not trying to push the discussion, you know, to change. But we have, you know, we have some decisions to make around how we do these things because this EPDP is a different beast. Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Heather. Donna Austin. I think we also need to be mindful that this is going to consume a reasonable amount of time of Council, you know, as the manager of the PDP. I think this is one that we will want to pay close attention to. But we need to balance that against making sure that we don't do that at the, what's the word I'm looking for, to the detriment of the other PDP working groups that we have underway. You know, we've seen all too often that, you know, the other - the next shiny thing that comes along and we drop those that have been in train and they start to suffer. So I think we need to be cognizant of that as well.

This is important, but we have other efforts that are going on as well that need the Council attention too, so let's just be mindful of that as we move forward and, you know, understand what the requirements are for this and how we manage not just this effort but the other three that are currently underway as well.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. I think that's an excellent point. And that leads us to a question that, you know, we've had sitting in the background, another decision, a question on our list is, you know, broadly speaking the RDS PDP leadership team gave us some input early on, you would have seen it in that briefing note that came after the initial call and their further reflections after that, that trying to wrap this effort that we're talking about now into the existing RDS PDP wasn't really workable given the charter that that group had and trying to re, let's say, rejig that charter and do something with that existing effort wasn't optimal.

That then leads us to a question of what we do to Donna's point about our other PDPs. We will ultimately have to decide what to do with the existing RDS PDP. And I think sweeping back in some of the earlier comments that were made we need to - we need to try not to accomplish everything in 12 months. You know, the sweet spot here is going to be doing enough, I think it was Rafik that made the point earlier or maybe Michele, we don't want to get to the end of 12 months and have nothing but likewise we don't want to try and do everything in 12 months.

So that really is a question for the scoping exercise, how do we get to that point and have something that's workable to the implementation point, and that has that legitimacy having the representation and, you know, the ability for everyone to participate that gets their voice in there. Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. Michele for the record. The RDS PDP is currently informally suspended, not doing anything, should we as Council formally suspend it or

terminate it or do something with it? Or are we just going to let it linger over in the corner?

Heather Forrest: Michele, I'm so sorry, I got distracted by something. Tell me again what you said just so I don't ignore you?

Michele Neylon: Madame Chair, I'm deeply hurt and offended. The RDS PDP at the moment is informally inactive slash suspended. Should we as Council formally terminate it or suspend that PDP?

Heather Forrest: Good stuff, Michele. Thank you very much, I'm sorry to make you repeat yourself and please don't be offended. I agree with you, again, I have no answer and it's not for me to answer, right, it's not a leadership thing. That is the operative question is what do we do with that PDP. I think we take a lot of input from the RDS PDP itself. I personally am of the mind that, you know, we're here as a manager of the PDP but I tend to like to rely on the expertise of the RDS folks.

And this is an opportune time to very publicly thank the RDS leadership team, Michele of which you're a part, for all of the input that they've given up to now that's really helped frame our thinking as the Council leadership team for what these options are and much of RDS PDP leadership, thank God they're not going anywhere, much of their input has found its way into certainly the briefing note that we drafted together after that initial call with the Board and our thinking around the briefing document for this call and preparing for this webinar. So, you know, public opportunity itself to thank them.

And I take the point, Michele, that the people aren't going anywhere but we do need to decide about that effort. And there are of course issues in that in the charter of that PDP, that we can't tackle in that - in the next 12 months. So you're right, the PDP itself needs something and we need to figure out what to do. And I'm inclined to agree with the comment that Donna's just made in the chat, she says, "Perhaps it would make sense to do so once we

understand the requirements of this effort.” She says, “However, I doubt that it’s possible to continue the RDS PDP Working Group at the same time as the EPDP.” And that let’s say, is what I had in the back of my mind when we started talking about our other - our three other PDPs. You know, the intention here is we can't neglect the efforts that we have going on. And but we have to be realistic about what it is that we can do and so we need - yes, we need to be strategic about how we use the resources here.

Tatiana, please, over to you.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much, Heather. Hi, everyone. I was just musing about the scope and I thought that maybe the concept of work streams that was used in CCWG Accountability would work like I totally agree with Keith comment on the chat that we need to establish a charter drafting team and define the scope, but what about defining the issues which are critical to be addressed in 365 days when the clock is ticking? And then leave some of the issues as a Work Stream 2 or whatever we are going to name it.

So not really like, you know, putting issues aside just delaying them in time, saying like, okay, this has to be addressed in 365 days and these we continue working on later in whatever form. So just an idea because we already used it. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Tatiana. Indeed I think that’s helpful, the sort of prioritization of what needs to be done and what can be done after is helpful. So I’ll take my hand down, I thought I could put it up and sort of stop the queue. We have two minutes to go, this is really just a first step, if you remember that sort of proposed next steps, you know, timeline chronologically the next thing that happens is we have our Council meeting on Thursday. And what I think we can usefully consider in that 50 minutes is these questions around, you know, getting a group together, what - so to be very, very clear, we need a group that gets together to draft the document that will kick off the EPDP, if that’s the route we think we’re going down, that’s called an initiation request.

And again, in the reference slides, the first reference slide there is the required elements of that. You'll see that they deal with a number of things that have been raised today, scope, working methods and decision making methodology and so on. So I think we want to think on Thursday about who will be on that group, how will we form that group even before we get to the point of, let's say, the team composition, we need to get a group together that will take ownership and leadership of that document.

And in my mind the sooner that we show that that is happening, the sooner we show publicly to the rest of the ICANN community, including the Board, that we intend to self-initiate a PDP and we intend to fulfill our obligations under the bylaws. So I think that's really first and foremost, you know, getting that team together and starting to work on that document is important.

That group will also let's say, in its work, put together what we would normally consider a charter and we have a number of things that have come out of the PDP 3.0 effort that we need to carefully think about in terms of how that charter looks and so on.

The other thing we need to think about on Thursday is who goes forward in that follow up discussion with the Board and how soon that can take place. I think it's probably sensible that we have that discussion with the Board after the Council meeting, that's just an initial impression given that we'll probably want some more time to talk about this before we call that - that discussion to happen so that kind of suggests to me that, you know, as a first step let's get the team for that discussion. It might be that those two teams overlap, the drafting team and the call team.

And there have been some comments in the chat about, you know, how that could happen and who those people are. I think those are probably the next steps for us. And it's a good opportunity for me just as we wind up here, we're one minute over time, to check in with Donna and Rafik. I don't see any

hands up, but just see as we wrap up here, Donna, Rafik, any further comments from you, anything you'd like to make sure we don't miss?

Donna Austin: Heather, it's Donna.

Heather Forrest: Donna, please, go ahead.

Donna Austin: I think it would be helpful if we can put the notes and the notes from this call up on the mailing list and perhaps have maybe a little bit more pointed discussion about the composition of the working group, perhaps leadership. I think if we can - the composition is going to be a little bit sensitive but I think it might be something that is low hanging fruit in terms of the other things that we need to do. So maybe if we can get some agreement on team composition for the EPDP then we could start a process to, you know, pull that team together.

And in parallel I think the Council can be working on the requirements and understanding what the task is in order to set the PDP up just as a suggestion. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, that's helpful. And I'll ask staff to help us let's say on the first point, make that happen that we get all of this information out immediately, you know, in the spirit of working towards very tight timelines. The sooner we get the stuff out from today's call the quicker we will be informed and Marika says the notes and action items should go out shortly after this meeting together with the slides.

Final acknowledgement here, is to say that the staff are working, you know, just as hard if not harder than we are in terms of keeping up with these sorts of timelines and managing this on top of all their other responsibilities for the other PDPs that we have going on. So again, personal opportunity or public opportunity to thank the staff very much for getting us to this point and for

everything that comes ahead. So brilliant work by all and Cheryl is making the clapping sign. Cheryl, I forget even how to make the clapping sign.

Awesome, so final check, Rafik, any last inputs from you?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Heather. Not that much but just I think also hopefully we'll get more input into several question from the SG and C and, yes, and thanks for everyone for attending today. That's it.

Heather Forrest: Awesome. Thanks, everyone. Super useful to be continued. We will be together as Council on Thursday so the sooner we all take this back to our respective SGs and Cs and bring back let's say fresh inputs on this to Thursday's discussion, the better off we'll be. Thanks very much, everyone, for making the time and we will look forward to speaking again on Thursday. So with that I'll end the call. Thanks to everyone and see you soon. Bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Heather. Bye.

Terri Agnew: And once again, the webinar has concluded. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day. (Pens), the operator, if you could please stop all recordings?

END