ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 22 February 2016 at 22:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group. 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: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-22feb16-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Michelle Desmyter: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on 22nd of February, 2016 at 2200 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room so if you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Karen Bernstein: Karen Bernstein, Bernstein IP in New York.

David Ackerman: This is David Ackerman from New York University.

Michelle Desmyter: A Statement of Interest is required to participate in this working group and everyone is encouraged to complete this statement as soon as possible. Should there be any questions or challenges with completing the SOI you

should feel free to reach out to staff for assistance. Should there still be members that have not completed their SOI despite numerous reminders, these will be downgraded to observers. At any point their status can be changed back to member upon completion of the SOI.

I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll hand it to you, Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Thank you very much. This is Paul McGrady. Welcome, everybody. This is obviously a topic in which lots of people are interested if you look at our roll here on the mailing list. It is not only long but it is a veritable who's who of ICANN participants. And so thank you all for your willingness to be involved in this.

As with any good ICANN PDP, there are going to be participants from all over the world with differing schedules and work styles and also different issues that are important to each of us. So one of the - just at the outset I want to express the Council's hope that this PDP will be run in a way that provides for opportunities for all to participate and for all to contribute. And of course in the spirit of ICANN that we all participate in a way that is collegial and respectful of each other.

So with that said, normally we would move on to a time where we allow various working group members to do introductions, the Working Group Guidelines suggest this. And I usually think it's a great opportunity to share those kind of interests and backgrounds, skills and experiences. I think it helps people understand where people are coming from in this process. But with a group this size and a desire to get some decisions made it may be a bit impractical. So I will encourage everybody to send around a brief introductory email on the list serve so that those who are not familiar with people that

they're going to be working alongside over the coming months will have a chance to get to know them a little bit better.

We - regarding the membership list and next steps, we should take a look at it, although it is quite impressive. We want to make sure that there is no particular group that is missing. Anybody from the ICANN ecosystem, that does not seem to have a representation here on the working group so that we can do some additional outreach and recruitment.

As I said before, one of the goals here is for robust participation from across the full segment of ICANN. So if you happen to notice any friends who are not here on the list and if you could pass along with comments probably to me is fine or if we get chairs elected at some point soon, or to staff, we'll make sure to track that down and see if we can get any missing groups to agree to participate.

So that's sort of the welcome. I think the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Paul?

Paul McGrady: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Paul. Cheryl Langdon-Orr here.

Paul McGrady: Hi there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi.

Paul McGrady: Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I put my hand up earlier just actually before your intro but it's relevant to the members list. I just wanted to point out that there was a limitation in as much as you could only identify with a

single affiliation and some of us, Avri and myself for example, do actually wear more than one hat and so perhaps an answer to the diversity would also be the ability to list more than a single membership or affiliation. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Cheryl. Appreciate that. Yeah, I agree with you, long gone are the days with very clear cut silos. That's not the new - the ICANN ecosystem these days. Terrific, any other questions or comments before we jump in to the next item on our agenda? Okay seeing no hands I will keep going.

The first thing we want to tackle is the schedule of meetings. And as we discuss the schedule of meetings we're looking at some basic questions like how frequent we should have our - how frequently we should have our meetings, the length of the meetings. You know, in my experience most of these calls on working groups usually run an hour but considering the size of the group and how much work we have to do are 90 minute meetings more practical?

What day of the week? Do Mondays work? Do we want to rotate times, those kinds of things. And so I think I'll just open up a queue on those sorts of issues and see if we can talk about it for a bit and see if we can get some feedback.

I see Jeff Neuman's hand. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Hey, Paul. Thanks. You know, I think when, you know, the first question of 60 or 90 minutes, I think it might be helpful to start out with 90 and then if - obviously if it turns out we don't need it we can always shorten the meetings but it's good to kind of block that out on people's schedules.

As far as the day of the week, you know, there's so many groups going on right now that, you know, we should really hear from ICANN staff and others that participate in other groups because I know at least while the CCWG Accountability group is still meeting that they have certain days that they

meet and, you know, it'd be good to just find a day - there's obviously the Whois PDP, I'm not sure if here's overlapping people. But we should pick a day and then my recommendation is for rotating hours within that day if we can set those pretty far in advance for the rotating hours so we can all block those out of our schedule.

The other thing is I have a feeling that we - because there are at least five work streams that will come up at some point according to the charter, I have a feeling we're going to break a lot into subteams, so I'm not sure if we're going to need to meet as a large group as often but certainly with the sub teams meet more often. But I think that's something that time will tell as to how we all as a group decide to operate. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Thank you. Ken, I see your hand. Ken, I think your microphone may be on mute.

Ken Stubbs: Can you hear me now, Paul?

Paul McGrady: Can hear you now, thank you.

Ken Stubbs: Hello? Okay good, I think it might be a good idea to poll the members of the group. I'm not exactly sure what percentage of the people who have elected to participate in the group are actually on this call. And I think if we use a Doodle poll at least we can pin it down to a day that has the greatest number of people who would be available. And I support Jeff's recommendation on rotating the call times, it's the only way we'll ever get any equity given the number of participants. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thank you, Ken. Any other comments on days and times of meetings and rotation? All right, I see a lot in the chat about rotation being a good idea but making sure also that we do not run into other meetings that are currently out there for other working groups and other things underway.

Steve Chan from staff, I see your hand up.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Paul. This is Steve from staff. And so what I put up in the AC room is just a graph we put together just to kind of show the distribution of folks in time zones. So I don't know if we want to try to take that into consideration so, you know, the number of folks in a certain region, should that drive how many meetings might be more convenient for that region. Possibly not because it doesn't necessarily work that way. But so when we discuss rotating times we might want to take in consideration whether it's a 50/50 split or if it's like a three to one split or whatever the case may be.

So I think what someone suggested is that staff can look at the days that will be appropriate, which we've already done to some degree. We avoided Tuesdays because that's the day that RDS group meetings so we narrowed in on Thursdays and Mondays as possibilities. But still we can go back and take another look and then we can poll the group to determine which group might be best and then we can also maybe do a separate poll on how we'd like to do the rotation times. So I just put this graph up for context if anyone thinks it might be useful to consider. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Steve. I think that is useful. Of course it's always hard to know if it's the chicken or the egg, right, if the ease of calling in enhances participation from a region or if particular regions are just naturally more likely to participate and that's why that number is higher in a particular place, just not sure.

But my personal preference is that we do the polling that we've talked about. I think that's a great idea, and just see if we can find a day and a couple of rotating times that work for the most number of people to encourage participation. But also in the way that we make sure that we don't leave out group three from this chart because I think that having their voice heard is also very important as well.

Thank you, guys, all for your comments on that. Steve, is that an old hand or a new hand? Must have been an old hand. Okay. All right, thank you everybody for your comments on that. Seeing no further hands want to move on to the next item on the agenda and that's just a brief talk about transparency and openness as it relates to this working group.

As most of you will know from Working Group Guidelines, which staff can post, our working group will operate under the ICANN principles of transparency and openness, which for us mean that our mailing list will be publicly archived, our meetings will be recorded and transcribed and statements of interest are required from working group participants. And all of that will be publicly posted.

As everybody knows, that is a great way for those who cannot participate in a working group to follow along on the issues that we're looking at. And I think enhances the quality of the work product. Any concerns or questions about the transparency and openness procedures for working group? Okay, seeing no hands we will keep - we'll keep moving, all right.

The next item on our agenda are the election of working group leaders. Normally we try to see if we can get chairs selected at the first meeting of the working group. Working groups are free to elect to have co-chairs or a single chair or even perhaps multiple vice chairs. There are other configurations perhaps that may work for different working groups.

Based upon some recent experience that those of us who've been active participants in the working group may want to consider a leadership team in the form of a chair, one or two vice chairs, hopefully or perhaps with different stakeholder groups and constituencies represented. It seems to me to bring good balance.

We had a similar thing in the recent working group on privacy and proxy. It seemed to work very well. It also helps balance work load. So that's an

option. Once the working group chair is selected that chair will need to be confirmed by the GNSO Council. That's usually a fairly straightforward process.

And we would essentially be looking for somebody who would be able to, you know, to take a strong leadership role in this and looking for someone who is prepared to essentially be a neutral voice that - I should say a person or group of people who are prepared to be a neutral voice that can move forward the work. And as the working group considers its leadership I think that those things are important.

I have to admit to not knowing what the next step is. And I think that what I will do simply is just to open it up for comments for now and see how it evolves. So if anybody wants to put their hands up and make comments if anybody is prepared to volunteer formally now would be a good time to do that. And oh I see Steve's hand is up. Steve, can you jump in? Steve, your hand up, can you jump in here? Okay, not hearing from Steve, let's go to Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Paul. On the list there were several people that either put themselves forward or someone nominated them. I put my name forward. I would love to be on the leadership team of this group. I submitted a statement of interest and neutrality on that. And would love to answer any questions. I'm open to whatever chair, co-chairs, vice chairs structure that the group tends to favor.

I did send an email earlier today as well that there's going to be a number of work streams and so I think, you know, whatever we choose as the main coordinating chairing structure does not necessarily have to be the leaders of each of the work streams. And in fact I would expect and would hope that this presents lots of opportunities for others that may not have led in the past to take on an active role. So I think there's lots of opportunities in this PDP for

leadership roles. And I look forward to helping out the group in any way I can. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Jeff. Appreciate that. Before we move on to Ken I want to point out that staff has posted the chairing a GNSO working group what's involved paper here for us to all look over. So if anyone is considering joining Jeff and volunteering I think this is a great thing to read through quickly.

Ken, can you go next?

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, thanks so much. There are a couple things I'm concerned about. Over the last year or two especially I've gotten an awful lot of comments saying that it seems that the working groups and the various organizations always seem to involve the same parties and that we need to get - try to more fresh blood and we need to create an environment that makes it attractive for enhanced participation.

I think - I have to agree totally with Donna's comment in the chat room. I think it's extremely important that if we stratify the working group to have what we'll call senior management that those people have significant experience in managing the working group. But at the same point in time, I want to make absolutely certain that this working group has credibility that the final product is not one that was just created by people who have nothing but conflicted interests in the results.

I think it's extremely important that the community understand that we're doing this from a broad perspective that it really is an inclusive process and not an exclusive one. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thank you, Ken. Appreciate that. I see Cheryl's hand is next.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And I certainly, as I did in the chat, want to support Donna on - and what Ken has just articulated in terms of the

requirements for experience. But we also I think have the opportunity, as Jeff outlined, with the proposed sub teams. And I think that's a great way for people to get a little bit of that experience.

That said, as I understood it, we had a fairly well supported in the list proposal for a co-chair relationship. I know Avri had pointed out a balance from a GNSO perspective between the two houses and she in fact had put herself forward and was I believe supported to co-chair with Jeff. And I've already put to the list that Jeff had my support but I'll put to this meeting that the co-chair arrangement should that get up, has my support as well. And I would support Avri in that role.

But I think there - you've got the ability to deal with a leadership team with the coordinators or facilitators or rapporteurs or whatever term you wish to use for your subteams. And I think that could be quite a successful model. What that mean, Paul, is that we could get the co-chairing arrangement hopefully put to bed in today's call and let the encouragement for leadership or even if needs be, co-leadership, of the subteams develop somewhat more organically but with an end game of having a strong, effective and viable leadership team which both works from experience and helps grow it. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thank you, Cheryl. Wise as always. Khaled. I see Khaled's hand is up. The - there we go, the microphone...

((Crosstalk))

Paul McGrady: Thank you.

Khaled Koubaa: Yes. Hi, my name is Khaled Koubaa. For the record I sent my self-nomination for the role of vice chair but then I was thrown my nomination to support (unintelligible). I think I just mentioned it from the beginning there would be a

lot of opportunity for everyone to put their hands on the job. There's enough work to be done and I will be always happy to help.

Paul McGrady: Thank you very much. I see from the chat there is some back and forth about the idea of balanced leadership and how that takes into account the concern about potential biases. I guess from my point of view when I think about balance it has less to do with substantive outcomes and more to do with skill sets and different points of view in terms of things - how things are implemented and those sorts of things.

And so but I do want to acknowledge that that is a concern that is being kicked around in the chat. And I encourage anybody who has an opinion or thought on that to raise their hand and bring that forward. But I agree with Kiran that good strong leaders is really the number one thing that we're looking for in this space I believe.

Alan, I see your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I support the Jeff and Avri as co-chairs. I think the co-chair thing works quite well in this kind of environment and it takes some pressure off. Both of them have vast experience in the GNSO. Both have demonstrated the ability to lead groups to successful outcomes. And I think we have a good pair in them. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Okay. Kiran, I see your hand is up.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Yeah, I think Khaled is before me. This is Kiran. I don't want to jump the queue.

Paul McGrady: Sorry about that. Khaled, is that an old hand or a new hand? There we are. Sorry about that.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Oh it was old. Okay this is Kiran. Thanks. I just - I guess I think it's a point well taken, Paul, that we need to have a balanced skill set. I will say that I think it is important to have some new voices. I support Steve Coates as one of the co-chairs and I wanted to make sure that that was on the record. I think that it's great to have old hats, I also support Jeff and Brett. I think that Brett did an excellent job with the discussion group for this same issue and it would be great for him to carry on a leadership role in the PDP.

I do think that good strong leaders are important but not necessarily proven leadership within ICANN. I think it would be great to have a leader with a new perspective and a new voice. And I also want to make sure that if we are talking about skill sets and balanced, you know, viewpoints, that we are very clear that the leaders are not leading in representative capacity of their individual stakeholder, constituency group or party house.

So I want to put that on the record as well because we want to make sure that there's some impartiality. I think that there's been some confusion on that in working groups in the past. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Kiran.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I be added to the queue?

Paul McGrady: You are up right now.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And apologies for being on - this is Avri speaking - for not being on Adobe Connect. I'm in South Africa and I've got terrible connectivity problems.

I really wanted to endorse much of what's been said. You know, especially what Jeff said at the beginning having been put up for this and would be very happy to do this as a neutral co-chair or working in a large group. Also agree that it is incredibly important that as Kiran said, that the people that are co-

chairing functions in a neutral capacity. And that we include new voices both as vice chairs and as leaders in the various streams. So basically, you know, I sort of wanted to (unintelligible) endorse what Jeff said and if the group did decide to have (unintelligible) as co-chairs would be very happy and think that we could do well together. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Thank you, Avri. Okay, any further comments or hands up? I see Khaled's hand is back up. Go ahead, Khaled. Thank you.

Khaled Koubaa: Yes, just to mention that we talked about the chairs role and the vice chair but we have not spoken about the secretariat one. My understanding is that there is a - I mean, possibility that the staff did that but also there is the possibility that any of the members would do that.

Paul McGrady: Perhaps staff can address this question but in past experiences of working groups that I've been on that role has been fulfilled by staff. I don't know if that's a rule or if that's just a blessing. Any hands from staff who can address that? Okay, I don't see any hands going up.

So I guess I will say that we can kick that around. I'll have to check in with staff to find out - that role but I'm pretty - oh Mary Wong. There you are. Mary Wong to the rescue. Go ahead. Mary, I see - oh, Mary I see your hand is raised if you could go ahead.

Mary Wong: Yeah, apologies, Paul and apologies, everyone, that took a while to come off mute, which really shouldn't happen from a staff member. I just wanted to follow up on the question that Khaled had and your answer. And indeed it is the staff that performs the support functions for the working group and this is exclusively put in the Working Group Guidelines for the GNSO. We have two basic functions which is basically a secretariat function as well as a policy liaison function that would include drafting if that is required by the working group.

And we are expressly conditioned to have our draft reflect faithfully the working group deliberations, and we are also permitted to provide on request expertise whether it be technical, legal or so forth advice on implementation, scoping, etcetera, etcetera.

On top of that, the working group is able to request the assistance of subject matter experts to the extent those are necessary or deemed as desirable by the group at certain point in its deliberations. So I don't know if this answers the exact question Khaled has but I thought it might be helpful particularly for newer members to know that some at least of these roles and functions are set forth in the GNSO guidelines. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thank you, Mary, that is very helpful. So I want to be respectful of the fact that we have still to go through the background materials and to talk about a potential work plan which are going to take up quite a bit of time. I'd like to open it up just for a couple more minutes. We have here in the notes from staff that Jeff Neuman, Avri Doria, Steven Coates have all three been put forward as potential co-chairs and Phil Buckingham as a potential vice chair.

And I would like to see if folks on the call could propose a structure that would be a way forward where we could utilize the talents of each of these volunteers. If that's what the working group has in mind. Or not. So I'm going to ask for hands again and see if we can maybe drive this particular item to completion. It would be nice to be able to report to the Council that we have leadership in place.

I see Ken's hand is up.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, thank you. I think that it would be entirely possible to have two - a chair, a co-chair, and then an additional - call them vice chairs, whatever you want. Jeff Neuman made the point that we're going to have a significant number of work streams. Those people that could be (unintelligible) like Steve could be working very closely with the working group chairs, co-chairs.

And it might add a little bit more uniformity and would make the whole process a lot smoother, enhance the (unintelligible). Just food for thought.

Paul McGrady: Thank you, Ken.

Amr Elsadr: Amr. Thanks, Paul. It's Amr. Yeah, I would suggest that the working group members should decide on a number of members of the leadership team and the names of who they are and then let that team get together and figure out how they would like to do their job and manage the PDP and then get back to us with suggestions on that. That seems reasonable to me. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Amr. Khaled.

Khaled Koubaa: Yeah, I think it's better to be consistent with the GNSO guidelines and have one chair and then choose different vice chairs or co-chairs. I prefer - I tend to prefer vice chairs to be honest. We can have two or three and all of them will be able to help the chair.

Paul McGrady: Okay thank you. Okay well this is - I mean, this is a really classy problem because we have five volunteers who are excellent choices and they're willing and able. So this is something that we're going to have to sort out. I'm not sure that it looks like we'll be able to get that done on this call with so many options. I do like the idea of - that's been kicked around of asking these leaders to get together on a separate call and come back to the group with a proposal on titles and roles and things of that nature.

And so I guess I'll just say is there any objection to asking these five to do that and coming back with a proposal? Khaled, is that a new hand? Khaled, is that a new hand?

Khaled Koubaa: Yes. I would prefer that we can do that on the mailing list. I think for transparency it can be done within the members.

Paul McGrady: Okay thank you. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Look, I think we really need to decide whether it's going to be a co-chairing relationship or a chair and vice chairing relationship. My personal preference is clearly in a co-chairing relationship and having obvious opportunity also for people to be leading and become part of a leadership team from the topic-based subteams that Jeff's already proposed. And I think is a very good way of working.

Now that said, I frankly don't give a damn whether we've got two, three or five. We need at least two, otherwise they wouldn't be co-chairs. And I think we should settle it on today's call. I think we need to get onto the substantive aspect of work and the willing leaders, if one or other of them would prefer to wait and take a topic-based leadership role should just get down and get on with the job as soon as possible. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Cheryl. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Cheryl said a fair amount of what I was going to say. I would very strongly advocate co-chairs. This is going to be a difficult and sometimes contentious discussion that we're having and I think the co-chairs need the benefit of having - of being able to talk amongst themselves and when some of the issues come up and how to move forward. And for that reason I strongly favor two because it's a lot easier to have a conversation between two than a three-way conversation where you, you know, it starts getting very disoriented sometimes. But I believe co-chairs are definitely the way to go. You can have some vice chairs under them but I think - I do believe co-chairs are important. Thank you.

Paul McGrady: Okay thank you. All right. Looking for other hands. It's been proposed on the list that we agree to two co-chairs and work out the method to include the other volunteers in the leadership structure. Perhaps on the - as Khaled mentioned, perhaps on the list serve rather than on a second call. Can we get

to agreement on the two co-chairs and three vice chairs concept? I see Steve's hand is up. Steve.

Stephen Coates: Let me - thanks, Paul (unintelligible) definitely this time. I think I did. I guess I just wanted to make a comment that at this point we haven't decided on a work plan necessarily so we might not actually know exactly what level of effort for subteams we need at this point. So without knowing that we might not know if we need three co-chairs or - sorry, three vice chairs or what the proper number might be in terms of how much work needs to be accomplished simultaneously.

So just to put that out there. I'm not sure that that influences the co-chair discussion but at least to maybe say that we don't have all the answers ready at this point to understand what the maybe below the co-chairs are three co-chairs, whatever the number might be, you might be able to decide that later at some point. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Okay, thanks, Steve. Okay so with the desire to use the last 17 minutes to get to some substance, I know there was a desire to resolve this on this call but as I'm looking through the chat it's not clear to me from the chat and from the hands raised that there is an overwhelming sort of flow here that is going to make it clear who should be in which role. So I do think that we need to set it aside for now, come back to it either in the next call or on the list, most likely on the list, and see what we can accomplish.

I do want to move forward to item number seven on the agenda, which is for staff to give us some background on the charter and Working Group Guidelines, those sorts of things. So if staff can go ahead and do that that would be great.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Paul. This is Steve from staff. And I'm trying to find the slide deck. Give me one second. Maybe the secretary can help me.

Michelle Desmyter: One moment.

Paul McGrady: Okay while Steve's working on that it will respond to something Jeff put into the chat which is would be great to have the leadership team done by Marrakesh if possible. I agree entirely. It would be much more productive for that in person meeting if the leadership team were handled by then and that certainly will be the goal of this process.

Steve, it looks like you're ready.

Steve Chan: All right, thank you. This is Steve from staff again. I just wanted to run and probably pretty quickly through this slide now that we're running sort of low on time. So the things I wanted to touch on are just some basics about the GNSO PDP development process, some specifics about our working group and what this working group the charter for this group and what it seeks to accomplish, and then just some basics about the Working Group Guidelines and how they're intended to help the working group work effectively and collegially to achieve its outcome.

And so along the way if there - we'll leave time at the end for questions and along the way if there's questions as well please feel free to ask. And so as well after the call if there are questions you can always reach out to staff and we'll do our best to answer too. And speaking of staff, I will not be alone in support of this working group. I want to make sure that I mention that Julie Hedlund will also be available to the working group.

Moving on to the PDP process. And so this is going to be very basic. And I know there's a lot of veterans in this working group but I think it's a good place to start. And, you know, from the mailing list conversation helping newcomers become familiar with the process and comfortable with the content it's important for the working group to succeed really. So as I noticed at least it seemed like familiar faces that are veterans were happy to help potential newcomers become familiar and to help contribute.

My slides. So I wanted to start with this graphic. And for this circle part in blue that relates to the part that this working group is going to contribute. And so it shows basically where we're at as a working group. And my slides keep changing. Is everyone seeing that? I'm not sure if someone is seeing my slides change as well.

So I guess what I also wanted to say though is that there are some steps that have already happened ahead of these - the blue circled section. So the working group - or so the - there was a request for an issue report from the GNSO Council. That tactually followed the work of a discussion group on new gTLD subsequent procedures. That preliminary issue report was published for public comment. There was several comments received.

The input was incorporated into this final issue report and that was presented to the GNSO Council for its consideration and deliberations. And so the GNSO Council ultimately ended up initiating the PDP, adopting the charter largely as it was presented, and provided as a draft in the final issue report. And so here we are at the very top of that blue circled part where we've formed the working group and we are obviously now at our first working group meeting.

And so I would actually also note that at the end after the blue section there's still steps that need to happen after the working group concludes its work. So once we reach a final report then there still is Council deliberation and ICANN Board deliberation.

And so this is narrowing in on that blue section. And so there are some high level prescriptive steps that the working group is going to need to accomplish. But the exact path that we follow it's not going to be the same for every PDP effort so how we achieve the high level things that we need to achieve such as the initial report and publishing things for public comment how we get to

that initial report is not exactly - it's not set in stone. It can happen how we need it to happen to make it to be effective.

So as the working group considers the subjects in the charter and works towards its draft recommendations to be included in the initial report, which is the middle of the graphic and towards the bottom, and that's what this working group is ultimately working towards, one of the most important aspects is reaching out to stakeholder groups and constituencies and supporting organizations and advisory committees to seek input to make sure the wider community remains informed and makes the process more collaborative and ultimately more robust.

And so this should be done early in the process. But also perhaps check points at critical steps along the way which we think leads to a more predictable trajectory in the working group reaching its recommendations.

So once the working group is able to reach consensus on its said recommendations, they will be incorporated into the initial report and of course along with details to help leaders understand how the working group reached those recommendations. And that initial report will be published for public comment for at least 40 days. And so the working group is then required to consider the public comment received and to communicate how the public comments were considered and what effect they may or may not have on the report as well as the recommendations.

And so from that point the working group will work towards the development of a final report which is provided to the GNSO Council for its consideration which if the Council adopts the recommendations it effectively marks the conclusion of the working group operations at least.

Moving to the next slide. So as I said, there are requirements that are at a high level. And as I also said it's the path to achieve these things is - can be different for each working group. It's not extremely prescriptive.

To the next slide, further reading, the policy development requirements that were on the previous slide are derived from Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws which you can see at that link. The next link is the policy development process manual. And this is sort of more of the how each of those requirements are to be achieved.

And then finally the last link is the PDP overview. You can find the graphic that was on one of the very first slides that shows the whole policy development process. It might be useful for those that are unfamiliar with the process or even those that are actually familiar to get a refresher on the process to go ahead and take a look at that. And you'll find drill downs in each of the phases of the PDP. And you can find out further details there.

So some very basic information on the PDP process itself, and we'll move into the specifics about this particular PDP working group. So there was, as most of you are probably aware, there was a final report on the introduction of new generic top level domains in 2007. So there is existing policy recommendations on new gTLDs.

And the implementation of those recommendations from the GNSO were effectively captured in the Applicant Guidebook. And another of the documents on this page is the final issue report which led to the initiation of this PDP. And then the last link on this page is the charter.

So as I was touching on there is an existing 2007 final report on new gTLDs. And one of the important takeaways or I guess one of the things that's captured in that report is that the recommendations were designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanism for applicants to propose new top level domains which effectively means if for whatever reason this PDP working group were to determine that no changes were actually needed that those recommendations from the 2007 final report would still remain in place.

And so as I said, it's probably an unlikely outcome given the number of subjects and issues identified by the discussion group and talked about in the final issue report. And so if there are changes needed they're seen as clarifying, amending or overriding or basically removing existing policy principles or recommendations and implementation guidance. Or developing new recommendations entirely.

So I was touching on the work of the discussion group. That group is responsible for identifying approximately 38 separate and distinct subjects, although some perhaps have some overlap in content. And so these 38 subjects and issues were divided into five groupings which you can see on this page.

So there was the first one which was overall process support in outreach issues, which includes things like whether or not the Applicant Guidebook, or the AGB, is the proper vehicle, how to inject more predictability and clarity into the process, whether or not different top level domain types are needed to be incorporated into the process.

The second grouping was legal and regulatory which had reserve names and the base registry agreement as well as closed generics. And so those first and second two groups were the two largest groupings of subjects.

The third is string contention objections and disputes. And of course it has string similarity objections as well as community applications. The fourth is international domain names which had IDNs as well as universal acceptance. And then finally we had technical and operations which had security and stability as it relates to the new gTLD program as well as the financial and technical reviews and name collisions.

So moving to the next slide, and this is touching on agenda item - I believe it's eight that talks about the work plan. And so the working group could consider any number of ways to organize their work. One could be the

groupings that were talked about in the charter as well as the issue report. And also as defined by the discussion group.

But in the final issue report there were also a couple of other approaches that were discussed. One was sort of a chronological approach where the issues could be discussed as they relate to how the program is laid out. So talking about possible recommendations related to the AGB, or the Applicant Guidebook, the application submission window, application evaluation to objections and to predelegation testing, etcetera. So that's one of the ways that was described or one of the - the ways to organize the work that was described in the final issue report.

Yet another way was to group subjects around sort of a logical progression of questions starting from a high level like asking ourselves a question of whether or not there should even be new gTLD rounds. And then if there are going to be new gTLD - or if the new gTLD program should continue then what are the high level principles that should govern that program?

And so once we are able to answer some of these high level questions, which we might not be able to answer in its entirety, then we can go into the further details and requirements around the application acceptance mechanism, application requirements, objections and so all the meat and potatoes of the program. You know, I think that's where we spend most of our time. But that's - and so this is perhaps touching my point about the exact need for - or the scope of need for the vice chairs.

I think we might not know until we get to some of these later stages how much of the work we might want to divide. And whether or not subgroups are even advisable because from - at least from a staff perspective it can be challenging to break into subgroups so we would at least put that concern forward.

So finally, the organization of the work is really ultimately up to the working group and these are just a few examples of ways it could be organized. But the development of the work plan is one of the important and very important first steps that a working group needs to consider and to start doing to be able to lay out how it's going to achieve its - what it needs to achieve.

The next slide. So one of the other things that is very important for the working group to do is to keep its ears and eyes open. And I realize we're about to hit time so I'll talk - try to talk a little faster. But as I mentioned, we need to seek input along the way from stakeholder groups and constituencies. The work of the Competition, Consumer Choice and Trust group will be important to the work of this group, their findings at least.

And we'll also need to coordinate with the Rights Protect Mechanism PDP of which there will likely be a liaison between the groups. And so it's important for this group not to work in a vacuum and to make sure we keep our eyes open and take into account information from other sources.

And it's also important to communicate outwards to the Council, stakeholder groups and constituencies and others to make sure that we include as many opinions and the things that this - or the recommendations and deliberations that this group undertakes that they're well informed and inclusive from all kinds of different sources.

And so I'm just - move on to the very last slide. This is about the Working Group Guidelines. And as I mentioned, these are established to help the working groups work effectively and achieve what it needs to achieve. And so I'm not going to go through this in detail because we're also out of time. But you can read more about these and I think I'm going to wrap up right there actually. So the guidelines are available here. Please take a look. It will hopefully help us work together well.

And I'm going to stop there. Sorry for rambling for 16 minutes. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Great, Steve. Thanks. Steve, thank you so much. And sorry for leaving so little time for such important work. I do appreciate you walking us through this even though the timeframes were a bit compressed. We are at - one minute over time now so I will just wrap this up by indicating that staff will send us along a list of action items that we have over here on the right. That will be sent out to the list so that we can all keep track of those things.

The schedule of meetings and the election of leaders are two very important issues that will be kicked around on the list. We would like to throw out the idea of perhaps having another call prior to Marrakesh if that is possible. Right now that is being kicked around for February 29. February 29 is also the day the Council will be chatting informally about the CCWG Accountability Working Group so that's going to be a busy day.

But hopefully the 29th might work for a good amount of people on this call. And I think that staff will be sending around a Doodle on that to see if we can get participation and to pick out a specific time.

And then lastly just to note for everyone's calendars I want to confirm our face to face session at ICANN 55. It is currently scheduled for Thursday March 10 from 9:00 am to 10:30. And I know we will all look forward to that. Hopefully we will have leadership well in place before then and a good start on some of this work.

So any last thoughts or questions before we go? Okay. Thank you all for your patience and for the great call and look forward to seeing you all on the list. Thank you.

END