
**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Temp Spec gTLD RD EPDP call
Tuesday, 13 August 2019 at 14:00 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://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/-wS0_njFTIGAnhk5aanY05opLPvTjUOZeznRtRJRsvryk1_G_MrCqVz2_ktVg

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/recording/share/_znIDAjGaniOnOC4GslhSN84HKdWhkFO5AwWnsQLH_GwlumekTziMw?startTime=1565704951000

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/14LkBg>

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

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO EPDP Phase 2 team meeting taking place on the 13th of August, 2019, at 14:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please identify yourself now?

Hearing no one, we have listed apologies from Ben Butler of SSAC and James Bladel of RRSB and Marika Konings from staff. They have formally assigned Tara Whalen and Owen Smigelski as their alternate for this call and any remaining days of absence. Alternates not replacing a member are required to rename their line by adding three Z's to the beginning of

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

their names and, at the end in parentheses, affiliation-alternate, which means you're automatically pushed to the end of the queue. To remain in Zoom, hover over your name and click Rename. Alternates are not allowed to engage in chat, apart from private chat, or to use any other of the room functionalities, such as raising hands, agreeing, or disagreeing. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form must be formalized by way of the Google assignment link. The link is available in all meeting invite e-mails.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand and speak up now.

Hearing or seeing no one, all documentation and information can be found on the EPDP wiki space. Please remember to state your name before speaking. Recordings will be circulated on the mailing list and posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call.

Thank you, and, with this, I'll turn it back over to our Chair, Janis Karklins. Please begin.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Terri. This is the meeting where we are looking to inform the team on the proposed project which we have to, according staff information, submit to the GNSO Council for approval. Berry has worked very hard to put all our preliminary agreements and understandings in a worksheet that he will be showing us and walking us through in a couple of minutes. After that, if there will be any questions, there will be the possibility to ask for clarification. Then we will have a conversation about the project.

Please take it in a way that this proposal is an attempt to, first of all, put on paper all the complexities that we are facing and we have to go through and, secondly, [that we're] trying to accommodate probably very divergent opinions about the timeline of our activities. So from one side, there's those who think we need to proceed swiftly and those who think that we need to maybe take some time and do our work at a more gradual pace.

Probably also we need to see that this is not really carbon strong but rather part of the journey that we are doing together. Personally, I would wish that this presentation should be done and also submitted to the GNSO Council after our face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles because I consider that extremely important in our process. I hope that we will be able to proceed as swiftly and constructively in Los Angeles as possible. That may help us also with all the timelines – I mentioned timelines – that you will hear in this presentation.

So that is the only item on our agenda for the meeting. Without any further delay, I will ask Berry to make an introduction and walk us through the document, which has been sent to all team members two days ago, I think.

Berry, please.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Janis. Just picking up on what Janis had introduced here, I did receive some offline feedback about eyes quite glazing over an minds exploding. I'm sure that the consumption of the PDF that contained five or six different work products was a little challenging to

consume and absorb, so I'm hopeful that the presentation that I give today will help alleviate some of that.

If you'll bear with me, I'm going to give you probably about a 15-20 minute review of the various work products and a demonstration of the Gantt chart project plan. After that – I'm hopeful that a lot of that will answer any preliminary questions you may have had – we'll open it up for discussions and questions and clarifications.

First and foremost, why we're here. Janis did introduce some of that. We have a requirement for the GNSO Council to approve our workplan for the Phase 2 efforts. Predominantly, this is really the first time the Council has ever required this. In the past, they've approved charters and, in some cases, there were preliminary or very high-level plans attached to that charter. But this will be the first that it gets into full details of a workplan that's being approved by the Council. More or less, it starts to align with some of the PDP 3.0 efforts that the Council is undertaking as well. So, in a sense, we're a guinea pig here, but hopefully most of this will benefit the group, benefit our plan, and provide a little bit more predictably. Certainly, what I think has been lacking for a while is some structure and predictability around aspects, if we were to start missing dates and how we can try to recover from that.

As Janis mentioned, I'm hopeful that we can send this plan over to the Council for their meeting next meeting, but, as Janis said, it may not occur until September after our face-to-face. The main reason why this is important is because, I should say, this is the first time where the Council is approving a plan. It's also because it's near the first time that a GNSO PDP effort received an additional funding or additional

resources outside of what is normally provided in a typical PDP process. So they're complementary there.

I think, at the end of the day, what we're dealing with here is a series of firsts. It's a first for the Council to approve the plan. It's near a first for requesting additional resources to accomplish the PDP. While I've tried in the past, this is probably the first formal time where we're going to have a regimented project plan approach to managing the group.

So, with all of these firsts, I don't expect any of this to go very smoothly. I suspect there will be several bumps in the road. But I do have aspirations that this will start to help change the culture in the GNSO and how we approach our policy development projects. Hopefully we can get some valuable lessons learned from this as well.

I think I'm going to start off with just a quick overview on the approach or how we got here. What I'm going to do is share an older presentation that should be familiar to you. You'll recall, back at the end of May, that we were on a due diligence mission to understand the high-level topics that should be discussed in terms of ... You'll recall that we had a mind map that would map the charter questions and other activities that the Phase 2 group would be doing. That eventually was distilled into this kind of preliminary approach for dealing with Phase 2 deliberations that is ultimately into this project package that I built here. So a lot of the same ideas are still in play or have helped inform this part of the process.

What you'll recall is that there was a high-level approach that was outlined. Essentially, what we got to was ultimately defining a set of

topics that would be discussed between Priority 1 items that resolve around the SSAD, as well as Priority 2 items, which were essentially topics that were carried over from Phase 1. The topics that are outlined that you see on the screen here have ... We've essentially started down this road. In particular, you'll recall that we started defining user groups, but we quickly pivoted from user groups to use cases. Several of these SSAD topics really were introduced into our use case template. So, in a relative way, we're touching on some of these topics as we go through the use cases, but there are some that won't necessarily be a part of the use case for which we're going to be needing to deliberate further on.

Ultimately, as part of this initial approach, there was a high-level timeline that was also introduced that more or less has an aspirational date of trying to release an initial report sometimes in December, allowing for public comment and then, ultimately, in the early months of 2020, we review the public comments and we start to prepare for a final report, socialize that final report in Cancun or ICANN 67, and try to deliver a final report on or shortly around that timeframe.

As a result of this overall approach, that's what ultimately led into us creating the one workbook for the SSAD overall. In addition, there were several workbooks that were created for the Priority 2 topics, but of which ultimately tied back into some of the early input that was requested from the SOs and ACs that was more recently given back to us and that we'll be shortly reviewing in the context of the SSAD.

So that's how we got here. Again, I'm trying to continue on with the same concepts that were outlined in this.

Now I want to give you a quick preview of the work products that I had sent out a couple of day ago. Do bear with me that some of these have changed. Now, there are five or six work products in this overall package, some of which you're only really going to see on a monthly basis. Most of them are meant as communication tools outside of the PDP. That big, scary Gantt chart, for example, is something that really only myself and EPDP leadership will ever review through. Of course, we'll post all of these out to the wiki so that anybody can consume them on demand. But really, there's only one work product for the purposes of this group that you'll probably see on a weekly basis, and that's the workplan that gets into more details of the tasks that are immediately ahead of this.

I'm going to start with some of the easiest work products to review through. Some of this will hopefully stir your memory because I did touch on them briefly when we met in Marrakech. Let me share my screen now. The first one is a summary timeline, as I mentioned in Marrakech. I think everybody is familiar with this format. We used it in Phase 1, although it's been enhanced a little bit. In essence, it's a rolling timeline that contains our high-level phases as we traverse through the policy process leading to an initial report, public comment, and final report.

The two quick takeaways here I again carrying over the aspirational dates from our approach in May of trying to deliver an initial report in December and ultimately trying to deliver a final report sometimes in late March or early April.

The second work product, I think, is also familiar to you. It was released on a monthly basis in Phase 1. This is what they term the fact sheet, which was originally born from the CWG/CCWG days of the IANA stewardship transition. It is now used, I think, for all of the review teams [in] the MSSI department. Of course, they're structured somewhat differently in that they do have financial resources that are attached to each one of those reviews. So it's commonplace for them to manage their budgets in understanding what funds are committed for the services that are required versus what's been spent to date, ultimately managing it to completion.

So, in essence, I think this particular fact sheet or work product really contains a lot of redundancy that we have in some of our other product management package documents. But the one thing that does stand out is, again, these financial resources.

You will recall as well that, coming out of Kobe, the GNSO Council made an initial request for funds to carry us through the conclusion of FY19 that allowed us to prepare for any supported travel needs for Marrakech. At the time, we thought that we would be utilizing Legal or outside counsel earlier on in the process. So we made that initial request.

Then, of course, we made a second request as it relates to the funding to prepare for our September face-to-face. We had this requirement of submitting a plan and the Council adopting the plan before we make the full formal financial request, but because there's such a large advanced timeline for any face-to-face type of engagements, we needed to initiate that process. Thus, there was this second request. Ultimately,

once the Council adopts our work plan, then we'll do a final resource request, which mostly will contain the funds remaining [for] ICANN meetings and ultimately the funds required for any outside counsel advice.

This particular product – the fact sheet – will be updated on a monthly basis. This is subject to change over time because there are some other projects that we're working on that will replicate and hopefully enhance this particular use.

The next work product is what I'm terming as the project situation report. It'll look familiar to some. This in essence is a section of the GNSO Council's project list. The project list contains all of the open policy development activities, those from the early stages to what's currently being worked on to what the Board is considering and ultimately through to implementation. For us, clearly we got the green light in early March. This is a fresh example on a redesign of this project list.

I think the key takeaways about this, again, it's really more a communication vehicle for the Council or really external to the working group should we ever have any requirements of communicating project status to the community outside of our immediate purview. The point here is to start, at a high-level, to create an information gateway to relevant links that are important for this particular project, some high-level stats about the activities of the group, and ultimately what is the status and condition of the project. These are two separate indicators on the health of the project. The status is ultimately connected to the schedule, whether it's in a planned, on-schedule, revised schedule,

behind schedule, our targets are going to be missed ultimately, or maybe the project gets placed on hold versus the condition of the project, which gets into whether we're on target, at risk, or in trouble.

There are other outside or external factors that can affect a project's condition that may not be related to the schedule at all, thus the distinction between the two. I don't want to spend a lot of time on that, but ultimately the Council is working on a procedure that, if the status or condition of a project changed from a green to a yellow or to a red condition, then that may involve interactions with at least the Council leadership and the working group leadership.

The remainder of this document though – the left-hand side is really just a quick reference for the high-level deliverables or key milestones. Most of them are attributed to getting to the initial report, public comment, and final report. I have included a few, such as our face-to-face engagements in the near future. This summary list won't change a whole over time, other than checking off when we've accomplished those milestones or deliverables.

The bottom right-hand side is ultimately to just provide some text description or rationale around the status and condition of the project, but it's mostly meant to, whoever it's being communicated to, tell them what the group is currently working on, what they plan to work on, and then ultimately what they've completed in prior periods. This is typically refreshed on a monthly basis, but it may be kept up to date in real time depending on any communication needs.

So those are really the communication work products. Again, you may want to look at these on a monthly basis as we move into the next month. As I said, they'll be posted on the wiki. Ultimately, I doubt you'll really ever see these too much.

Now it's time to get into some of the heart of why we're here. This is the core element of what is termed the Gantt chart/project plan. What I'm going to do is give you a high-level overview of how the project is set up. For those that are really interested, I'm using Microsoft Project as the tool here. I want to give you an overview of the different sections of it, and then I'm going to change course just slightly and try to give you an illustrative example of how the inner workings of this project plan are set up that pretty much map or align with our working approach now. I'm hopeful that that will help better inform when we get into some of the details at the task level and how that's structured in terms of duration, dependencies, and ultimate deliverables.

Let me share my screen now – again, I should say. As I mentioned, this is Microsoft Project. What you're reviewing here is, on the left-hand side over here, the task level descriptions of the project plan. The right-hand side is what they consider or term the Gantt chart, which is meant to provide a visual representation of each of the tasks a – how they're associated, what their dependencies are – ultimately leading to a deliverable or an outcome of the particular project.

When you're viewing the Gantt chart on the right, you'll see these high-level black bars that move from left to right over the timeline of the project. They're really meant as a parent relationship or to help group child tasks that sit underneath it. One of the neat features about project

tools is that you're able to next like categories of tasks to first just organize your work but, secondly, when you start to build in the dependencies of how those sub-tasks relate to the overall delivery of the project, that gets into a term that they use, what's called the critical path. Ultimately, the critical path is the beginning-to-end path which dictates or ultimately produces what your expected delivery date might be.

If, for any reason along that critical path, there are potentials for dates to be missed, you'll be able to start to manage that aspect, if a date is in fact missed, what are the downstream impacts to our delivery of our overall milestone. For example – this is purely an example, not one that I hope ... Let's say, in the end of October timeframe, the EPDP deliberations determined that there was a specific topic that needed to be discussed that we didn't have planned at all – essentially an unplanned event that's going to add three weeks of deliberation around that topic. I would eventually be able to load that into this plan, connect it into our critical path deliberations of our topics, and, once I create those dependencies and have inputted in the way that this is structured, it will spit out what the new planed or the revised plan deliver date would be. So that's the high-level aspect of what we're wanting to accomplish or that would allow us, when we do encounter unplanned events or other delays, to quickly manage or recover and have a better clarity and predictability about what that impact is.

This project plan is structured essentially into four primary buckets. Technically, you see five, which includes post-EPDP activities. Really, that's a task that this group wouldn't be related to. But ultimately the policy department still owns the project as any potential consensus

recommendations flow out of the GNSO Council up to the Board. Ultimately, when the Board approves any consensus recommendations, it moves into the implementation phase. Again, this isn't anything for this group to be concerned about from a task or duration perspective, but we are documenting this because there are behind-the-scenes activities that are occurring here. So we won't spend much time on that.

The other four are important to us. If you'll recall, looking back at the fact sheet as well as the situation report, I'm essentially using these four broad buckets by which to produce or represent a percent-complete component to the underlying task between it.

The project management section is pretty much more or less myself, or it's really the EPDP leadership team, that is driving the work behind here. It's mostly, again, just to account for overall activities of behind-the-scenes components to delivering this project. There are things that should be somewhat familiar to you here, especially that we do have this ongoing activity of the leadership team in general. That's Janis working with staff as we prepare for each meeting or each face-to-face event and try to understand what the tasks are in front of us and those kinds of things. There's not really a start or end date to this, but the point here is to show that this is an effort, it is an ongoing event, and it pretty much lasts the life of the project until we deliver a report to the GNSO Council.

A second component to this, as we mentioned, unlike other PDPs, does have resource allocations that are assigned to it. So there is also another sub-team attached to the EPDP, which is called the Project Cost Support Team. Ultimately that group reviews the budget, committed

expenses, and actual expenses and approves any expenses that the group [takes on] as we move forward through the projects, such as allocation for expenses to cover face-to-face charges, or if there are legal expenses that come through or any professional services- type expenses. It's essentially an ongoing project as well, and it's mostly again just to document the activity that's being done here., but it does last throughout the life of the project.

The EPDP deliberations section is essentially our critical path. It's the core of everything that we're working on week to week. I'll come back to that in a minute, but I wanted to give you a quick illustration of essentially what our two primary deliverables are, and that's producing the initial report, reviewing the public comment, and then eventually getting to a final report.

The task under these two deliverables are pretty much templated. There's really no reason to get into super details about the tasks that are occurring here because they are repetitive from one project to the next. Ultimately, they do account for duration and activity that occur through those events, but it's more of a placeholder for the work that's being done up in Phase 2 or the actual deliberations of the group. I have dependencies defined as that, as the deliberations or outcomes occur during those deliberations, in essence, that material or those outcomes are being fed into an initial report.

For example, you can see that the first task of an initial report started back in June and staff starting to assemble what a draft report might look like. As I mentioned, for example, early on in our deliberations, we came to a working definitions list. That definitions list has been

imported into this initial draft report so that it's already there and we don't have to try to play catchup as we get closer and closer to the actual delivery of that deliverable.

The final report is a little bit different than the initial report because, at this point, essentially the second phase, the deliberations, and the initial report have concluded. So I'm trying to make it a little bit cleaner and easier to manage when we get into this final report stage. But, ultimately, it's about reviewing the public comments, are there any final deliberations for Priority 1 or 2 topics, getting to a final report, determining consensus levels, allowing time for the report to be reviewed and then ultimately sent to the GNSO Council.

You see a number of days that are assigned to each of these tasks. Don't let that scare you. At the same time, don't let these number of days fool you. In essence, in terms of how the durations are set up, you can say that I'm padding some buffer, if you will, that will allow some flexibility, should we miss a date by a week here or a week there. I can adjust the duration of these more important tasks leading up to the deliverable.

The other thing that I'd like to say about the way the duration is structured here is that all of these tasks are built on a five-business-day work week, Monday to Friday. Now, when you think about any business week that the EPDP has, technically that's really only about three-and-a-half hours of deliberations. We have our weekly meeting two-hour plenary call on Thursday, and then every week on Tuesday is either the Legal Committee call or some other activity that the EPDP is working on – some of those kinds of things.

When you really think about it at that level, there's not a whole lot of time as compared to when you start thinking about this from a calendar perspective. So I do want you to keep that in mind: when you're looking at these tasks, if it says ten days, for example, to discuss findings an interim recommendations, essentially that equates to two business weeks. That's the calendar perspective, but ultimately that two business weeks is just under eight hours of actual deliberation times, assuming that they were phone calls. Of course, when we get into our face-to-face engagements, those'll last eight hours a day. Ultimately, I think it's important to not just take for granted the calendar dates but to put some thought into the underlying tasks.

Now, quickly, I just want to give you a quick overview of what is the critical path of the EPDP deliberations sections. Some of these first tasks we've already completed. That was our initial early days, understanding the charter. We developed the worksheets and divided Priority 1 and Priority 2 topics. We developed that working definitions, and we also started the aspect about soliciting early input from the SOs and ACs, all of which you have recently seen some traffic on the e-mail list about of bringing in that input. Staff is incorporating that into the SSAD worksheet that this group will soon be working on. Ultimately, when you think about the task around the early input, a lot of this again is more staff working in the background, but we start to enter the area where the full EPDP is involved and is resourcing these particular tasks.

This is further then sub-divided between, as you know, our Priority 1 deliberations versus our Priority 2 deliberations that were carried from Phase 1. I am including a section in here called Unplanned Events. This section is highlighted in red. It's not connected in any way to any of the

other tasks in this, at least not yet. Right now, I have two possibles, and they may or may not impact our work. There could be discussions around geographic basis, or there could be discussions about thick WHOIS as a result of our Phase 1 type deliberations.

These were never meant to be part of the EPDP Phase 2 charter. They could fall in our lap. They may not fall in our lap, but if they do, the moment we receive an indication that it will – that’s when I talked about earlier that we would further flesh out what the underlying tasks are and understand the duration. Then essentially these unplanned events would be migrated either into Priority 1 or Priority 2 deliberations depending on what that topic was or how it impacted. The point here is that, as soon as we get indication, we connect these unplanned events into the planned so that we can immediately see what the impact is going to be for our full delivery dates.

Ultimately, we’ve got the Legal Sub-Team. Again, this is really tracking the activity. I’m not getting super specific about any of the tasks that the Legal Sub-Team may be doing. It ultimately is an ongoing exercise that’s expected to last until we deliver the final report.

As I noted earlier, again, the EPDP deliberations and all of these tasks listed through this section are meant to try to be wrapped up by about the time we deliver the initial report. Then, at a high-level, I’ve carried over these high-level tasks that we would still be doing as we work towards a final report. For example, if you were to see the ongoing review of legal questions by the Legal Sub-Team and see that includes towards the end of November, don’t fret. We’re not stopping that all together. We’re picking up a new task when we’re entered into the final

report stage that the Legal Sub-Team would still continue to complement the activities of the group and delivery of a final report.

The last section before I get into an illustrative example is just the key events, which are face-to-face meetings. These are divided up either between ICANN meetings or planned dedicated face-to-face meetings. As you can see, we just went through Marrakech. This shows up 91% complete. The task within each one of these events are pretty much the same. There's a boatload of work that goes on behind the scenes that staff and the leadership team do in preparation for these events. The only thing that you really see are maybe these four particular tasks, which are essentially calendar-assigned dates of our actual face-to-face meeting. Typically, those are measured at eight or nine hours for that particular day, but there's a very considerable amount of other work that goes on behind the scenes to prepare for that. So it's kind of the same for the Los Angeles face-to-face. Ultimately we'll be meeting in Montreal sometimes early next year, into January-ish, and we hope to be having another face-to-face meeting, and ultimately we have the Cancun meeting in March.

With these particular events, there are a couple of specific tasks that inform these events. You heard Janis mention about having a Day 0 draft for when we convene in Los Angeles that will allow the work of this group to gain early traction or to have something tangible to work from. There's a task embedded up in the EPDP deliberations about creating that particular deliverable, and there is dependency to the face-to-face. But ultimately these key events are not part of the critical path, so to speak. They're really here for documentation purposes and

to understand the level of effort or activity involved in these particular sessions.

I'm going to stop here with the demonstration of this and I'm going to try to give a quick illustrative example of what our work is now. Based on this illustrative example is how I've divided up or created the structure of our detailed task of this project plan that ultimately informs our final deliverable, which is the workplan that you'll be using more often.

Let me find ... Okay. This is again strictly a visual representation – or I'm trying to build a mental picture for you – about what our work looks like so that it hopefully better informs when I review the project plan. If I were to Zoom out, ultimately what you're seeing is a quick mockup of the use cases that the group is currently working on.

Over here in Column 1 is the LEA use case. Over here in Column I, I believe, is the ALAC use case. As the group traverses each of one of these use cases, it's based off of the template. Those template sections or the section of the use case are defined over here to the left. Ultimately, at the day, after we review one or two key use cases across the five groups – or maybe we decide to review all of the use cases – essentially if you were to line them up [left to right,] next to each other. The whole goal is to attempt to try to find similarities or commonalities across each one of the sections of the use case.

So ultimately what we're doing right now is we're working from a top-down nature or the green arrow, so to speak. We build the use case. We're reviewing the use case. Janis put forward a proposal that we

essentially have a first reading of the use case. We allow time for input from the group to react to the initial reading of the use case. Then we have a second reading. Ultimately, the group is going to come with some kind of outcome or maybe preliminary agreement on whether that use case is valid and should continue to be worked on and considered or perhaps some of these use cases aren't applicable and they get set to the side so that we focus on the main ones.

I think what the group is starting to encounter is, as we continue going from a top-down section, some pretty complicated topics such as accreditation or the lawful basis or safeguards [and are] not opining on whether those are valid or not. Ultimately, the review of an individual use case won't satisfy the requirements of this group properly deliberating particular topics – for example, accreditation.

So ultimately what we're going to be doing after we've reviewed these use cases and perhaps, as I mentioned, create this Day 0 tangible document that the group will work with in L.A. is we're going to start looking from a left-to-right perspective or these red arrows. Again, for example, with accreditation, if the group agrees that that is a topic that does need to be moved forward, the elements of the use cases that talked about accreditation will help inform the deliberation about accreditation as it relates to the overall SSAD. So, in essence, where these primary topics that float up out of the use cases become dedicated topics – that's what you're going to see that I have listed out under the project plan.

Only two points here. I'm not advocating that we need to line up all of these use cases into a workbook again. Actually, I'm PTSD-workbooked

from Phase 1. Maybe this will be a beneficial exercise. I'm not sure. Again, this is strictly just to try to put a visual here.

The second thing that you want to walk away with this from this illustrative example is that not all of the topics that we have listed in the use case satisfy the topics that we agreed to earlier on in our process. There are other charter questions. There's other activities. For example, at least on my first run, there are some other Priority 1 topics that aren't listed in then use case. Of course, we still have to tackle how the group is going to deliberate and ultimately come to a conclusion on Priority 2 topics that may or may not necessarily be directly connected to our Priority 1 topics in SSAD.

All right. Coming down the final stretch, and then I'll open it up. I just want to spend about three more minutes on the details of the project plan so that you can see that I'm not lying to you, that this is how the framework was loaded into here.

As I noted Priority 1 versus Priority 2 deliberations, I'm going to go through Priority 2 real quick because I think we're all familiar with this list. Ultimately, each one of these are a "dedicated topic" within Priority 2 that at some point this group is going to have to deliberate and come to some sort of conclusion on.

What you'll notice when you get into the details of this is that, for now, they're pretty much structured or templated tasks. What I'm trying to do is to replicate the framework that Janis put forward together. Again, the first reading, allow for input, have a second reading, come to some sort of conclusion. So I tried to replicate that same kind of process for

each one of these topics and then I've attempted to assign some sort of duration and a start or end date and dependencies on the tasks that are here.

Ultimately, what it's coming down to is that – I want you to recollect about how we got to where we are with the use cases. After May, there was the proposal put forward about the dedicated topics. The very first dedicated topic was user groups. You'll recall that it took this group three or four weeks to get traction about how we were actually going to advance that work forward that ultimately became the use cases that we're working on today.

Hindsight is always 20/20, but had I built this project plan on what our understanding was of the work that was ahead of us in early June, we would have completely missed the dates assigned around just addressing the topic of user groups because we pivoted into use cases that restructured our approach. Because of that, that provided inspiration into at least trying to provide template tasks that would satisfy the overall conclusion about city field.

The first task, for example, is initial scoping of the topic. We had Tuesday meetings through June, where we touched on one or two of the Priority 2 topics. It was reviewed and understood. We went through the worksheets. The group would provide input about whether additional legal advice was needed and some of the preliminary tasks. Ultimately, for example, with city field, it was determined that some sort of briefing from Byrd & Byrd on the city field memo might be required. Perhaps there's a task about some other legal questions that may be required.

Ultimately, we're trying to understand this topic and determine how and if we're going to deliberate on the topic. Once we come to that conclusion, we're going to determine approach. Then we actually deliberate the particular policy issues. In parallel, we're building some sort of draft work product that hopefully ultimately is imported into the initial report if it's approved. Then, as I mentioned, there's a first reading and a second reading, assuming that there was some responses into that. Then there's some sort of ultimate decision of whether we adopt that particular outcome or not. So you're going to see that repeated across all of these particular topics that we have lined up in Priority 2.

Last but definitely not least, which is ultimately what we're working on now and is the bough of the ship, so to speak, for our critical path, is that we have what was again our user groups, which became use cases. There's a series of tasks under this particular event. This particular section right here represents the green arrows on that illustrative example that I just showed you. Then, when we get into the work breakdown structure of 1.2.7.2, it's meant to represent the red arrows that you saw on the screen when we're moving left to right across the use cases. We're specifically deliberating on some of these dedicated topics – again, things like safeguards, lawful basis, and timeline of process.

The same kind of structure exists here as with the previous. There's the whole idea of – sorry; wrong one – understanding the topic, what do we need to deliberate on, let's determine some sort of approach to do it, let's actually deliberate the policy issues, let's develop some sort of

draft work product, let's have a first reading, a second reading, and some sort of outcome.

Right now, these are the topics that I had identified thus far that seem worthy of being classified as a dedicated topic coming out of our use case, or ultimately it wasn't a part of the use case and it's still something that is on our inventory list to do.

What you would ultimately see here, if you were to look at all of these particular rolled-up tasks, is that they lead to a Day 0 document for the L.A. face-to-face, and/or as we prepare for Montreal, there's going to be some sort of package document or documents to help inform our deliberations on the face-to-face.

This Gantt chart I don't expect anybody on this group, except myself, Marika, Caitlin, and Janis to ever look at willingly. You're welcome to if you want to see a percent-complete on where we think we are on some of these tasks and those kinds of things, but it's not meant for consumption, except really for the leadership team to help manage our timeline and resources.

There's one last work product that you will work with quite extensively. Let me find it so I can share it with you. We'll be sharing a [link] soon. This is ultimately the workplan. Originally, I had in mind that there would be a workplan and then there would be a second work product for action items. But really they feed off of each other, so we blended it into one ultimate work product.

The idea of the workplan is really just a document that is meant to show the task that we're working on now or we'll be working only for the next

couple of weeks. It's constantly refreshed as we close our older tasks, and new tasks that are in front of us will start to show up on this document. It's really meant to keep you focused on what we're working on now for the next several weeks or a key milestone in this example, which would be the Los Angeles face-to-face and that you don't get bogged down trying to find your way in the full-blown Gantt chart.

So this is structured and we will have some work to do it. Ultimately, we were wither defining an action item or an actual task from the project plan. We've got the date that it was assigned.

I'm creating an inventory or what is called the work breakdown structure. I think everybody is familiar with the numbering component aspect, but what I'm trying to do is create a connection between individual tasks and/or action items that ultimately relate back to the formal project plan. This is for my own selfish reasons, but, when I do a post-mortem on all of this, I want to be able to try to better quantify the activities around certain tasks to better understand what our actual effort was towards that.

Most importantly about the workplan and the action items is who's it assigned to. I think this is where we need to work on these two columns a little bit. Ultimately, there's going to be an individual assigned to many of these, but in relative circumstances, it's the individual group that is responsible for the delivery of it. For example, if the person that was assigned to it couldn't be on the call, maybe we can refer to the secondary member of that respective group to try to get to some closure.

Ultimately, if there's a due date, if it's possible there's a meeting number that is attached to this action item or task, then there's a great description of what that particular item is. What you're seeing here – this big, long list of action items – I've pulled off of the wiki and put it into the Google Sheet, if, for anything else, again, selfishly because now I can start to quantify these action items, where I can't do that on the wiki. When you come to view this, it will pretty much always be filtered: if the action item or task is completed, it will be filtered and we don't need to look at it. So we're really only concerned about these particular items that are in front of us that are still open and need to be resolved. Each week, as we prepare our plenary calls, we may want to devote two or three minutes in the early stages of the call just to remind people that these action items are open and still need to be resolved.

We're contemplating, although I don't think we made a decision yet, that the entire group – you'll have at least read access to this. I'm contemplating, for example, if an action item was assigned to an individual person, if they could come in and mark this complete. What I have noticed is that there's a new feature in Google Sheets which is to show the cell history. So we'll be able to keep people honest if they mark something complete and it wasn't.

Anyway, this is the idea of the workplan. This is what everybody will leave and breathe on a weekly basis.

The last feature about this, as I mentioned, is what are the tasks that are right up in front of us? Again, you'll be able to see that we're doing our first and second readings on particular use cases and the number.

I'm going to stop there.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much. It's already an hour. We started our meeting and there's not more than 30 minutes to go. Thank you very much for this presentation. Maybe it was more than we had to know, but it was very informative. Also for me it demonstrated how much we need to accomplish still in order to present our initial and final reports.

You also probably mentioned – here I'm talking to all team members – that the timeline has shifted and has moved further past the March 2020 meeting, as it appeared to be simply impossible to accomplish, even on paper, all the plans that we need to do. So we're now looking at presenting a final report after, not at, the Cancun meeting.

With this, I know open the floor to those who want to ask questions or provide comments. I see Mark Sv. Has his hand up. Mark, please go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Hi. Berry, I think you did say that the project file would be available if I really wanted to look at it. Is that correct?

BERRY COBB:

Yes. On a—

MARK SVANCAREK:

A read-only basis?

BERRY COBB: Yeah. It'll be a in a PDF unless you have Microsoft Project. I'll be posting it as a PDF on the wiki.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay. Because I saw the PDF you had sent in advance and, of course, that has every line exposed. It is pretty hard to review against schedule with every line exposed. It's nice to be able to express them and expand them. I do have my personal project, of course. So I guess it's not as useful for other people, but for me, looking at the raw project file would be great. You don't have to do it just for me, but it'd be great if you did. Thanks.

BERRY COBB: Advised. What I'll do is I'll produce an exploded version and a collapsed version, and then I'll post the actual raw file.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks.

JANIS KARLKINS: Thank you. Any other comments/questions?

I see Ashley. Ashley, please go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi, Janis. I'm not sure this is the appropriate time. Is this just an opportunity to ask questions about the presentation, or is this also a time that we can make some comments and ask questions about the timing overall?

JANIS KARLKINS: You can ask whatever you want. We'll see whether we can answer.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: All right then. As you noted, time is getting pushed back on the timeline. Also, I note that what became really obvious to me through this exercise was how many use cases we have and how much time we've already taken to go over these cases. I just wanted to throw out an idea. I'm not wedded to it myself. But just something for us to think about moving forward is the utility in going over all these use cases. We've got five groupings of the use cases and we're working our way now through the different groups.

I was just wondering, considering that the intent of the use cases is to be illustrative and to help us pull out policy considerations, if perhaps, once we get through one example from each of the groups, we need to sit down and do a stock take of what policy considerations have been pulled out. I understand that ICANN staff has been doing that as we've been going through the use cases. So then we can get a better understanding of where we are in terms of pulling out the considerations, what, if anything, is glaringly, obviously missing, and then make a determination at that point in time as to whether or not we need to really go through all the remainder of the use cases.

So I'm just throwing out there for people to chew on or not even necessarily comment on today but perhaps consider at a later date, not now. Thanks.

JANIS KARLKINS:

Thank you, Ashley. The idea is we're using use cases simply to better understand the issues and the complexities associated with those issues and links between them. Basically, we're talking about the shape of building blocks, even if it does not appear obvious that we do that. Staff is trying to depict from all these conversations the rational [grains] that will go into the zero draft

The idea is that we would disseminate the zero draft before the Los Angeles and would try to see, at Los Angeles, whether the zero draft is in the shape that we could use as a basis for further discussions but already on the topics more focused on charter questions. If need be, we could then revert to the use cases if we need to increase our understanding and then continue discussion.

If the zero draft would be received well, then we could concentrate on the discussion of the zero draft and more negotiations of the text of the zero graph by adding things and then making sure that the zero draft turns into an initial report.

So that is the idea. Whether we will get there remains to be seen. Staff is working very hard to produce the zero draft. In the meantime, we will continue to go through the use cases because we still need to address some issues that we have just slightly touched on. Maybe our understanding is not yet fully formed.

With this, I see Greg's hand up. Greg, please go ahead.

GREG: Thank you, Janis. So the goal is to have an initial report around the time of the Montreal meeting in early November, which means, if we have legal questions, we should be asking a lot of them fairly soon. The legal team is working on those questions and presumably we'd be spending a chunk of our legal budget on that set of questions. What's our legal budget right now and how much of it have we spent?

JANIS KARLKINS: I recall that we were talking about \$50,000. For the moment, expenditures for this phase is basically because we haven't asked for anything yet. The Legal Committee is working on questions. One question has been formulated. On the 20th of August, the Legal Committee is meeting again. I expect that there will be some additional questions. Then, on the 22nd, we will review them during the team meeting. If approved, then they will be sent to Byrd & Byrd, if that is the place where they will be sent.

GREG: Right. Yeah, Byrd & Byrd will expend some time on those. My personal expectation would be there might be a round of follow-ups as new issues come up or we need clarifications on their first round of answers. The SSAC wants to make sure there is budget available for whatever rounds need to be done.

So my request to you as the Chair is to monitor that budget and see how much this first round takes. If we do need more money, then we make provisions for that as soon as possible. \$50,000 is not a lot of money to spend on the EPDP Phase 2 legal questions because this is entirely almost a legal exercise. So we just don't want to run out of money. Thanks.

JANIS KARLKINS:

Thank you, Greg. Your concern is noted. When I started this exercise, I was told that we will have any money we need but in reasonable terms. It's not just wasting money but spending money wisely. I hope that we will have it as we need.

I see Berry has a better answer than me. Berry, please, go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Janis. I'd just say, to a put a hint more of precision – I don't think it's a better answer – yes, we had \$50K allocated in our first initial request. We don't have any actuals at the moment. As I mentioned, it's important that this plan does get signed off by the [Council] because that allows us to do this next request. As part of that next request, I strongly suspect there will be a sizeable allocation as it relates to outside counsel.

JANIS KARLKINS:

Thank you very much, Berry. I see no further requests for the floor. In that case, please don't feel scared. We're on time. What is important – Berry, if you could put that chart with the green, showing whether

we're on time or not – is that we keep our activities visually represented in green, not in yellow, and, for God's sake, not in red. Of course, that will require a lot of effort and also dedication. Therefore, what is important is that all us do our homework, that, on whatever we agree to review, we provide comments on time, and that we can really follow our pace.

I heard somebody saying that I am maybe pushing too aggressively things forward. Please bear with me because we need this external push. Otherwise, we can spin our wheels and we will repeat ourselves. So staff is really carefully listening and relistening to whatever team members say and try to accommodate all the concerns with the understanding that some of them may be contradictory or opposing. Therefore, as soon as we will have the zero draft, we will look at that. The Los Angeles meeting I would like to structure around discussing that document and putting more substance in it on top of what has transpired from our reading of use cases.

Once again, as I said, Ashley proposed to drop use cases. We may, if the zero draft will be well-received and will be considered as a good basis for further activities. I hope that that will be the case.

In case we need to review certain issues, then we can use, again, a use case or maybe even a few use cases combined, to see how one issue could be dealt with in certain circumstances – for instance, accreditation. Already from those that we have examined I see that in some cases accreditation might be recommendable. In some cases, this is simply unfeasible. So already our conversation gave us some sense of how accreditation might be organized at the systemic level. Then we

will go into detail on how these things could be done one by one. Hopefully we'll get it [done] in time by December for the initial report.

That's all from me. I do not see any further requests for the floor at the moment. I understand now that this project will be submitted to the GNSO Council for consideration with the understanding that the outcome of the Los Angeles meeting may introduce some corrections in the plan. Hopefully not, but it may. After approval, we will keep the GNSO Council informed on our progress and we'll continue our deliberations as scheduled.

Any further requests? In absence?

Berry, thank you very much for your presentation and putting all our work on paper. I wish all of you a good rest of the day. We will meet in two days – Thursday – for the team call. Thank you very much. This meeting stands adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]