
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council**

Thursday, 20 February 2020 at 21:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

[https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/78Yvc72g_D03E9fEsASDAvEqW47pLvis1yQc_KclmU3nWndQN1quZrEQ.Y7N-mtgBgQY4C4bjp7lc4KA2 \[icann.zoom.us\]](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/78Yvc72g_D03E9fEsASDAvEqW47pLvis1yQc_KclmU3nWndQN1quZrEQ.Y7N-mtgBgQY4C4bjp7lc4KA2 [icann.zoom.us])

Zoom Recording: [https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/45FNcr77-01ObJXp5U7hR-0vP7bXT6a8gSNI-PIJxUwHxloYPWcV9Ae2qilNICYd?startTime=1582232442000 \[icann.zoom.us\]](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/45FNcr77-01ObJXp5U7hR-0vP7bXT6a8gSNI-PIJxUwHxloYPWcV9Ae2qilNICYd?startTime=1582232442000 [icann.zoom.us])

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: [https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar \[gns0.icann.org\]](https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar [gns0.icann.org])

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Erika Mann (apology)

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon, Greg Dibiase

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Keith Drazek, Sebastien Ducos

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Tom Dale

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo (apology, proxy to Scott McCormick), Scott McCormick, Philippe Fouquart, Osvaldo Novoa, John McElwaine, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Juan Manuel Rojas (first meeting as NCSG councilor, following Martin Silva Valent's resignation), Elsa Saade, Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, James Gannon, Farell Folly

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlton Samuels

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

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.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer

ICANN Staff

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional

Marika Konings – Senior Advisor, Special Projects (apologies)

Mary Wong – Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant

Emily Barabas – Policy Manager

Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist

Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager

Jeffrey Graham – Technical Support

Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations

Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 20th of February 2020. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call you? Thank you ever so much. Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos. Sebastien, you are muted. I can see Sebastien in the Zoom room. Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon.

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tom Dale.

TOM DALE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo has sent her apologies and she has signed a proxy to Scott McCormick. Scott McCormick?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: John McElwaine.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Elsa Saade. I heard Elsa earlier in the Zoom room. I'll mark as present. Farell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Flip. Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Osvaldo Novoa. I don't see Osvaldo yet in the Zoom room. We'll circle back to him. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Tatiana. This is first meeting as NCSG councilor, following Martin Silva Valent's resignation; welcome to Juan Manuel Rojas.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: James Gannon.

JAMES GANNON: [I'm sure].

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Carlton Samuels. I don't see Carlton in the Zoom room yet. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Present, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Cheryl. Erika Mann. Erika doesn't seem to have joined yet, either. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINIUS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Julf. Maarten Simon. I note that I don't see Maarten in the Zoom room but I do see that Osvaldo has joined us. Welcome, Osvaldo. From staff, we have apologies from David Olive. In the room, we have Steve Chan, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Ariel Liang, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Jeffrey Graham for technical support, Terri Agnew, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, Nathalie. Welcome, all, to the GNSO Council's meeting of the 20th of February 2020. Allow me to extend a welcome to our newest councilors, Juan Manuel and James. Welcome to the team. Glad to have you both aboard. With that, thanks to Nathalie for going through the rollcall. I will first call for any updates to statements of interest, and then we will go through a review of the agenda. Elsa, I see your hand. Please, go ahead.

ELSA SAADE: Hi, Keith. Thank you. I would just like to express that I'm no longer a liaison for SubPro.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, Elsa, and thanks for your e-mail to that effect. Thank you for your service of the two GNSO Council liaisons to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. We certainly appreciate your service, there.

For everybody else's benefit and reminder, Flip Petillion is the other and now the sole council liaison to the Subsequent Procedures PDP. Thanks also to you, Flip, for the continued work, there. Are there any other updates to statements of interest? Elsa, you can put your hand down, now. Thank you. James, over to you.

JAMES GANNON:

Sorry. It would be useful if I unmuted. Yeah. I have a quick update. I haven't been able to update my physical SOI on the Wiki yet. Just so folks know, I re-joined Novartis on Monday in a role unrelated to Internet governance or ICANN. I will get that updated once I can but no conflict of interest with the role in any way.

KEITH DRAZEK:

All right. Thank you very much, James. We'll look forward to that update for the written SOI. Any other updates to statements of interest before we move on? Okay. Seeing no hands, thank you very much. I will now go through a review of the agenda for today's meeting. I'd like to just note at the outset here that I think everybody has seen that the ICANN67 meeting originally scheduled for Cancún has now been turned into a virtual meeting.

We will carve out some time in our agenda a little bit later on to discuss that and to make sure that we have an opportunity to, basically, go through and try to identify how we as the GNSO Council and our constituencies and stakeholder groups need to adjust with the new reality of a full virtual meeting before us just in two weeks' time.

And so, what I'm going to suggest is that between item number six and item number seven on our agenda we insert some time to discuss ICANN67. That will be after the update on the SubPro project change request and before the council discussion on the GNSO project list review.

On our agenda today, we'll have some opening remarks and a very brief review of the projects and action item list. We have no items on our consent agenda but we do have a council vote, which is the adoption of the PDP 3.0 implementation final report. That's item number four. On number five is a council update on the RPM PDP Working Group's project change request.

Item number six, as I mentioned, is a council update on the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group project change request. Item seven is a council discussion, which is the review of the project's list. As you'll remember during our face-to-face meeting at the strategic planning session, we discussed and agreed that we would try to spend a significant amount of time focusing on the project list as a level-set so that, moving forward, we can do a little bit more of a focus on updates when there are changes to the project's list, especially the status codes and the statuses of those various projects. We'll look to spend some time on that.

We will also have on item number eight some GNSO work [prioritization]. Again, this is a follow-on from the conversations that we had during our face-to-face and strategic planning session in Los Angeles. We conducted the informal sense-of-the-room survey about the list of 12 or 13 items that are before us, looking ahead to 2020 and 2021. I'm hopeful that everybody has had a chance to at least socialize that list with your respective stakeholder groups and

constituencies so we can have a little bit more of an informed discussion about the workload ahead of us in our prioritization efforts.

And then, on item number nine, we have any other business, which is a reference to ICANN67. We'll talk about that in more detail before we get to item nine. Council consideration of the GNSO Council's public comment on the FY21/25 operating and financial plan. Just to note, those comments have been developed by our SCBO and the comments are due on the 25th of February.

And then, council consideration of whether a response is needed to ICANN's December 5th letter related to clarifications on data accuracy and ePDP Phase 2. With that, would anybody like to suggest additions, edits, changes? Any questions related to the agenda for today? Okay. I don't see any hands so let's, then, move on.

I will, under item 1.4, under "administrative matters," just note the status of the minutes for the previous council meeting. Minutes of the GNSO Council meeting of the 19th of December were posted on the 2nd of January, and minutes of the council meeting of the 23rd of January were posted on the 10th of February so those are both complete. Let us, then, move onto item number two, opening remarks and the review of the action items list.

I just want to take a couple of moments, here, to note that we, yesterday, had the pre-ICANN67 GNSO Council webinar, the policy webinar, which was essentially the update from the leadership of the three active PDPs. We had a little bit of a question and answer session. Not a whole lot of questions and answers.

We ran the webinar for approximately an hour. It did not go the full 90 minutes. But I just want to make a note here that the webinar, the pre-ICANN webinars that we run, are essentially required for councilors. I'm disappointed to say that yesterday about a third of you were not able to join. And so, I'm just going to put a marker down here and say that for anybody that was not able to join, if you haven't already done so, listening to that webinar is required before we get into our ICANN67, even if we're not going to be there face-to-face.

Looking ahead and moving forward, you need to make sure that you're attending those webinars. We do those webinars because we used to have these conversations and these sessions in the face-to-face working sessions of the ICANN meeting but, in the interest of trying to make those face-to-face sessions more efficient and more effective, being able to focus on a little bit more substance, we started doing the updates during the webinar week.

And so, I just want to make a note that these are important and it's really an obligation for all of us to attend, so if you weren't able to join for whatever reason, please make sure you listen to that recording. It's an important update on the status of the various PDP Working Groups and I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Okay. And then, as I noted earlier, we've all heard that the ICANN meeting in Cancún is no longer going to be face-to-face. It will be an entirely remote engagement, which is something new. We've never had that before. And so, we're going to have to go through a process of reviewing the existing schedule, or the original schedule, and trying to figure out exactly how much we can reasonably achieve.

This is community-wide but for our purposes today, the GNSO Council, we need to make sure that we've identified the critical things that need to get done to make sure that we're able to fit everything into the schedule, understanding that there will be competing sessions and perhaps some limitation on the bandwidth available for everybody and staff support to do all of this remotely.

So it's going to be a bit of an experiment and I just want to make sure that everybody is aware that we're going to have to be a bit flexible as we move forward in terms of seeing how we can ensure that we achieve all of the critical obligations for council.

And just to note, there's also going to be, tomorrow at 11:00 Eastern Time of the US—somebody can help me with the UTC conversion—a meeting of the SO/AC and, I believe, SG and C leadership with ICANN leadership and staff to try to, basically, tackle this issue. I am looking for your input today, when we get to that section between agenda items number six and seven, for any input that you might have in terms of thoughts of how we and the GNSO should engage during that conversation. I just want to put that marker down and make sure that you're starting to think about that one.

Okay. I think those are my opening remarks. Any questions/any comments at this point before we move to the action items? Seeing no hands, let's move to the action item list, please. Okay.

First on the list here, we have evolution of the multi-stakeholder model of governance. This is the carry-over or the carry-on from the Brian Cute effort of 2019. The action item here is, if applicable, for the ccNSO and GNSO to form a joint team to identify any

commonalities or differences in terms of our approach, and also to look at the budget and five-year strategic plan.

We don't have an imminent action item here but I think there's this opportunity, if we choose to take it, to reach out to the ccNSO and to engage with them in the conversation of the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. Berry, I see your hand. Always welcome. Go right ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Just to note that the SCBO did meet with the ccNSO's SOPC, their version of their financial committee to review the budget. We met on Tuesday. We briefly touched on this topic. We didn't get into extreme details as the draft of the ccNSO's comment didn't really specifically target this particular operating initiative.

I don't know if we really want to close this particular action item out. There was nothing of substance that came out of that discussion other than recognizing that there's probably more high-level coordination that might want to occur the next time this council meets with the ccNSO Council.

But from a budget perspective, both groups were aware of the draft allocation of three to five million over the course of the five-year operating plan, and noting that the appendix C of that five-year operating plan, which is the next version of the draft of the Brian Cute effort, still really isn't in a plan. I think there's a lot more preparatory work to do and less about the financial components. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Berry. I appreciate that. I see that John has also typed into chat about the SCBO's meeting with the SOPC, so thanks to you both for that. I take your point and I think the question here may be at a higher level, rather than just budgeting, of that. You know, are there the commonalities or differences related to next steps on the MSM evolution conversation?

I think, from a GNSO Council perspective, in Los Angeles we discussed—and I think in Montréal also we discussed—that a lot of what we've done related to PDP 3.0 actually covers a lot of the stuff that was included in the MSM evolution discussion and the things that were assigned to or allocated to the GNSO for leadership, that we've actually, I think, checked a bunch of those boxes.

I guess the question is, is there an opportunity for us to claim victory on some of this through the work that we've already done and demonstrate to the rest of the community that there is some good work that has already been done there? It's probably a good conversation to have during our next engagement with the ccNSO. Again, we'll have to see if, when we get to the schedule refinement or redo for ICANN67, whether the GNSO and ccNSO Council engagement remains or if that's something that moves on by the wayside.

Anyway, yeah. Let's remove this as an action item related to the budget and five-year strategic plan. I think it's just something that we'll continue to have that conversation with the ccNSO. Okay.

Unless there is any comment on that, let's move to the next item, which is managing the IDN variant TLD issue. I know that we've been delivered, I believe, the recommendations from the IDN scoping team and the council now has an action to consider the recommendations and try to figure out what the next steps are, here. Steve, would you be able to help me with this one, just in terms of next steps? Any imminent action items on this one?

STEVE CHAN:

Sure. Thanks, Keith. As Keith just noted, the IDN scoping team delivered its recommendations report, I think, in the middle of January. I think it's at the council's discretion how it wants to proceed with that. We should, of course, take that report into account and then determine what its next steps might be.

The report didn't say equivocally whether it should be a PDP or ePDP. It also said that it should potentially carve out some of the operational reviews of the IDN guidelines 4.0. Those are some of the things that the council should review, take into account, and consider as it determines next steps.

On a somewhat related item, one of the things that was discussed at the strategic planning session was to actually experiment with some of the PDP 3.0 improvements to the draft charter to actually start preparing that draft charter, and not necessarily to initiate the work in any imminent fashion but just to build that muscle memory and to take into account the PDP 3.0 improvement as we try to understand how best to start drafting our new charters in light of there was an improvement. On a related note, there's that as well. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks very much, Steve. If anybody would like to get in the queue on this one, feel free. Just to summarize, we've received the report from the scoping team and the recommendations are, essentially, to form a Policy Development Process, or an ePDP. Steve's point, I think, is a really good one, that as we look to do the chartering of that group we make sure that we do so in a way that's consistent with and benefitting from the work of PDP 3.0.

Again, I think this is one of the many items, or the several items, that we have on our list for prioritization. I think this is an important one for us to recognize that we've got to figure out at what point we should initiate and kick this off. Maxim, I see your hand. Go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I would like to remind us all that starting this PDP on IDNs before we finished already endangered species like SubPro and RPMs might delay, potentially, the next round even further because there are lots of items which will have to be reviewed again, from RPMs mostly. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Maxim. Noted. That's certainly one of the items that we would consider in our prioritization discussions. It would actually probably be helpful for us to identify and enumerate the items or the issues that you've referenced, so to the extent if you and others could help us understand that list of potential other impacted policies or policy developments, that would be helpful just

to help inform us of our considerations moving forward. Okay. Thank you. Let's move on.

Okay. Let's see. If you could remind me, the green color coding means "not on our agenda for today," is that right? "Complete," thank you, Steve. I thought so but I didn't want to jump to the conclusion. Yeah. So I don't think we need to go through these, as well, now that we're finished.

All right. Let's go back to the agenda, please. All right. Thanks, everybody. As I mentioned earlier, we have no items on our consent agenda today, on item number three, so we will move directly to item number four, which is the council vote on the adoption of the PDP 3.0 implementation final report. With this one, I will hand it over to Rafik. Rafik, if you don't mind, is our shepherd or Sherpa for the PDP 3.0 work. If I could hand it to you for the presentation of the motion? And also, to note that there has been an amendment suggested by John McElwaine that we need to consider. Rafik, over to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Keith. I guess we can start by reading the motion, the reserved part. Okay, if we scroll down, please? Okay. Reserved. "GNSO Council hereby adopts the GNSO PDP 3.0 implementation final report and instructs GNSO support staff to work with the GNSO Council leadership on the deployment of improvement based on the effective timeframe proposed by the PDP 3.0 small team.

The GNSO Council requests future charter drafting teams of the GNSO Council to commence chartering for upcoming PDP efforts

by utilizing the revised GNSO Working Group charter template and other related PDP 3.0 work products and report to the GNSO Council on whether they have achieved the intended outcomes.

The GNSO Council requests that after PDP 3.0 improvements are in effect the GNSO Council conducts a review of the implementation effectiveness in a timely manner.

The GNSO Council requests that following the GNSO Council review of the PDP 3.0, implementation effectiveness. The GNSO Council considers any necessary updates to the GNSO operating procedure and uses the relevant work product in PDP 3.0 implementation final report as a starting point.

The GNSO Council confirms that none but one working item/statement of interest [issue] identified by PDP 3.0 small team should be moved forward into the GNSO Council as an opportunity to evaluate the PDP 3.0 implementation effectiveness.

The GNSO Council thanks, to the PDP 3.0 small team, the GNSO support staff and others who have contributed to the implementation of GNSO PDP 3.0 improvements as well as the proposed implementation work products to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of GNSO PDPs.”

Okay. That was the motion. As was mentioned, also we have a friendly amendment that was introduced by John. First of all, I can read it. The amendment concerns [or has] number ten. I think the amendment is acceptable and I have no problem with it. I think we can accept it as a friendly amendment. And so, I would like to ask

Pam is she agrees with that. I see Pam is in the queue already.
Pam, please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Rafik. I am okay with John's proposed amendment. But John, I would just like to maybe also make a minor suggestion or amendment. In your proposed amendment, there was a reference to GNSO policy. I don't believe there is something called "GNSO policy." I think that reference probably should be changed to "as part of the PDP 3.0 improvements," or something along that line, because we really don't, as far as I know, have something that will be categorized as a GNSO policy. I hope that is okay by you, John. If you have any other thought or concern, please let us know. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Pam. I see John in the queue, [while he even] said that he agreed with the minor change. John, please go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks. Pam, yeah, we're on the same page. I was just trying to put down a marker that appeared to be missing that we would just have to vote on that consensus playbook. I think you're exactly right; as it becomes part of PDP 3.0, we're on the same page. However best to describe it is fine with me. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, John. Okay. Is there any further question/comment?
Yes, Maxim. Please, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I was asked by members of the constituency to ask why the consensus playbook is not intended to go for public comments?
Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Maxim. I think it's maybe important to remind about what this playbook, which is intended to be a resource for working leadership to help them in how to work toward consensus building. It's a material, it's a resource, and it's being done because we got the funding with an additional budget request. It's also aimed to be used or available for the broader communities, not just about GNSO.

This is a resource. It's a material. It's not intended to change anything in terms of procedure or process. It's more to help everyone to work for consensus building as we recognize the thing in our different discussions about the PDPs and how to be more effective. We are getting, here, the support or the help from experts on consensus building; how to offer that additional information or reference that can be of value for anyone in the community. So this is a kind of reference.

We are using vendors. It doesn't really make sense. It can be quite an overkill to go through a public comment for this one. Personally, I think it's also quite strange when we talk about the community workload and so on is to have a public comment on the material.

This is what I think we can explain why it's not necessary, really, to have a public comment on the consensus playbook. At the end, it will be provided. People can use it or not but it doesn't change anything in terms of procedure or process. Okay? Sorry?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Thanks for the clarification.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Maxim. Okay. Anyone else or any other comment? Okay. I think with this, unless there is another question or clarification, Keith can move to vote for this one.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Rafik. Thanks for your introduction and reading the result clauses, here, and for the discussion. With that I think, Nathalie, we can move this one to a vote, please.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Keith. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say "aye." No one. Would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say "aye." Hearing no one, would all those in favor of the motion please say "aye?"

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Scott McCormick, proxy for Marie Pattullo, please say “aye.”

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. With no abstention/no objection, the motion passes, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. Thank you, Rafik, and to all who contributed to this. I look forward to moving this forward. Yes, Rafik. Go right ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, sorry. Just I want to take this opportunity to thank everyone, and the team, and the staff for the work done. I think it was an important task for us to do it and to live up to the expectation we are setting for the PDP Working Groups themselves. I think, now, what is more important is how we will implement these improvements, evaluate them, and see if they need some adjustment and tweaking. It's no more [to use] the term of implementation and evaluation, and just asking the council to follow that closely. Thanks again.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thank you, Rafik, and thanks for those words. This is a combination of quite a bit of effort from Rafik, from councilors, and

from staff. I think this is an incredibly important development and step forward in our efforts to become more efficient and effective. Rafik, thank you, and thanks to all. Okay.

Let's then move onto item number five, please, on our agenda, which is a council update. This is the RPM PDP Working Group project change request. I think for this one, John, I'm going to hand this over to you to help introduce this but I'll just tee it up here very briefly.

We talked about this in some level of detail yesterday during the pre-ICANN67 policy webinar. Essentially, what we have here is a continuation of the discussion with the RPM PDP co-chairs, with the support of staff and, of course, with John McElwaine as our council liaison to the group, to try to ensure that we are on a predictable and achievable path for delivery of the Phase 1 final report.

This is a PDP that I'll remind everybody has been in flight for many years. What we are trying to achieve is to bring this Phase 1 effort in for a safe and timely landing before the end of this calendar year. We received an initial budget request submitted by the co-chairs. We, as the council leadership, and working with John McElwaine, have some questions. This would follow on from the conversations that we had during our council strategic planning session and council meeting in January.

We basically had some questions and we wanted to make sure that the timeline that we were being presented was not just a best-case scenario but it was a reasonable and achievable scenario. We had follow-on conversations with the co-chairs and we engaged with staff to make sure that, in fact, the timelines that we're being

presented were achievable and that there was a commitment from the co-chairs to deliver on that timeline.

One of the questions that we had in the original project change request that was submitted was about the date, looking at the end of August or early September to deliver the final report. Well, that raised some questions in our mind about holiday schedules in August, and could the group reasonably conclude its work with the final month of its proposed timeline taking place in August?

And so, we went back to the co-chairs and they went back working with staff and, basically, came up with a revised timeline that we all, I think, now believe is more reasonable as a best-case scenario but that is something that the co-chairs will be able to deliver upon.

We had questions in conversation with the co-chairs about working methods, about their willingness and ability to work together and to have efficient decision making that would allow for the group to be able to conclude its work on the proposed timeline and trajectory. I think that's setting the stage for this conversation and John, I'm going to hand it over to you at this point. We look forward to your input.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Absolutely, Keith. Thanks. Keith did an excellent job of summarizing how we got to the document that has been shared with everybody, the change request form. I think a couple of dates just to keep in mind, and then I'll focus folks in on what I think is the important section with respect to the change request.

We started this exercise/this working group in March 2016, to just let that sink in. In just another month, any of us who have college-age kids, they could have gone all the way through university so it has been a while. It was currently scheduled to have been delivered at the end of April, and when we saw that was not going to be the case. We submitted the first change request and that one has a date initially presented to the council of concluding in August of 2020.

Keith did an excellent job of describing that, coming off of last month's council meeting and then meetings with leadership, we asked the three co-chairs to really take a hard look and give us a change request that was reasonable/thought-through. Berry made a big impression upon me that there were mitigated actions that were going to be taken. And so, if we can scroll to the proposed actions section of the change request? I really think that's the important part, here.

We're now requesting for a delivery date in October, worst-case scenario if I recall. Hopefully earlier, but that's when the report would be due. That second paragraph is a real important thing that was hammered out as we identified some of the problems that had slowed things down.

So the working group co-chairs have all agreed, and I'm pleased to report have all agreed—I'll explain that later—that they'll commit to work together, and they've acknowledged that that might mean that sometimes when there's a two-to-one split they're going to have to just go forward with that decision, knowing that one person's view has not been accepted. That's fine. I believe they all recognize that it is a diversity of viewpoints and they're not going to agree on

everything, particularly as we start getting to subjective-type decisions.

They're going to do that with a common goal to complete Phase 1 on time and, believe me, they fully understand from Keith that there could be consequences if they don't deliver this work on time. They've agreed to be firm with the working group and to make sure that the people are not relitigating issues and are staying within scope. I think we saw that fairly nicely in the last call, where that was done and we really made some good progress.

Lastly, they've agreed to develop a detailed plan to take the rest of the steps to get to the final report. They're going to decide how they're going to deal with those next steps, how certain decisions will be made, what is the scope of input that will be allowed—in other words, not going back and redeciding things that shouldn't be renegotiated or re-looked at—and finally, they'll clearly communicate that process to working group members.

I find it that that last part is key because, as people don't know what the next process is, particularly in this working group, they start to play that chess game and try to think, "How should I angle this or my comments in a meeting, or my request in a meeting, to make sure that I'm driving towards a particular end-game that I want?" But if they knew that the real next step was not such a final or important thing, they may be less inclined and to allow things to lie.

That's what we have in front of us, here. Again, an October date with some, I think, good steps, some measures and commitments, to get this working group to deliver on time. As I alluded to, I was pleased to report that all co-chairs had signed onto this. When this

was submitted initially, Kathy Kleiman, because of work commitments, had not had a chance to review this. I spoke with her last night via telephone and she is on board and committed to working together/to this proposed action. With that, I will pause and see if anybody has any questions of me or just further discussion. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, John. I appreciate, again, of course, your work as the liaison, and also the update, here, and your engagement with the co-chairs during this important phase, here. And just to remind everybody, these project change requests are a relatively new thing and, again, it's an important tool for us as the council to be able to ensure that we're holding PDP Working Group leadership accountable and that, if there are going to be significant changes to timelines or resource requirements or, for example, if a group felt like it needed to update or adjust its charter, this is the mechanism by which that happens. And so, this is an important engagement for us as the council working with our liaisons and the co-chairs of these various groups.

If anybody would like to get in queue with any thoughts or questions, please do so, but I want to note—and Flip, I saw your hand go up. I'll come to you next—that John alluded to the conversations that we had with the co-chairs over this topic, specifically here in the RPM group.

Everybody knows that there are three co-chairs and that one of the challenges that I think we've seen over the recent years is that having three co-chairs has been a challenge in terms of being able

to get the group making decisions, being able to move forward. This is something that we communicated to the co-chairs directly during our engagement, that they need to be able to move this forward in a timely fashion, work together, and to drive to a conclusion.

We put a marker down that said there are a range of options that we have as council, and one of those options could be, if they prove unable to deliver on the details in this project change request, that the council could remove them and find different leadership.

We sort of put that marker down as a possibility. And so, I think everybody's on notice that this thing needs to be delivered per the guidelines that have been put out in this PCR. Flip, over to you.

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you very much, Keith. I have a practical question. We've discussed this a couple of times already and I was wondering whether there is going to be a point in time where this is going to be put into a motion, or is that not a purpose? Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Flip. It's a great question. I think the answer to that is there is no requirement for us as a council to vote on the approval or objection of the project change request. I think, unless someone raises a question, a concern, or has an objection to the project change request moving forward and being approved, that the council leadership would take the action, basically, to give the approval.

Again, I think if someone or if anyone has concerns with, problems with, or opposes what's being put forward then, by all means, now's the time to start flagging those concerns. But I think if there are no concerns or if people are supportive of the work that council leadership, me, Pam, and Rafik, working with council liaison—in this particular case, John—working with staff, and working with the co-chairs, if you're comfortable with where we are and where we've come to on this then we would, following this discussion and moving forward, move to approve it. But there's no current plan for any sort of a motion or a vote of the council to certify it. Flip, follow up?

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you, Keith. Thank you very much. That was a good clarification, for my personal understanding in the first place. I actually raised this because I thought that that would be a concern or that would be a comfort that the chairs of the working groups would be seeking.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thank you, Flip. Berry, did you want to add anything? I see you've typed in the chat. You are more than welcome to jump in here.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Basically, restating what you did. At least in this cycle, these can basically be adopted by the council without objection, but that doesn't prevent the council in the future from maybe considering a motion of the "all other" type in the future, should you want to make it a part of the more formal record.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Berry. That's helpful. Flip, did you have any follow-up there? Anything else? Or would anybody else like to get in queue on this one?

FLIP PETILLION: No thank you, Keith. As I said, I asked this because I just wondered, if I were a chair and I was asking for a change request approval, I would kind of expect an answer in a formal way. But if that's not necessary, it's not necessary.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Flip. I think there will be a formal answer, that the council leadership would respond and give the formal answer, but that at this point at least it's not subject to a formal vote of any kind or a formal motion. Pam, I see your hand. Go right ahead, please.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. Keith, given that it seems it wasn't entirely clear to the council or some members of the council, including myself, this is the process we're adapting now for considering and approving this change request, I was thinking maybe we could, now it is clearer ... So, this is a process we're going forward with for now until there is a change.

Before these two change requests before the council, maybe we could discuss them today and then leave it for a few days so council could also have more time to think about them and, based on no-

objection basis, then there would be a communication from the council leadership to the working group leadership.

But even though the communication is from the council leadership, obviously the decision we are conveying is the whole council's decision. The reason that we, as the council leadership team, have a prior call with the respective working group leadership team was to try to really hear from them, in a more detailed fashion, their reasons for change and proposed remedies, etc.

So, we could maybe inform other councilors when we have this discussion or maybe propose other suggestions and things like that. I just wanted to emphasize the decision is collectively, as a whole, on behalf of the council whether to approve or not approve the change request. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thank you, Pam. It's a good point. I should just note also that these PCRs, these project change requests, are new. And so, we're finding our way in terms of how to use them, how to engage. And so, I think we can adjust as we go. I think if, at some point, we decide that we want to create a more formal approval process, a vote, and all of that, then I think we have the ability to do that as far as adjusting our own internal processes.

Pam, to your point, I'm more than happy to make sure that people have the opportunity to consider this. We could leave it open for a week for people to consider, discuss, engage, and provide any feedback that you may have. But I think at some point we're going to need to be able to respond to the co-chairs of, in this case, RPM,

but also we're going to talk about SubPro next, so they understand what the plan is and that they can continue to execute against the new plan.

Anyway, let me just pause there and see if anybody else would like to weigh in at this stage. Okay. I don't see any other hands. On this and the next one, we will hold open an opportunity for councilors to provide feedback for a week. A week from today, we will look to wrap this up and try to provide some feedback to the co-chairs of the two PDP Working Groups.

Any final questions or comments on the RPM PDP project change request, before we move onto SubPro? I don't see any hands, so with that, John, thank you very much. Thanks for all of your work on this one. I'm sure if there are questions that you'll be able to field those on the list.

With that, let us move, then, to council update, item number six, which is the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group PCR. With this one, Flip, I'm going to hand this one over to you. I know that this is, again, another PDP Working Group that has been going on for many years, and there is, I think, a recognition that this group has quite a bit of work still ahead of it. There are some substantive differences of opinion in this group that still need to be worked through.

Thank you very much for your presentation yesterday during the pre-ICANN67 webinar on Subsequent Procedures and the current state of affairs. Obviously, you're more than welcome to engage here in this conversation. Flip, if I could hand this one over to you, please? Thank you.

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you very much, Keith. I will set a bit of history of this one for those who are less familiar or relatively recently joined the GNSO Council. This PDP was chartered in January 16th, if I'm not mistaken. It had to address a very long list of topics and it has set up a number of sub-teams to divide the work and to be very efficient.

It published a series of reports: an initial report, a supplemental initial report, and a report specific to Work Track 5, which focused on geographic names. It asked for public comments on all these reports and it has reviewed it. It is now in the midst of developing and reviewing draft final recommendations. The working group is seeking to resolve open issues on a subset of topics.

It is estimated that it could deliver its final report to the council by the end of the second quarter of this year but that was based on the understanding that an additional public comment period would be limited to a subset of topics. However, there was an expectation of a new public comment period, and on the entire draft final report, so the dynamics have changed. That's why the working group is submitting a project change request that commits to deliver a final report to the council, not later than the end of December of this year.

I must stress that the working group co-chairs have not been taking this lightly. They are very well aware of the fact that such a project change request is a relatively new concept, as Keith has described, and that it is exceptional, and that it is only used if the leadership of a PDP Working Group finds that it needs to make a significant or substantive change to it. We know a change can include an amendment to the timeline or a request for additional resources or

input, and the leadership of the PDP is requesting an authorization from the council for making a change to the timeline.

What they propose is a worst-case scenario. They stress, and I think they're right, that it's a safe timeline and that they are already ahead of the schedule. They've been making efforts to speed up the process, to become more efficient, and if they can finish sooner they will do so. They strive constantly to beat this timeline of the end of the third quarter. They already plan to hold several extended meetings in April and in May, and these meetings will last for several hours.

I would like to remind you of the current challenges and issues of the working group but let me first start with the challenges and the issues that were previously identified and that I think are still relevant. First, I see a number of challenges and issues that are caused by working group members who seem to come to down to them ignoring an essential feature of the policy developing process, and that is the willingness to accept that other members may have other views, the readiness to strive to consensus recommendations, and the preparedness to compromise.

These challenges and issues are the following. Some members continue to assert that their strongly held opinion must be upheld. There is participation from a limited subset of participants who sometimes dominate the conversation and some members are continuing to show up to meetings without an understanding or appreciation of the conversation that has already been taking place, or without having reviewed materials shared and to be discussed.

What I hope will be achieved by the group, if the change request is granted or not objected to, is an increase in the level of negotiations, the quality of the discussions, and the sense of ruthlessness by the chairs so that they make progress and, indeed, are able to land this set of recommendations timely.

I do believe that this leadership can achieve but we, as council, show them that we support them in this. There is the expectation for a public comment for all recommendations and the list of topics is extensive. There is a number of challenging topics with pending deliberations. So how can we as a council assist, and how can we as a community assist?

We can reinforce with our respective communities that a multi-stakeholder model works best when everybody participates in good faith, seeking a solution everyone can live with. So, promoting compromise. The councilors—so we in our respective communities—should familiarize themselves with the anticipated outcomes in advance of the delivery of the final report. We can continue to remain available as a resource for consultation/escalation in respect of the issues that are identified.

I remind you of some changes in the PDP 3.0 that will now become quite useful if—and I hope never—necessary. We can continue to support the co-chairs if there is any remedial action that is necessary from the working group member disruption.

In brief, I strongly propose we support this request and continue to support this working group and its two chairs. The purpose for us is that this multi-year PDP must come to a conclusion this calendar year so other bits of work can be added to our list. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you very much, Flip. I think your point—and this applies, I think, to all of the PDPs, and looking ahead—is that providing some structure and some accountability for co-chairs, or two co-chairs, actually has the potential to help the leadership of PDP working groups advance the work on a reasonable timeframe.

I'll try to restate that. I think if the leadership of PDP working groups know that they are going to be held accountable by the council for delivery against a specific or a particular timeline, then they are also, in turn, able to work with the members of the PDP working groups to underscore the importance of meeting those timelines.

In other words, it's accountability for the leadership but it's also accountability for the participants in that the council, at the end of the day, is responsible for managing these processes and that we will, if needed, intervene to ensure that the working groups are delivering on expectations. That's not just the leadership or only the leadership's responsibility but it's the responsibility of the participants, and that speaks directly to some of the PDP 3.0 improvements that we've been discussing now for several years. Thank you, Flip, for that. Maxim, I see your hand. Go right ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Is it possible to scroll the document back to the beginning? Yes, here. There is a date of the 31st of December. Usually, the ICANN office closes a week before that. How to deliver something with no support of staff? Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you. Sorry, Maxim. It took me a minute to get off mute. Yeah. Thanks for that, and it's an important observation. Of course, the language is "no later than." Obviously, I think you're right, in terms of a logistical question, that if ICANN offices are closed during that timeframe it would need to take place prior to that. I think if we need to take another look at that specific date, we can certainly do that, but end of the business year for ICANN is another way, as you've said in chat.

But I think the key here is that it's no later than the end of the year and if the group is going to meet that deadline then it would need to be prior to the ICANN offices closing. Okay. Any other comments or questions? Any other discussion on this one? Cheryl, you're more than welcome to speak to this issue. We don't have the co-chairs of the RPM group but you're here as our ALAC liaison so you're more than welcome to speak to the Subsequent Procedures topic as well, if you like.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Keith, thanks for the offer. I did put some things in chat but I think, in fairness to all of the other co-chairs, those of you who wish to look at what I've written in chat, fine, but I don't need to take the microphone.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Okay. Any other questions? Comments? And questions for Flip or for council leadership on this one? Again, this is an important PCR, project change request, that sets out a new timeline, a new deadline, but one that, I think, the

leadership, the liaison, and staff have approached with some level of rigor to make sure that what's being proposed is not just a best-case scenario or a minor adjustment that will be missed.

There has been some good work that went into this in terms of making sure that there is some predictability and that it's a reasonable and attainable proposed new timeline. Steve, any comment you'd like to make on this one from a staff perspective? Is your primary support for the SubPro group? Steve says, "No," nothing from him. Thanks. Philippe, please. Over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: [inaudible] really, in terms of the impact to the timeline to launch ahead something like Q2/Q3, the approval of the board for the recommendations. The rest of it would be depend on that, ending somewhere around Q1 2022, the first submissions. Does this mean that it all shifts six months ahead? That's what I seem to understand. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Philippe. If I understood your question correctly, this current timeline would push out, I think I heard you say, the first submission or the first application for the next round. Is that it?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, that's essentially the question. How does that affect the timeline to launch overall?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. It's a very good question, Philippe. I think we may have a slide somewhere that lays out the process but we have to remember here that what we're talking about here is the Policy Development Process, the PDP Working Group delivery of its report to the council by the end of December 2020, this year.

After that, there is still going to be a requirement for the board ... Well, there's the council consideration, right? So we, as the council, or the next council, will actually need to go through our process for approving the policy recommendations, then forwarding that to the board.

The board will have its consideration and eventually, hopefully, approval, and then there needs to begin the implementation phase, and then that implementation phase would include, presumably, the development of the updated Applicant Guidebook or the implementation parameters for how ICANN would need to build the review process for applications that are submitted. So really, from A to Z, figuring out how to implement these policy recommendations.

We've been told by ICANN and GDD, and Göran, I think, that essentially the systems that existed for the last round are no longer in place, the personnel are no longer in place, and that something is going to have to be developed, essentially from scratch, to be able to handle the next round of applications.

And then, of course, there's the application phase, there's the review phase, and the allocation or delegation phase. I don't have a good or specific answer for you in terms of timing but a lot has to happen, especially during that implementation work, between the

approval of the consensus policy recommendations and the actual acceptance of the first applications.

And so, if anybody else would like to jump in on this one, please help me out. I see Cheryl says, “That’s correct. That’s the understanding.” Maxim, I don’t know if it’s around six months to draft when everything is ready. I don’t know if that’s a reasonable or even a likely scenario. Anybody else like to jump in on this one? Okay. All right, I don’t see any other hands so if anybody else would like to speak please put up your hand now, otherwise we should probably move on.

Then again, like the previous project change request, we’ll hold this one open for a week, and then next Thursday, essentially, if we don’t hear any objection or concerns we’ll give the thumbs-up to both the RPM and the SubPro leadership. Okay. Let’s move on, then.

As I noted, this is the time I’m going to reserve some time on our agenda for a discussion of ICANN67, and just to remind everybody that just this week and the last 24 or 48 hours we’ve received indication—well, 24 hours, I guess—that the ICANN Board has voted to, essentially, pass a resolution saying that we will not be having a face-to-face meeting in Cancún for ICANN67, that it will be a fully virtual meeting.

I think everybody is familiar with the rationale and the reasoning behind it. There was a call that took place earlier today posted by David Olive. That basically was an opportunity for the community to hear from ICANN and to ask questions about the decision to not have a face-to-face meeting and not travel to Cancún. I think there

were, at one point, approximately 300 people that joined that webinar or that conference call, and so I'm sure that many of you were on that call as well. We can certainly talk about that.

But the reason I bring this up is that I think we, as a GNSO Council and as a GNSO community, need to figure out how we're going to approach this. This completely virtual ICANN meeting has never happened before so we are in uncharted territory.

I think we need to be cognizant that the ICANN schedule that existed for Cancún two days ago is probably not going to survive in its original form, and that we, as a community working with ICANN Org, are going to need to try to figure out and prioritize what needs to get done in this virtual engagement over the week of the ICANN meeting, and what can reasonably be set aside or handled in other forms or another format.

I think there are some questions about, you know, there would have been certain sessions that would have been extremely valuable during a face-to-face where there may not be the same value for the conversations taking place remotely. And so, I think we as a group need to try to figure out what is it that we as a council, specifically for our purposes and our scheduling, need to do and we can achieve, and are there things that we could potentially push off to be able to reduce the burden on the remote participation, the staff support, and everything?

My view is that if we try to keep everything exactly the same it probably won't succeed, or that we as a community won't get the value or be able to progress the important work that we need to do.

And so, I'm interested in anybody's thoughts on this. Obviously, the decision has been made.

I know there are parts of the community and a lot of folks that are disappointed in the decision to, basically, say we're not meeting face-to-face in Cancún, but under the current circumstances and with the level of uncertainty that exists, I know that the ICANN Board, Göran, and ICANN Org, took this decision very seriously, this situation very seriously, and I think it was probably a no-win situation in terms of having to make a call like this. But I think we should respect the fact that they made the decision and now try to figure out, how are we going to make this thing as successful as possible?

That's my view, my personal view, and I'm happy to hear from others on this one. I see a bunch of hands up, this is great. Rafik, then Tatiana, and then we'll go through the queue. Rafik, over to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. First, I do agree with what you said about the decision. I don't believe it was an easy one, and with so many things moving on, it was important to make a quick one. Now, it's more to think how we can organize and to be effective for this virtual meeting.

Also, as you said, we cannot have the same format, the same schedule, for a virtual meeting. I had, myself, to do before a remote participation for ICANN meetings and also for face-to-face

meetings. It's quite challenging so it's important to think how it can be optimized for everyone to be able to participate.

What I want to highlight is that, from the council, we need to prioritize what session we want to have. We have our working session so we need to think it should be, really, like what we do before, or we can change around that. Also about the joint meetings, but I think it's not just up to us. We need to check if we will keep joint meetings with the board, with the ccNSO, with the GAC, and so on, since now it's a different venue. How much can be feasible?

Also, I want to highlight it's also kind of a challenge, now, for the different PDPs, in how to organize their schedule because, I guess for all of them, their work plan is based on having a face-to-face session on the ICANN meeting in Cancún, so that's not going to happen. They'll have to adjust their work plan. We got that kind of question from the ePDP team members and they are trying to explore the kind of alternatives and how we can adjust. There are so many moving parts but in such cases we need, maybe to fix some parameters in the way so we can work on the others and to be able to do so.

From my standpoint, it's clear we need to reduce the number of sessions so we need to give really high priority with regard to the outcome and what we want to achieve. So, for example, updates are less important, I think, than a session that is supposed to be for making or reaching a decision.

I cannot talk about, for example, how the stakeholder group constituency will organize themselves because they use, usually,

the ICANN meetings for a lot of internal meetings. I'm not sure how much is feasible but we need, also, to take that into account if, also, people think to change the time. I think everyone will need to make a sacrifice and efforts to make this achievable.

Another point we need to clarify is about which time zone will be followed. I'm kind of scared, to be honest, and I think maybe this situation for Cheryl, Pam, and others who are in this part of the world, if we will be heavily impacted. We need to get some insurance that we won't be ... Depending on how the time zone maybe shows up. Sorry for this long comment.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. No, that's really helpful. I know that already, including during the webinar that took place earlier today, there were concerns expressed about time zones and, basically, expecting people over the course of a week to be working in the middle of their night. That's probably not going to be sustainable. I think there are some real, legitimate questions about time zone, about the total amount of hours, especially if you're not in a face-to-face environment, over the course of a week.

I think your point about the stakeholder group and constituency day, from a GNSO perspective—and this is not a council question but each of our groups will need to make these decisions for themselves—if you're not meeting face-to-face, is it really necessary for, for example, the Registries Stakeholder Group to have an entire day dedicated to meetings where, perhaps, a lot of that work could be done during a regular teleconference?

I'm not saying that the Registries Stakeholder Group has made a decision one way or the other and I'm not speaking for them. I'm just using it as an example of, if it's not in a face-to-face environment, does that meeting need to actually happen on constituency day or could it be repurposed to a regular teleconference? I think we all, and our groups, should be asking those tough questions at this point. Again, not dictated to anybody about how your groups decide but those are the tough questions I think we need to be considering. Tatiana, then Michele, then James. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much. Well, it is hard to add anything new from me after Rafik talked. I think that what I consider important here is not only prioritization but also how long the sessions are. For example, on Sunday or Monday we used to have the entire day of the GNSO working session. In any case, if we work like this for the entire day, someone would be affected because of the time zone, so maybe we can split this into two in the course of two days.

The concern I have here is that earlier today on the call with ICANN, on this webinar, some people asked to postpone the meeting or make it two or three weeks later because if we are canceling it anyway it doesn't matter. I want to say that for people like me it matters. I freed the entire week to go to the ICANN meeting in Cancún. I didn't schedule anything during my workdays, so whatever GNSO/ICANN will schedule, even if I'm affected severely by time zone differences, I will be able to participate.

If this is going to be postponed, anyhow, if the GNSO working session is going to be the week after ICANN, I would be a lost cause because I squeezed everything that I couldn't do at work when I was supposed to be Cancún into the weeks after, so my schedule is full. My request or my kind plea, or whatever you name it, would be please, can we keep it during the Cancún meeting, be it two or three hours a day, or whatever? Can we just schedule it during that week because we were planning to do it anyway? Otherwise, for me, and I believe for some other people, it's going to be a total mess. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Tatiana. I think it's a really good point. I think, certainly, my inclination would be for us as the GNSO, at least the GNSO Council, in our work, to have the sessions that we need to have during that timeframe and not necessarily push them off. But if something can be pushed off, perhaps we tackle it during the next regularly scheduled GNSO Council meeting. I guess it's not a question of saying, "Well, we can't get it done this week. We'll do it the following week."

Yeah, that wasn't my intent. It was more about, "Let's identify the things that we need to do during the week of the ICANN meeting," and that if there are things that can be pushed off we then schedule those for the following regularly-scheduled council meeting. And agreed, completely, with the commentary about "can't be in two places at one." Okay. Michele, you're next. Tatiana, that's an old hand. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah. Thanks. Can you hear me okay?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, sure can.

MICHELE NEYLON: Sorry. Sorry, the headphones are dying and everything, here. I think that one of the biggest questions for a lot of us is, what time zone is ICANN planning on using? Because that's going to impact how we proceed. I know from speaking to other registrars and other people in the broader ICANN community that some people will end up traveling to the region anyway because they can't change their flights, etc. For those of us who may not end up traveling to that part of the world, if it's going ahead on that schedule, then it's going to be a challenge. For people in the Asia Pacific, it's going to be impossible.

I just think we need to know which time zone plans on using now so that we can plan based on that. Because, as others have said, it's impossible to expect people to do multiple full days remotely. That just simply will not work. Add on top the potential issues around time zones, then for a lot of people that could mean that they were literally working in the middle of the night.

Now, for some people, ICANN might be their day job. For a lot of us, it's something that we do outside our day job. I just don't see how that will work. It's something we really do need to get answers on quickly because I heard people, on the call earlier today, talking about that it might be L.A. time, it might be Cancún time. That's quite a big difference.

In terms of the constituency days and things like that, I think that's something that each group will probably decide themselves but I suspect we will be curtailing our schedule quite significantly. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Michele. I agree. I think your point is a good one, about the time zone. You know, the time zone probably needs to be nailed down and then decision-making about what's retained, what's pushed off, and how we structure all of this will probably follow from that.

I know that there have been suggestions that we don't, perhaps, stick to a single time zone, that we spread things out and have things throughout the course of the day, but [present] the possibility that people are working around the clock. I think we need to have that conversation and figure out what the next step is.

Again, that, I'm sure, will be part of the conversation tomorrow for the SO/AC SG and C leaders with ICANN as we try to figure out what comes next. In the queue, I've got James, Maxim, Tom, and Flip. Over to you, James.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. I'll keep it relatively brief. Michele said a lot of the points that I was going to make. This is just one or two additional things that for those of us whose jobs in the normal way of the world have absolutely nothing to do with ICANN, we have to actually take PTO vacation time to attend ICANN meetings. Speaking personally

for myself, I'm certainly not taking a couple of days as PTO to sit on conference calls. That's just not an option for me.

With regards to what my availability would be, I would suggest, as a potential way to help folks in a similar situation, if we are going to have multiple meetings over the course of the week, if that's the direction that we go, can we try and split those into two categories?

So, something like "core meetings," which would be, obviously, our council meeting, and maybe a single working session, and then option meetings for the ones that are less important and are more of a nice-to-have if people are able to attend given their time zones and day job commitments. I think that would be a way for us to maybe manage it a little bit easier.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, James. It's a good point. I mean, obviously, our formal council meeting would be one that's mandatory, and there may be others that would be less so. Yeah, we'll take a look at that. I expect the council leadership working with staff will come up with some proposed calendar of events for consideration, and we'll be sure to share that. Okay. Maxim, Tom, and Flip. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

To ensure the proper participation and reasonable participation, I think we need to ensure that all materials for all sessions are available online more than 24 hours before the beginning of the session because people are spread over the world. They need to be able to read something because without materials available

before the meeting people will be asking too many stupid questions. They will mishear things, etc., is the first item.

The second is the recordings of each session should be available really fast online to ensure some kind of interactivity during the course of this virtual meeting because if records are available after the meeting they're just worthless. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Maxim. Your points are noted. Tom, over to you. Tom, if you're speaking you're still on mute.

TOM DALE: How's that?

KEITH DRAZEK: Hey, Tom. We were getting some feedback from your microphone. Let's try it again.

TOM DALE: Okay, how's that?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. I can hear you but there's an echo so you may have two microphones open, maybe one on your laptop and one on the phone. Something's going on, there.

TOM DALE: Okay, I'm sorry. I'll try and fix it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Oh, that's better. No, you're good now. Thanks.

TOM DALE: Oh, okay. Thank you. I just wanted to make a more general comment about this new meeting format. It might be helpful to, in all the excitement of trying to make it work, actually try and do some planning for a proper evaluation of how it does work, capturing some of the issues for a meaningful comparison of how it works compared with the usual face-to-face meeting.

It could be useful information to know whether the remote participation format is going to be a viable alternative in the future, not necessarily for this sort of contingency in this case but more generally. It's an opportunity to see if it works in a positive way as well as a negative way, I guess, and it will be helpful to bear that in mind in the planning. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Tom. That's a constructive suggestion and I'm sure that that's something that I could bring to the conversation with ICANN tomorrow during that SO and AC leaders gathering. Because I think this could be, and we could find that there may be some benefits and that there may be savings associated with it, or the ability to find a new mechanism for our engagement. I think you're right in terms of wanting to make sure that we were thinking

about that ahead of time so we can properly assess relative levels of success or challenge. Thanks for that. Flip, you're next.

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you, Keith. I was thinking of the following: we are an organization of compromise, and although, of course, I respect and I do understand the decision that has been made by the board, it's very drastic. I was wondering, the whole purpose of a meeting like this is to bring people together and to have face-to-face meetings. Why don't we consider having people gather still but on a regional level and prepare meetings?

For example, there are quite a number of American people who could actually come together. There are quite a number of Europeans who could do the same. We can then prepare meetings, have discussions, maybe not with the entire group but at least we do one thing, and that is to have face-to-face meetings and to have reasonable discussions and prepare the online meetings that we would plan. It's an idea. It is, maybe, bold. Sorry for that. But it's something that came into my mind. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thank you very much, Flip. I'll make an observation here. There was a meeting that took place in either 2008 or 2009 in Nairobi—yeah, exactly. John is just mentioning the same thing in chat—where, because of a concern about a report of terrorist threat, particularly, and I can only speak to the companies in the US because I was working for a different company at the time, but the companies found that they were not going to be sending employees

to Nairobi, in part for insurance reasons and because of the threat that had been identified.

At that time, a group of contracted parties, registries and registrars, and I think some others, in the Washington DC area basically got a conference room in a hotel and a bunch of people ended up staying at the hotel and got up in the middle of the night and participated remotely. There were remote participation facilities involved and we were able to, essentially, create a little hub for folks who were not able to attend in person.

And so, I think your suggestion is a good one in the sense that we ought to look for opportunities for people to come together to contribute, to participate, and to have that engagement. I don't know whether that's something that can be pulled off in the short time that we have between now and the second week of March.

I don't know if that's something that ICANN would be able to support, either at their hub offices or to provide infrastructure or to help cost-sharing or anything like that. But it's a conversation or a question that could certainly be posed during tomorrow's meeting and I'm happy to carry that question to that discussion.

If anybody else would like to jump in or, Flip, if you have any follow up ... I think the idea of getting together on a regional basis is one that's worth considering but, of course, the gathering is also one of the concerns related to the reason for not having the face-to-face. Greg, did I see your hand go up?

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah. I was just going to say something I was thinking about that was similar to what you said. I definitely understand all the concerns about how inconvenient time zones are and how we can rearrange this but given that this is happening in two and a half weeks, I can see how we can cut from meetings, like make things shorter, but a complete reorganization and try to figure out which time zone to use, that just seems like a very heavy lift that might end up using more time and not getting anywhere that would be productive. That's just my thought as we were discussing this.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Greg. I think there is a risk, as you've noted, of making things more complex and messier in a very short period of time by trying to redo a lot or to restructure a lot. I hear what you're saying and I think we need to be careful to avoid digging the hole deeper, if you will. But I think the concerns that have been expressed by folks in very different time zones are something that we need to take on board, as well. It's going to be a challenge, for sure.

Okay. Any other questions, comments, or input for me before this call tomorrow? I'll be sure to report out with an e-mail to the list on how that conversation goes, and then, as I noted, the council leadership working with staff will come up with some proposed adjustments moving forward. Pam, I see your hand. Please, go right ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith. Keith, I was just looking at what might be in front of us for the council to consider at ICANN67. I really do not see anything that is super-urgent, crucial, critical, or pressing for the council but I do see we have major PDPs that are underway that are pressed for time/sensitive to time completion dates and all that.

Personally, I really think we need to prioritize what's important from the GNSO and GNSO Council's perspective. Personally, I would have thought if there's a conflict when we are rearranging all these meeting schedules/sessions, priority should be given to those PDPs.

In terms of council activities, other than the March monthly meeting I personally do not see anything that is really mission-critical at this point but that's just my view and others might have different thoughts about how we prioritize. I just see we got two core businesses, here: one is the GNSO PDPs for whom we are the manager and one is our council business. I would just think those PDPs are more urgent and pressing. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, a lot, Pam. You're getting a lot of plus-ones in support in the Zoom room chat, as well. I think that's exactly the difficult decisions ... Or maybe not difficult decisions. But we're going to have to be a bit ruthless in terms of what we feel is mission-critical and what is the highest priority, and what can reasonably be pushed off to our next council meeting.

And I agree with you that the actual policy work that we are responsible for managing really ought to take precedent or take

priority. Obviously, we'll have our regular council meeting, our formal council meeting, but anything else, perhaps, is not as mission-critical as the PDPs.

Pam, thanks very much for that. As I noted, I think Pam, Rafik, and I will work with staff to come up with some suggested updates or suggested framework for our engagement. But I think what you're hearing from us is that there's a recognition that the current schedule that existed two days ago for Cancún is not going to survive and that we're going to have to take a pretty significant chop to what comes out the other end. Anybody like to weigh in? I'd like to take this opportunity to ask staff if any of you would like to weigh in with comments, views, or anything on this discussion of ICANN67, you're more than welcome at this point.

And then, I'll note that we're going to push the GNSO project list review to another meeting. As much as we discussed this as being an important review and getting into the level of detail that we want to, we don't have time today because of the discussion that we're currently having. Would anybody like to jump in? All right. Nathalie, Steve, Marika, Terri, anyone? This is your chance. All right. Not seeing any takers. All right, very good. Okay.

Let's, then, move on and I will report out tomorrow from the conversation with the other SO and AC leaders and staff. Next item on the agenda. We have just about 15 minutes left. We need to get through the next two, which is the council discussion of our work prioritization.

Again, this is not specific to ICANN67 but it's the broader discussion of what's important, what is timely, or how we want to order our

work, being cognizant or acknowledging that we now have three PDPs ongoing that are going to take up a good bit of bandwidth for most of this year.

We've got, as we've discussed, Subsequent Procedures going to the end of the year, RPMs going through, potentially, October, and the ePDP Phase 2 effort going through June. We're limited in our ability to add new things and new PDPs to the pipeline but we have the list of 12 or 13 items that we discussed during our SPS. I've asked you all to socialize those with your stakeholder groups and constituencies. This is our opportunity to carry on that conversation.

I'm just going to ask if anybody would like to weigh in, if anybody has views about how we need to be thinking about this work. I'll note, here— this is important—I forwarded to the list just a couple of days ago the latest update to the ePDP Phase 1 recommendation 27 list. This is the wave one report that ICANN has been working to develop.

They've socialized it with the ePDP Phase 1 implementation review team, they've socialized it with us, and it is essentially the list of items of other impacted policies and procedures from the ePDP Phase 1 wrecks. That's, I think, one of the important things that we will need to tackle in the very near future. Rafik, over to you. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Hey. Thanks, Keith. I think in terms of the GNSO work prioritization we shared the list in the NCSG but it was pointed out that maybe there was some work that was not listed and is kind of important for

the council, maybe, to add. Just to share here, it's regarding the work of the IRD, the Internationalized Registration Data. That was, I think, put in the scope of the RDS Working Group but since we terminated it it's kind of now in limbo. So probably, just to add it somewhere and to bring it back. I'm not saying it's maybe something we need to prioritize or not but just to bring it back to the council radar in terms of work.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yep. Thank you, Rafik. That's an important point. I mean, in addition to the list of items that is now being put on the screen that we've identified previously, if there are things that are missing from the list then, by all means, folks should flag them and make sure that we've captured them.

And so, Rafik, you said that was the IRD? It was the Internationalized Domain ... I'm sorry. I missed the actual acronym and specifically what you were referring to so you just ... IRD. Yeah. Okay. Let's make sure that we capture that as something. Right. Internationalized Registration Data. Okay. Thanks, Rafik. Would anybody else like to speak to this issue? Any other issues that we need to capture? Any thoughts in terms of our ordering or prioritization effort?

I just want to note—this was something we discussed before and during the strategic planning sessions—that when we talk about prioritization or the ordering of the work, we're not saying that one thing is necessarily more important than another but there needs to be, I think, some review and some rigor about what is appropriate

at a given time and how much bandwidth is something going to take in the context of everything else that we've got going on.

For example, we may not be able to initiate a full-blown, large PDP this month or next month because of all the other PDP work that's ongoing. But if there are some smaller pieces or even if there's a PDP that could be very, very focused and very tightly managed with a smaller footprint, then that might be something that we want to prioritize or order earlier in the process.

I want us all to be thinking about this not just in terms of what you think is the most important or relevant to your group but, how do we understand what's important and relevant to us all in the context of what we can reasonably fit into the funnel? If that's helpful. I hope that provides a little bit more context as to how I think we need to be thinking about this. Michele, over to you.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. Within the Registrar Stakeholder Group, we've been trying to get some feedback from our members on what they consider to be the most important topics. I don't know if Pam or Greg want to speak more eloquently on the subject but I think the big takeaway was that the transfer policy was of a lot of interest and importance to people. But I think the point you made, as well, about resources, is something that we are all very conscious of. We really need to clear things off the list, off that project list, before we start adding anything else to it.

I mean, I think following from some of the conversations we had in Los Angeles around trying to do some targeting/narrow, etc.,

PDPs or whatever we want to call them, and I think that's something we definitely need to explore, I just don't know what that angle looks like. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Michele. Yeah. It's a good question. There are going to be some of these items that simply are not of interest or really don't impact one particular group or another. But at the end of the day, we've got to figure out how to come together and decide what we're going to have the council and—really more importantly—the community work on without overloading. And to your point, we need to get some of these things off the existing projects list. Okay. Anybody else like to get in queue? Any other thoughts? Any other inclinations from your respective stakeholder groups or constituencies? Pam, go right ahead, thank you.

PAM LITTLE:

Thanks, Keith. I just wanted to add to what Michele has said. I believe we originally planned from the strategic planning session in Los Angeles that we would discuss this at this meeting, in the February meeting, and hopefully be able to be in a position to make a decision on prioritization and maybe even a draft work plan for the council for the years ahead – for this year, at least.

We are two and a half weeks away from our next council meeting. I just want to remind our councilors, if you have not shared this list with your respective group, please do so. Hopefully, we could really make some decision about what the council will tackle in the next 12 months or so.

And of course, the point, Michele and Keith, you've made about completing some of those PDPs in order to free up bandwidth and resources, it's, to me, kind of a prerequisite for the council to even contemplate initiating a new PDP, whichever one which we ultimately decide to do first or take on first.

The RrSG is very conscious of the bandwidth and this competing interest in a very long list of work items that are potentially coming our way but we just need to be really disciplined and rigorous in our approach to decide what work we will tackle and the work plan going forward. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thank you, Pam. Yeah. There's no question that there's a lot on our plate now and there's more on the plate ahead. And so, again, this is a call for all of you, for each of us, to really spend some time and consider these things. At some point, I think council leadership working with staff will come up with a proposal to, basically, say, "Here's what we think based on the assessment of the topics, where they are in flight. Has something been on hold for years? Does it need to remain on the list? Are there things that are impacted by others?"

This is really important for that Rec. 27 from the ePDP Phase 1 list. If we're moving forward, implementing new consensus policy, are there other existing policies that are incompatible that we need to actually go through and have a process to clean that up? There may be some things on this list that are—I hate to use an overused term—low-hanging fruit? Can we reasonably take care of some of the low-hanging fruit in a shorter period of time using PDP 3.0

improvements to be able to knock some of these things out relatively quickly? Those are the questions we need to be asking ourselves. Steve, thank you.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Keith. I guess, sort of in line with what Keith was saying about there being potential inter-connections with other things—or dependencies, in fact—and, I guess, also consistent with what Keith was saying, it's not necessarily what may be most important to your specific SG or C but also that there could be, I guess, connections to other things.

I guess the example that I might use is that in the non-binding survey that was conducted at the SPS, something like IDN variance did not score well. And I recognize, of course, that it's not binding in any way, and I'm also not implying that the IDNs are a dependency the launch of new gTLDs but maybe it is.

And so, taking in account those dependencies and the effects from whether or not the work is either addressed now or deferred to later, you should take that into account, I guess, in determining where that applies in your prioritization. I just wanted to make that point. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Steve. Very helpful and I agree completely. Okay. I think we've beaten this one enough. Again, this is a call for everybody. This is a call to action. Please make sure you consider these and be prepared. At some point, leadership team and staff are going to produce a recommendation roadmap

for our consideration and the extent you can be up to speed on all of this, the faster we'll be able to move to a conclusion.

All right. We have four minutes left on the call so if we could go back to the agenda we have a few things under AOB and we'll try to get out of here on time. Let's see here. Okay. Item number nine, 9.1 was planning for ICANN67, questions for lunch with the ICANN Board. We're clearly not having lunch with the ICANN Board at this point so we'll move off of 9.1 and hold that conversation subject to the further discussions taking place tomorrow.

Okay. Item number two, council consideration of the draft GNSO council comments on the draft FY21/25 Op plan. John, is there anything that you would like to speak to with regard to the draft comments and the work that the SCBO has done? I'll hand it to John and then, Berry, if you've got anything that you'd like to add feel free to do so.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Not a whole lot to add. I just asked that everybody take a look at the comments. You'll notice a repeating theme of PDP 3.0 in there. And so, those councilors that are familiar with PDP 3.0, you'll see very quickly the gist of what we're getting at with some of these comments. And then, feel free to add any examples or any other issues you want to make sure that are covered.

I would also say if anybody on the call has project management experience there is also, I think, some point that we made to that effect. Really, I put this comment together, not by myself, but in a large part the outline coming out of the strategic planning session

and how that fits within the budget. So there's a lot of opportunity for folks if they want to dive into the document to still put some comments in.

It's a Google Doc. I'll just encourage people to look into it and maybe, Berry, if there's anything you want to say about version control and how to access it, anything like that, please come on. But if not, we just look forward to getting more input. It's due the 25th. Thanks.

BERRY COBB: Keith, I'm assuming you're going to either unmute or you were going to let me talk.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Berry. I was talking to myself on mute. I was just thanking John for his volunteering to be the chair of the SCBO and for the work that he's put into this. Over to you.

BERRY COBB: Thank you. Yeah. Just to follow up on what John said, if there is any additional input into the draft, please try to send that no later than tomorrow close of business or 23:59 UTC. Our latest draft does include some input provided by Pam but largely it's unchanged from what was sent to the council last week. Monday at 23:59, the SCBO will forward the final draft to the council and then, the following Tuesday, the 25th, we'll need to submit that to the proceeding by 23:59.

Again, there really haven't been hardly any changes at all but if you do have any suggestions or edits please get them in yesterday, basically. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Berry, and thanks to you for all of the work and support that you've put into this, as well. If I could ask that the draft comments be recirculated to the list with the link, to the Google Doc, so it's at the top of the inbox, so folks can take a look? But again, time is very short and it has been out there for a while. Not a lot has changed. This is going to be submitted before or on the 25th. Okay.

Moving on, then. Last item on the agenda is just to note that we have to decide as a council whether there's a response needed to the letter that we received from ICANN Org on December 5th. This relates to the clarification around data accuracy and ePDP Phase 2. We don't have time to go into the details on this one but I'm flagging it for folks.

This is a question about whether there needs to be discussion, further work, or requirements around data accuracy as it relates to the ePDP Phase 2 work. There was a bit left over from ePDP Phase 1 so I'll take an action item to circulate that to the list with some thoughts, but I just wanted to flag that as an action item that we've got open.

With that, is there any other business? Any other comments? Any other discussion points? Anything else anybody would like to raise before we wrap up? All right. I am seeing no hands. I am hearing

no voices. Thanks to you all for participating in our GNSO Council meeting today. With that, we will conclude the call. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]