
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council Extraordinary Meeting
Thursday, 16 July 2020 at 21:30 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/ucckfuCurTs3GNLEtgSDBP95W426L6ysgHNPqPYJyUyxU3ULNAWuZ7MaZ-WS9v9-Idx7v_G6TnAJlvYn

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/vpV8JOyhm43SYDhtASDUfAsW9XoLays0SVNq_NZzhq2VilFNQb1Y7YXNuRZhr5lv1htpdPulmEkPow

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 (absent)

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, Scott McCormick, Philippe Fouquart, Osvaldo Novoa, John McElwaine, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Juan Manuel Rojas, Elsa Saade (apology sent, proxy to Tatiana Tropina), 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 (absent)

ICANN Staff

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

Marika Konings – Senior Advisor, Special Projects

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

Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations

Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the extraordinary GNSO council meeting on the 16th of July 2020 focusing on GNSO work prioritization. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you ever so much. Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos. I don't see Sebastien in the Zoom room yet.
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.

MAIRE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks Marie. Scott McCormick. I do see Scott in the Zoom room.
John McElwaine.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe Fuquart.

PHILIPPE FUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Elsa Saade has sent her apologies and given her proxy to Tatiana Tropina. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Tatiana. Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Farrell Folly. I do see Farrell in the Zoom room. Juan Manuel Rojas. And Juan is also in the Zoom room. James Gannon.

JAME GANNON: [inaudible].

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Carlton Samuels. I don't believe Carlton has joined yet. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Thanks, Nathalie.]

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Erika Mann. I don't think Erika has joined us yet. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here, Nathalie, at least physically. It is 11:30 PM here, so mentally, it's a different question.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Maarten Simon. And I'll note for the record that Sebastien Ducos and Scott McCormick have confirmed they're on the call.

From staff, we have David Olive, Steve Chan, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Caitlin Tubergen, Ariel Liang, Amily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Terri Agnew, myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for recording purposes. And a reminder to councilors that we're now using the Zoom webinar room. You've all been

promoted to panelists. you can activate your microphones and participate in the chat as usual. A warm welcome to observers on the call who can now follow the council meeting directly. Observers however do not have access to their microphones, nor to the chat option.

As a reminder, all those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, Keith, and it's now over to you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Nathalie. Hello, everybody. Welcome to the 16 June [sic] extraordinary meeting of the GNSO council. This meeting has been scheduled with the express purpose of going through and trying to move forward on decision related to our GNSO work prioritization. I will be handing this over to Berry Cobb very shortly, but I just want to note that as most of you will recall, the GNSO council met in January in Los Angeles for our face-to-face strategic planning session.

We definitely spoke to and discussed work prioritization during that time, but I feel like we have been talking about prioritization without actually achieving any prioritization since that time. And we all understand that we've been in some challenging circumstances without face-to-face engagement, but it really is important for us as a GNSO council in terms of the program management and the project management aspect of our responsibility to start making some decision about how we're going to prioritize and to initiate new work.

As we all know, we expect several significant PDP efforts to either conclude or conclude in phases this calendar year, and this is the time we need to make sure that we're all on the same page about the dependencies among various programs and Work Tracks and that we are making informed decisions about where and when we will be able to initiate new work.

So this is a very important discussion for us today over the next two hours, and coming out of this, I think we need to have a much better understanding, picture and plan for initiating new work and to be able to start having those discussions and driving towards making a decision and making some actual progress on our prioritization efforts.

So with that, let me pause and see—I know we have an agenda item here about statements of interest. Does anybody have an update to their statements of interest before I hand this over to Berry?

Okay, not seeing any hands or hearing any voices, Berry, I'm going to hand this over to you and then we'll go ahead and kick things off and have a dialog about this. Thank you very much.

BERRY COBB:

Great. Thank you, Keith. Before we get started into the action decision radar, I'd just like to first state that in terms of setting up the recorded demonstration of the tool, I do hope that the council found that useful. It looks like 35 persons had access to the recording. We can't see whether the entire recording was viewed or not, but it is a positive sign that most did, and I'm hopeful that

the demonstration, being in a recorded nature, if anything does allow us to better devote our time here for substantive material instead of just hearing me roll on about how the tool works and whether you like it or not.

The second thing that I'd like to mention is really just to reiterate some of the disclaimers about this tool. Again, everything that is positioned here or stated in the tool as well as the action decision radar is really based on the best possible information that we have. And I just replied to Philippe's e-mail about the sources that made up the content, but this really ranged from the project list that the council's been using for quite a while, some of the concepts or features that have been used in previous strategic planning sessions, and as well as several work products that have been used recently to help define or help inform the council on possible paths forward. So I'd just like to state that, again, this tool doesn't presuppose any decisions that the council makes but it does presuppose possible outcomes, and that if those outcomes do materialize, it's really an attempt to document the possible greatest amount of effort. So kind of repeating from the recording, if the decision by the council was to launch a PDP effort and assuming that there were consensus recommendations out of that effort, and assuming that the council and board adopted those consensus recommendations, that it could ultimately lead to an IRT implementing those recommendations.

And if you really looked at some of the details about some of the in-flight or proposed PDPs, the duration that was assigned to some of those are really kind of thumb in the wind guesstimates based on kind of just general instinct, but again, it's not meant to

be a determinative set duration on how long a particular working group or IRT may take. One example of an IRT may show a 12-month duration because it generally kind of seemed that the complexity to implement may be less than another working group where an IRT may be showing an 18-month duration. But the idea of the concept there is so that we can really start to get closer to this idea or evolve into a concept where we understand what not only staff or the council's or the community's available bandwidth is, but what are impacts to if we don't deliver certain projects on time, what are the downstream effects to that and eventually get to an understanding of what our utilization rate is when we're considering decisions about when certain projects should be launched and so on and so forth.

As I also mentioned, we're going to make a best effort here to at a minimum update this tool, both the action decision radar as well as the program management tool on a monthly basis or as we encounter new additional information or perhaps unplanned work becomes a part of our pipeline, and I note that even in this current form—and I expect that this will evolve over time, but this is yet to be the silver bullet on prioritization, but I do think that it puts us in a good place of where we can be in a better position to start to make better informed decisions about when to launch certain projects or what are the implications for when we don't.

So with that, as you can see here on the shared screen, I don't think that we'll be using any of this today. I have it handy, should we need to reference it, especially from a work breakdown structure or understand some of the dependencies or not, but the

primary focus is mostly going to be about the action decision radar and any of the work products that might be used.

So essentially, the cadence here is I'm going to be starting at the top and we're going to work our way through the bottom as far as we can get to on each of the line items or program items that have a potential action or decision that the council will need to consider. I'll talk to one or two of them, and then I'll pause, in some cases maybe turn it back over to Keith so he can help facilitate any discussions as it relates to that action or decision. We'll wrap conversation about that topic and move on to the next one.

So starting at the list is highlighted in red and the intent with red is if you really think about a radar and you see an object right in front of you, that means that it's right upon you and it has immediate impact or potential for impact to your situation and your position. And the unplanned marker here is really not so much the substance of a particular topic that is on the council's plate, but my main intent here is to really start to better identify when unplanned work comes our way, mostly as it relates from a bandwidth and utilization perspective, because if these types of unplanned events cause additional work for the council and the GNSO community, that in turn has downstream effects to how we handle our current in-flight projects as well as may have downstream effects for any planned work that we do have. And so I'm certainly not wedded to what kinds of information would belong here, but what I've listed here now is the topic of DNS abuse, and it has been kind of a front and center topic that the community has been discussing for the last several months.

We really don't know what the outcome of those are going to be, but we should be monitoring for it, and there are certainly council action items to monitor those types of things such as collaboration with the other SO and ACs leaders, discussing this with the ccNSO and there's a Technical Study Group.

To kind of put in another example though, assuming that we were using this tool back at the end of 2017, the GDPR or possible EPDP and temporary specification would be a likely candidate that would fit in this unplanned type of section because it was something that we never really had in our existing pipeline. And as we know today, hindsight being 2020, it's led to a fair amount of work that the community has had to react to.

So I don't really want to spend any time about the particular topic, but that's the intent of the unplanned section. And I certainly welcome your feedback about how we can utilize this, and I see Keith's hand raised. I'll stop there.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Berry. I think it's really important that we do ensure that we have the ability to recognize and track when there is something that comes our way that is not previously on our radar. I think if you look back to 2019, it was probably the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model discussions, the effort that was initiated in Kobe and that Brian Cote led the effort to engage with the community.

That was something that was not on GNSO council or GNSO radar prior to Kobe. So I think that would have been an example

from 2019. Also, as you noted, EPDP and GDPR-related things, and now obviously we've been discussing DNS abuse now for the last 12 to 18 months in the community.

I think just very briefly, on this topic, the council needs to try to start figuring out what it is that we want to see come out of community discussions on DNS abuse. And our respective groups are going to have different views on this. But I think substantively and procedurally, we need to start to discuss as a council and with other parts of the community where we want this to go or where we think this needs to go. But the first question, I think, is going to need to be, what is the desired outcome?

And I think once we understand the desired outcome, we'll have a better roadmap or understanding of where the decision points might be and what processes we might need to follow.

So I just want to put a marker down for that one, and I see Flip has his hand up, so Flip, go ahead.

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you, Keith. Berry, it's quite late here, and before I forget, I would just like to raise a couple of questions that I have, because we have in front of us the section on unplanned, and that made me think of the possibility that there are a couple of things that are not listed yet. For example, in view of the reports that will very shortly come into our direction, the outcome of the working groups, RPM, SubPro, they will need an implementation, and I was wondering where you have put that, or if not, if we should put

it in the unplanned and we need to [inaudible] here. Thank you. And this is the implementation phase, I guess. Is that right?

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Flip. No, these two line items here, which fall within the three-month to six-month range, is based on what is communicated in the project list about the delivery of final reports for these two PDPs. The RPM phase one group is expecting to deliver its final report on or around mid-October and that's when the council will need to start considering that final report and come to a decision about whether they adopt the consensus recommendations, and conversely, the SubPro final report is on or around the December timeframe, again, roughly this three- to six-month bandwidth or this band.

And I'd note that it's only after the council makes decisions about adopting those consensus recommendations that then these would be pushed down beyond a nine-month timeframe, but ultimately, it would presuppose that the board would adopt those consensus recommendations that would then lead to an IRT. And this is why I kind of have this brought up.

And I know this is going to be small on your screen, but assuming here that the council deliberates and adopts the working group recommendations on SubPro, then the board, then we're going to execute an IRT: For example, we would have the IRT possibly starting around the July timeframe of next year, and that again assumes that the delivery of the final report will occur on time, it assumes that both the council and the board spend roughly two to three months to deliberate and eventually adopt those.

Again, I can't predict the exact time that it would do it, but then at some point in time, the IRT would be initiated. And let's just assume for a hypothetical that we approached the time when the IRT is coming to conclusion is when we would see an IRT line item return back to this list to announce back to the council that we're expecting that the IRT will come to a conclusion. They're going to announce a policy effective date and basically the tail end of what is termed within GDD's CPIF document about their process and procedure for implementing consensus policies through to a policy effective date.

FLIP PETILLION: Thanks, Berry.

BERRY COBB: And to your point, Flip, I think it's important that what I don't have on here—and there are a lot of moving parts here, so I'm definitely prone to missing a thing or two. As I've mentioned, this is going to be an iterative process. But what another candidate for the unplanned section might be is the outcome of the ATRT3 recommendations that are under public comment right now.

I believe we might have an action item about the council wanting to provide comments in that regard, but again, assuming that the recommendations that were offered in that review were adopted, it's likely that it could have a downstream impact to the work that'll be in front of the GNSO council.

I have accounted for ATRT4 in a longer-term project plan, but because we didn't have it in our project list, it just kind of escaped

my mind. But I do think it would be warranted to find a spot somewhere here on the action decision radar to keep tabs on the next steps through there.

Okay, I'm going to move down into the zero-month to one-month range marker. A few of these are pretty easy, so I'm going to go through a couple of them and explain a little bit in detail. And then when we get to the one about IDNs is when I'll turn it back over to Keith about opening up some conversation.

So the first one is the transfer program. This is easy. I marked it as crossed out mostly just to demonstrate that this is taking care of the, at the last council meeting, the council adopted a resolution for staff to start the issue report.

The next version of this, this row will be removed, but we know that the possible PDP on transfers doesn't go away. So if you were to move further down into this list in the one- to three-month range marker timeframe, down at the bottom, there's going to be an eventual decision for the council to determine whether they should initiate the PDP or not.

And so this'll eventually start to creep up to the top of the list as we get near to the delivery of the issue report after it's gone through public comment. But one of the other reasons why it's tightly coupled or within this range marker is because there is also an item from the recommendation 27 wave one report that was listed as high-impact that the council will need to consider how to get that resolved.

Staff is already taking the initiative to include that particular item listed in the wave one report as part of the issue report that'll be delivered to the council in the near term so that we're basically trying to identify and couple these issues that were impacted by the RDS or bound to be the RDS policy so that we can keep track of them coming to some sort of conclusion or outcome or decision on how they're going to be handled.

So like I said, in the next version when we have our council meeting, I'll send out a new update of this particular ADR and you'll see that the transfers one will be deleted and some of these will move up to the top of the list.

The second item here is specifically in relation to the Recommendation 27 wave one report, and I have this up here kind of as reference. If you were to review through the wave one report itself, there was a summary table that identified each of these impacted consensus policies as high, medium or low.

So ultimately, what this particular line item is for is really more informational at the current moment, but policy staff consulting with our GDD colleagues, we needed to understand what the workload would be like to handle those impacted policies that have a low impact that mostly constitute terminology changes to existing consensus policies.

So ultimately, I think by August, staff will have a presentation ready for the council to better inform how this will be handled. Again, not presupposing any particular outcome but what is likely going to happen is that in cases where there are low impacts to consensus policies that only require terminology updates, there'll

likely be some sort of redline form of that consensus policy. It will be collaborated with with some form of an IRT, whether that can be the existing EPDP one or some other form of an IRT, that it would go out through public comment, and then ultimately, assuming that there were no concerns about the redline form, that the updated consensus policy would be published on ICANN.org.

So there are several of those, and even some of these terminology updates are required for our medium and high impact impacts to the consensus policy. So we're going to eventually need to make decisions about how long we can last without making some of those updates, recognizing that there could be other work as it relates to policy changes. So, does it make sense to just make the textual updates now, or can it be coupled with possible down the line policy work? And can the community survive six, ten months, however long, without those updates being made?

So there's a lot of moving parts here. We'll have more information in August. And ultimately, we need to understand what are the bandwidth impacts here. But eventually, what has been identified here is going to be work required of the entire community as well as the council about making some ultimate decisions.

The next one I'm going to go through, this one is very easier, is the CCWG auctions. As you know, at the end of May, that group submitted their final report to the chartering organizations and I believe that at the council meeting next week, there's a resolution that'll be considered by the council about whether to accept this report or not. And assuming that the council did sign off on the report, of course, this particular line item would be deleted. It's not

yet clear what implementation may look like, should this be adopted by the council or all the chartering organizations and the board. It's something that'll be monitored, but I don't think that it has any direct impacts to other projects or ongoing work within the council. And we'll know how those things turn out down the road.

So now I'm going to move on briefly to the gTLD program and talk about the IDN operational track one and policy track two approach. Ultimately, this is a decision that is in front of the council that needs to be made as to how to handle the next steps regarding this work.

You'll recall that I believe earlier this year, there was a—late last year, but submitted the report earlier this year, an IDN scoping team came up with a possible approach for how to tackle some of the policy issues around the topic of IDNs.

I won't go into the details here and I'm certainly far from knowledgeable or expert when it comes to this particular topic, but in essence, there's a proposed two tracks. Essentially, track one is that in collaboration with GDD cross-community colleagues and contracted parties, they were talked through some of the topics that have been identified in the scoping report, and that the outcome of those actions will help inform the possible track two which is some form of a policy development process, which again could be a PDP or an EPDP. I believe the scoping report kept it as an EPDP. But really, the decision in front of the council right now is when should a decision be made about forming a chartering drafting team to eventually launch this potential policy work.

And I think basically, it's kind of immediately in front of us, and the next council meeting or two, there probably needs to be some sort of decision about what that's going to look like and when it's going to launch. Perhaps the decision may be to push it out later. I'm not going to presuppose the position, but the council should make some sort of decision that it can point back to when it's going to initiate the effort. So I'm going to stop there and turn it back to Keith, and perhaps if colleagues can answer any more detail questions about what the council should consider in relation to this topic.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. So yeah, I think on this one, there's been quite a bit of work already done on the topic of IDN variants and IDNs generally, including multiple iterations of the guidelines.

And I think it was back in May of last year, the board was moving towards approving the guidelines if I'm not mistaken, and we as the council said, wait a minute, please hold on a second, we think there may be some policy implications here as the IDN guidelines had essentially evolved over time, but become obligations rather than simply guidance on contracted parties.

So I think there's been some good work done here. I think the scoping team did very good work in terms of coming up with recommendations for us to consider as a council. And as Berry noted, we received that report I think back in January and we discussed it in our council meeting in February. So the clock is ticking here.

Also, in Kobe last year, the board called on the GNSO and the ccNSO to basically ensure that we're aware of one another's work, and the ccNSO has a PDP underway on this already. So I feel like this is probably something we need to prioritize and to start doing the drafting work for a charter, and I think that we probably need to start within the next meeting or two as Berry said, probably make a decision to charter that work.

I'm concerned that the ccNSO is doing its work, and if we don't initiate ours in a timely manner, at this point, we won't be able to ensure that consistency or ensure that there's not conflict between the various works. Rafik, go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith, and thanks, Berry, for this presentation. So I do agree about the priority. This was in our agenda I think for a while, and the scoping team delivered on time as expected. So I think as action, we should start or initiate the drafting soon. But wanted to add here more something that should be explored, and maybe that's for the drafting team to think about, is about maybe identifying the resources required here, and in particular, the composition of whatever working group end up with, because I think for IDN, there is some maybe knowledge or expertise that's required, and if we form that working group when we are asking the different SG and C and other maybe groups to have volunteers involved with that, we need maybe to identify an early stage and to start thinking more about how we are resourcing or forming those, populating those working group as early as possible to be able to have that expertise in the working group.

So I'm not sure if I missed something in the report, what was delivered by the scoping team, but maybe just something to have in mind.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. Yeah, I think your point is a good one in that we have to understand the availability of members of the community who have the requisite expertise to be able to do the job. But I think this is one that's been hanging out there a while and probably the only way we'll be able to determine availability is to actually issue the call for drafting team members. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CHAN:

Hi Keith, thanks. I think I want to draw a distinction. So in various description here, it shows that there's an operational track one and a policy track two. I think I just want to try to make it explicit that these two things don't necessarily have to go in lockstep, and part of that is due to the fact that the level of effort from the council is not the same for these two things, or at least it's not anticipated to be so.

For the operational track, as Berry had mentioned, it's primarily going to be GDD and the contracted parties working in collaboration to review the substance in the IDN implementation guidelines 4.0, whereas the track two, which is on policy, requires the charter drafting that you all mentioned. So the lift is potentially higher, and then perhaps the timeline there makes sense to target the August meeting as Keith mentioned. So I just wanted to point

out that those things do not necessarily need to be linked together from a timing perspective.

For instance, if the council wanted to give the green light to this operational track now, that doesn't prevent you from taking a little bit longer to track two. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Steve. It's a helpful distinction. I think the fact that GDD and the contracted parties will be working together to review the guidelines 4.0 is the right next step for that operational track, but I do think trying to get the call for drafting team members no later than our august meeting would be helpful. So from my perspective, moving forward on the operational track as described, now or whenever GDD is available and ready to begin, is the right thing to do. And then we should try to get our charter drafted for the PDP or EPDP work as soon as possible. If that means we use that call following our August meeting, I think that's a good target. Would anyone else like to speak to this before we move on? Any questions, concerns? Now is your opportunity to ask.

I don't see any hands. Berry, let me hand it back to you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. The next item is our RPMs program, and this is primarily the result of what was identified in the wave one report. As I noted here on this high-level chart, both the UDRP and URS were listed as high impact, and technically, there's two nested in URS. One is the URS procedures and the other is the URS rules.

Some of these do constitute just terminology changes, but when you look through the details of the items that were listed, specifically items two through nine of the URS procedures and items two through two, four through eight of the URS rules, had a high impact.

What I want to distinguish here is that UDRP is also mentioned and I think one of the things that we'll have to work with our RPM program owners as well as our GDD colleagues, as I noted to earlier, how long for example we know that phase two of RPMs is all about UDRPs. And whenever that launches, can the community survive a likely several years without making even small level edits to the UDRP based on implementation of the RDS policy, or do they need to make the minimal terminology updates in the meantime but still, there are likely substantive policy issues that need to be discussed for UDRP?

So just as a quick example, I think this is listed down here for UDRP. Ultimately, assuming that phase one completes their report on or around October, the next steps after the council considers that final report will need to start considering how to form a possible charter drafting team to review that charter. Likely, there would need to be a fresh call for volunteers. All kind of assumptions. I don't know what that looks like. But ultimately, what I have connected here is these impacts identified from the wave one report for UDRP. And again, I think we need to do a little bit more due diligence about how long the community can survive without making some of those terminology updates and it can be connected to this or ultimately, we make those terminology updates but still, those items that are truly policy impacts would be

connected to that future phase two PDP. But that's not the decision in front of the council right now. Ultimately, as we all know, we have a phase one RPM group that specifically touches on URS. So the council needs to make a decision: does it make sense that this group can consider these possible policy impacts on URS which could potentially mean a small change in scope, or is it better served that the council consider that these potential impacts be considered after the final report? But one way or another, we need to be able to identify how these impacts are going to be addressed and ultimately, that's what the particular decision is about.

Before I turn it back to Keith, I think staff has done some initial investigation, none of it written in stone. It does seem like some of the topics have already been considered or deliberated on within the phase one group, but there's likely still one or two, or possible three, components that haven't been considered that of course again is kind of a—from a project manager perspective, a slight change in scope because it was something that they had never considered as a part of their charter or what they're currently working on. So I'll stop there and turn it back to you, Keith. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Berry. I see Maria has asked a question in chat. You're welcome to speak if you'd like. And then John McElwaine has his hand up. Marie's question is, "Couldn't terminology changes be done at any time when staff has the bandwidth, not just RPMs? And then dependency will be, does the report mean that the URS

as is be changed? If so, pointless to make changes now, waste of resources.”

I think, Marie, those are all good and legitimate questions. I think what we have out of the recommendation 27 wave one report indicates where existing policy is not consistent with the new policy recommendations coming out of the EPDP phase one. And I think it really is a question of, is this something that we need to accelerate as the council and find a dedicated effort to deal with it, or is it something that can be folded into other work? And that would include URS for the phase one work that’s ongoing now, or the phase two UDRP work if we’re talking specifically about the RPMs here?

Marie, feel free to get in queue if you’d like to speak to it, but John, over to you.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks. First, I think this is a great tool. And as a member of the RPM working group and a council liaison to it, I see that topic up there and my initial thought is, yeah, boy, we need to be talking about this. I’m glad it’s front and center with a nice yellowish orange urgent highlight to it.

But curious to get a bit of take as, how are we going to utilize this? Because Berry is saying, will council need to deal with ...? Are we going to all take responsibility for this? Are we going to go over it in each meeting and the chair or the liaisons are going to be responsible for saying, “Hey, we need to do this RPM thing, we

need to look at this and see whether the URS rules need to be changed because they're about to finish up their work?"

So I'm kind of curious to understand practically how we use this tool to light a fire underneath our butts. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, John. It's a good question, and I think there's absolutely a role for all of us as council members, but our council liaisons to play an important role as we engage with the various groups where these impacts are taking place or scheduled to take place.

So I think the work that we're doing now in this conversation is intended to show everybody some of the tough decisions that we will have to make as council understanding that there are community and staff bandwidth limitations. But I think absolutely, all of us on council—and we may need to break out into small teams to focus on some of these things, but ultimately, I think the liaisons will have an important role to play. Would anybody else like to get in queue?

BERRY COBB:

Keith, if I may just add to that. I think in terms of the job description of any good program or project manager is somewhere in the middle of that job description is "constant pest." So until the council takes a decision on what is listed here, it's going to remain on the list, and by and large, with council leadership, we're still figuring this out. But we don't think it's going to be advantageous to have a consistent agenda item from one meeting to the next to just review the program list or the action

decision radar, much like we do the project list. That is the responsibility that all councilors and staff and leadership should be doing in preparation for every meeting.

So what we're contemplating is that the key most important ones that are in this zero- to one-month range will become individual agenda items by which to kind of assist the council in coming to some sort of decision about this.

So ultimately, in terms of why this particular item is here, it's certainly not staff's place to just automatically say, "Hey, RPM working group chairs, go handle this policy topic." This does have scope change implications. I can't see whether or whether or not it may impact the delivery of the final report, and that's ultimately why that decision is front and center in front of the council.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Berry. Any other questions, anybody else like to get in queue on this one? And I welcome our staff colleagues to weigh in as well. I see there's some activity going on in chat, but you're more than welcome to jump in as well. all right, Berry, let's move on.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. The next one is in relation to the curative rights mechanism for IGOs. You'll recall that the council decided that additional work needed to be considered in relation to one of the recommendations that flowed from the prior working group. Ultimately, through deliberations, and I believe the council made the decision to adopt the charter for this particular effort which

would be connected indirectly to the RPM working group. And I'm not going to go into the details about what that charter entails, but ultimately, this item is on standby because obviously, with the COVID-19 impacts that we've had, bandwidth concerns, there was some dialog between the GNSO council and the GAC leadership about understanding when they would have available resources to participate on this group.

So ultimately, in front of the council is to come to a decision about when the next steps need to take place, and basically, as I understand, those next steps are to do a formal call for volunteers and essentially establish a timeframe when we expect that this group would spin up. So the council decision is, should we do the call for volunteers, much like we're thinking about with the IDN ones, or should they council wait two or three months before doing that call for volunteers, recognizing that once the call for volunteers has occurred, we need to not only identify the volunteers, they need to be onboarded into the working group. Eventually, a first meeting is scheduled, and a chair needs to be identified, and some of those things. So it could be an additional roughly four to six weeks from the call for volunteers to the first day that that group would spin up. So if there's a delay of when we do the call for volunteers, that just delays that additional work to get that group started.

Keith, back to you, please.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Berry. I see Rafik has his hand up, but I'll just give everybody a quick update on the conversations that the council

leadership had with Manal, GAC chair, as well as Brian Beckham from the IGOs. Prior to ICANN 68, we had a touchpoint where we discussed timing and bandwidth availability of GAC members and IGOs to participate in this particular line item. And the response that we got was that they are ready and willing to engage and to participate when the GNSO council is ready to initiate the work, and that we agreed sort of tentatively that we would target a time frame after ICANN 68 but before ICANN 69, just in terms of trying to ensure that the work is initiated in a timely manner, that we don't let this sit out there for too long or too much longer, noting that there are some other IGO-related issues that have been pending with the board for quite some time, and that's something that we discussed during our GNSO council meeting with the board during ICANN 68.

So I think from my perspective on this one, targeting an August or September call for volunteers for the membership as well as for identifying a chair is an appropriate timeframe. I know that, as we start saying, "Okay, we're going to initiate this new work," there are pressures on other existing Work Streams as well as the bandwidth of staff and the community broadly that we need to take into consideration, but it's really important, I think, for us to start moving forward on some of these issues that have been pending for quite some time. So I'll stop there and hand it back over to Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. I understand it's about the next steps, as already described when we voted or approved the motion for this track, but just thinking, and also wondering here about one aspect that

we might have overlooked, is that this track is supposed to be within the RPM and with the expectation and the timeline they are supposed to deliver their final report around mid-October.

But the question here is more how the track—if we initiate this one, as you're suggesting, maybe around August or September, going through all the steps, and how that track will then be working when after the delivery of the final report from RPM and then we are also discussing. It's listed in the radar here, the rechartering of the RPM working group. So I think we need maybe here to discuss more, not necessarily right now, how that will work in practice, because the track is supposed to be within the RPM, but if the RPM working group will deliver final report and then we'll talk about rechartering, then maybe we have to terminate and so on. So I think probably we need to just discuss those elements before making any decision.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Rafik. It's a good point in that I think the intent was—and I know our intent was to allow this IGO Work Track to proceed independent of phase one or phase two, but I think your point is a good one that if phase one wraps up and then we have a phase two that needs to be rechartered, how do we ensure that the charter that we have approved for the IGO track survives in that umbrella? And how and where does it fit? And make sure we don't just have something standing alone without a governing document, I guess. So I think that's worth looking into.

But I think as we drafted and approved the charter for the IGO track already, it was intended to be able to proceed independent

of the other two on substance. So I hope that's helpful, but you're right, we need to make sure that we've got the appropriate language in place for creating the umbrella that we discussed for the Work Track.

Would anybody else like to speak on this one? I also just want to note that while we're considering prioritization and bandwidth and all of that, this is something that the GAC is focused on and it was, I believe, referenced in their communique coming out of ICANN 68, and a desire to see this one move forward. So I think this is one where there is some interest and attention, and something that we don't want to leave hanging out there for the reasons I discussed earlier, related to the other IGO topics that are currently pending with the board and have been for perhaps years now.

Berry, back to you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Moving on down the list, the last one for the zero-one-month range marker is the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. Obviously, this has been a topic in front of the community for a while. Near-term action or ultimate decision by the council, my understanding is there's an initial draft of possible comments coming from the council, that that will need to be reviewed and eventually distributed. And of course, there are a couple of action items related to webinars for PDP 3.0 and the outcomes from that effort to help better inform the community about how some of those pieces may fit into this evolution work that is also connected part of the larger five-year strategic plan and of course, this is supposed to be spread over that duration.

But ultimately, I think there's still some kind of known unknowns about what additional work that may mean for the GNSO or in particular the GNSO council once this particular line item is achieved from the public comment proceedings and the webinars, and I believe likely more additional information from ICANN Org that this will probably return back into the radar based on additional information as it becomes available. I'll stop there.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Berry. Rafik, over to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. Just about this item, we will share soon a draft comment regarding the evolution of multi-stakeholder model public consultation. We hope that we can review that quickly because of the time constraint, but that'll be done soon. So wait for the draft in your inbox. That's it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Rafik. Thanks for helping to shepherd that effort forward. Also, the second bullet point here is referencing the webinar that we planned on PDP 3.0 implementation and that's something that I think we'll be looking to get on people's calendars for a month upcoming prior to ICANN 69 certainly.

Okay, any questions or comments on this before we hand it back to Berry and go on to months one through three? Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. The first item here is for the council to consider the EPDP phase two final report. The council will recall that last month, a project change request was submitted asking for an additional month to deliver the final report by the 31st of July. As of now, that is still anticipated to be made. I don't believe that there's anything to discuss other than to state that after our council meeting next week—and we do another version of this that this particular program line item will shift up into the zero- to one-month range, again, assuming that there is a final report with consensus recommendations, that it's likely going to take the council a month or two to consider the output from that group. So it's here where it is.

I'm going to go ahead and move on to the next item, and I believe that the council is aware about the deliberations as it relates to the remaining items of priority two from the EPDP phase two. In particular, there is a small group that has been formed to determine how these can be met. The topics are essentially legal versus natural, the feasibility of unique contact, as well as accuracy. That group is still working through its proposal on how to potentially address some of this work.

In general, it kind of looks like there's two potential subtracks here, again not presupposing any particular outcome. One is that the legal versus natural and feasibility of unique contacts could potentially be an extension of the phase two group on some limited time, and then a second track would be how the topic of accuracy could be addressed.

Without getting into details here about the topic of accuracy, what I do want to point out is there were discussions or deliberations

about the topic of accuracy in all of the EPDP deliberations, but what has recently come onto our radar is some additional topics that could potentially be grouped around the topic of accuracy.

Recently, the council sent a letter back to the ICANN board about the two recommendations that were passed to the GNSO as a result of the WHOIS review team. One of those recommendations, recommendation CC.1 basically stated that the council's message was that if there are any policy considerations around this topic, that the council would consider it at that time.

Again, not going into the details of it, but it's likely possible that the recommendation that was passed to the GNSO could potentially be considered in this larger topic of accuracy, and then of course, the phase one recommendation 27 wave one report listed two potential impacts to existing consensus policy, the restored name accuracy policy as well as the WHOIS data reminder policy having low and medium impact respectively. Not getting into the details, but in reviewing some of the impacts that were identified, seemed to have kind of a natural affiliation to this topic of accuracy. So I believe the small team is still working through a proposal and I believe there'll be an update as it relates to EPDP phase two in general as well as these remaining items for the council meeting next week, and likely some sort of possibility for some decision by the council at its August meeting. I'm going to stop there on those two and turn it back to Keith to see if there's any questions about this.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. So yeah, I think on this one, obviously there's a couple of dependencies here on the full council consideration. One is the finalization of the EPDP phase two final report and delivery to the council for our review and considerations, and then also the work of our council small team to come up with a recommendation about the remainder items or additional items for consideration.

I really do appreciate the fact that you got to a level of detail here on this particular line item or line items where you identified some of the other dependencies or areas where there may be some overlap with the topics that have been identified as requiring some additional work.

So I think it's important that as we talk about program management, we understand where these things overlap and where they have implications for one another as we try to figure out how to chart the path forward.

So, would anybody like to speak on this? We don't need to get into the substance of the ongoing deliberations of the EPDP phase two work, but just in terms of process and trying to plan our work, any questions or comments here? Is that the wave one report that we're looking at?

BERRY COBB:

The first quick snapshot was just the letter that the council sent back, and then this particular view is the possible next steps document based off of the wave one report, and this was

predominantly the input that fed into the program tool, and ultimately the ADR.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Berry. Any questions or comments before we move on? Berry, back to you.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Keith. I see we have about 24 minutes remaining. I believe we have ten minutes on the agenda item for Any Other Business, and I might want to talk about one or two of these down towards the bottom of the list just to complete the overall cadence or concept of how this tool is to work.

The next one is still within the RDS program, and this deals with the WHOIS procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts. Oh, I'm sorry, 53 minutes. Wow. Handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy. The council, you may recall, this has been in a holding pattern on the council project list since I believe around 2015-ish, 2016, somewhere in there. Ultimately, as the council was trying to determine next steps on how to handle this particular policy, whether to reengage with the implementation advisory group, those kinds of things, then we were confronted with GDPR and EPDP so the council ultimately made a decision to postpone or stall any additional work as it related to this topic.

Now that the EPDP is close to wrapping up, the recommendation 27 wave one report also identified potential issues as it relates to this consensus policy. So really, I think that this is a larger topic of discussion amongst the council about what it is that it really needs

to do next. There are two action items kind of listed here. If this policy continues forward, there are going to be some terminology updates. I believe the review of the wave one report didn't determine any substantial impacts as it relates to changes to that procedure, but other than just terminology updates.

The secondary action item is about engaging GDD about input and experience, or the efficacy of the procedure. To my knowledge, I don't believe that this particular procedure has been invoked, so I'm not sure there's really additional information there.

Ultimately, there needs to be some decision made by the council as to how we're going to handle this topic. I'm sure there's a range of options. One, from the far left, might be to take no action at all. Some intermediate or in-between type actions are to at least make the terminology updates and decide or come to some sort of decision that perhaps the procedure will be considered a few years down the road, or the other spectrum about determining whether this policy is even applicable, some of which might still require some effort to determine what that looks like, either at a council level or across the GNSO. So I'll stop there and turn it back to Keith. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. I saw Pam had her hand up and Michele has his hand up, and there's been some chat activity as well. Michele, over to you, but I think we'd all very much value any recommendations. Obviously, this is something that's been deemed unworkable in its current form, but if you have a concrete

suggestion or recommendation about how the council ought to consider next steps, I think that would be helpful. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. My more facetious suggestion would be to take it out the back and shoot it, because in its current form it is completely useless. So the policy itself isn't the issue. The issue is the implementation of the policy. The policy as one could—updating the language so it's consistent with other policies, contracts, etc., that I would not see as being particularly problematic. The issue is with the actual implementation. Berry's suggestion to ask GDD is going to get you nowhere because nobody can actually use it in its current form, which it is effectively the most useless policy in relation to WHOIS that ICANN has ever managed to create. Which is no small feat, but it has actually managed to create an absolutely pointless policy because there's no way for a contracted party to actually trigger the damn thing.

So it's the implementation that's the problem, and I think others apart from myself were around when we last tried to fix this and we ended up being kind of pushed into a corner and it just didn't work out very well. I would hope—and if I was into prayer, I would pray—that thinking has evolved a bit and that fixing the implementation to make the triggers accessible and usable by a contracted party would render this policy of some value. But the current implementation is an absolute nightmare.

We did park it because we were waiting to see what was happening with RDS and then with what became the EPDP. So revisiting it in the not too distant future would not be a bad thing at

this juncture because all of that stuff has moved on. There was no point in revising it or doing anything with it when all of that was in process, which is why we agreed to pause it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks? Michele. I see that there's some discussion going on in chat as well. Pam, I'll come to you next, but I wanted just to note that—maybe staff can help me understand, in terms of if the policy could use some tweaking and the implementation needs to be revamped, what would the process be? What would the council's action be? Is there a review that's required? Essentially, triggering a new policy process to update the preexisting one? I'm struggling a little bit to understand what the choices are before us based on the feedback that we're hearing. But Pam, let me hand it over to you.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith. Hi. I just want to add on to what Michele has said. This policy apparently has never been invoked by any contracted parties, so it brings to the question whether it is really fit for purpose. So I'd really like us to think about whether the council needs to correct course. If my memory serves me right, the council did pass a resolution back in November 2017 that we would relaunch this IAG to get advice for the council to consider some of the public comments.

At the moment, as you can see, as currently stands, it allows two triggers. One is if a contracted party is already in violation of local laws, so they're pursued by a local regulatory body, and then they

name collision go to ICANN, say, “Please, can I have exemption so I don’t have to comply with WHOIS?”

The new trigger that was added on after the revision was to get a statement from your local DPA to say the WHOIS obligation actually in conflict with your local laws. So to me, these are really quite—as Michele said—unworkable, and just really backwards, because it doesn’t make sense for a contracted party to operate in a country where they must comply with applicable local laws and regulation who then need to seek an exemption or a waiver from ICANN to say, hey, please, can I not comply with this particular WHOIS obligation so I can comply with my local laws and regulations? To me, that burden is really quite unfair. It should not be on the contracted parties to demonstrate there's such a conflict.

And it’s not just WHOIS there could potentially be conflict between local laws and ICANN requirements. There could be other contractual obligations or consensus policy that would have conflicts arise. So I just find the principle of having such a procedure in place quite unusual and odd. And I also note for example in the EPDP phase two now, there's some potential recommendation about automation of response to request, and the recommendation is likely to be the contracted party just need to make a determination whether such automation is in conflict with your local law and if so, you just need to notify ICANN.

I think something like a notification process is more appropriate to handle conflicts between local laws and ICANN contractual obligations or consensus policy versus some sort of codified procedure like this. And so I really would like us to think about

whether we need to really shift our thinking rather than just kind of stuck with this procedure that is with us, and maybe the procedure has come to its use by date. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Pam. Much appreciated. Anybody else like to get in queue on this one? There's quite a bit of discussion going on in chat. So I think at the outset, Berry sort of laid out a range of options. One would be to let it sit and do nothing. I don't know that that's the right thing for us to be doing. But there may be some tweaks that are required to the policy language, but also, it seems pretty clear based on this conversation that the implementation of the policy is not workable and that it needs to be reviewed. And if we're going to achieve that, then it means probably repopulating the IAG and having that group give it another go. Michele, you're next.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. The problem—sorry, I'm having flashbacks because I lived through that IAG. The problem was that several of us put forward, okay, alternative paths that would kind of make the policy workable so that you wouldn't end up in this farcical situation where the only way you could trigger it was when you were already being sued or being fined by your DPA or basically already in an absolutely ridiculous and impossible situation.

It's like saying, I don't know, let me think of a completely ridiculous policy. Okay, if ICANN had a policy that mandated that you had to murder people, that somehow we'd ended up with this policy. So

obviously, that's illegal, but I would have to be already in court defending that before I could get a [trigger.] I don't know. That's an actually terrible analogy.

It is absolutely ridiculous. So what we had requested was that getting a legal opinion from a law firm to show—would start the trigger. This does not mean that you'll automatically get anything, but that would start the process. And that was knocked down and that's why we have this ridiculous situation at the moment.

I would hope that people would realize at this juncture that it is absolutely ridiculous, but I don't know if reopening this is going to lead to the same farcical situation. The only way to fix it is to reopen that and fix the implementation, or alternatively, as a contracted party, if I've got to choose between an ICANN policy and the law, I am going to choose the law.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele. Marika, I see you've typed in the chat some language from the approved charter. Would you like to speak to this at this point?

MARIKA KONIGNS:

Sure. Thanks, Keith. I just wanted to point out that I believe the charter, as it was drafted, tried to focus indeed on some of the issues that Michele flagged and is really focused on looking at the implementation of the policy, and hopefully addressing some of the comments that were made in response to the public comment forum that was held that helped inform the council's decision to develop a charter for this group. I think as Berry already noted,

this charter has been adopted. I think Kerry Ann call for volunteers has been drafted. It's really about deciding if or when that call for volunteers should go out or whether the council wants to have another look at the charter it originally adopted to see whether any changes are necessary. But as I think Berry pointed out as well, the launch of the call for volunteers was originally paused as indeed it wasn't clear how this would intersect with the work on the EPDP and whether some of it would potentially be addressed or no longer be necessary as a result of that work. But now with that work coming to completion, especially those groups that [inaudible] to be impacted or would be the users of this procedure which are contracted parties, may have a better insight on whether or not the EPDP is addressing some of these issues. And again, may need to review this charter to see if it's still fit for purpose as well as what will be the urgency of initiating this work and launching that call for volunteers, or reviewing the charter, or do something completely different.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Marika. That's helpful. And thanks for providing the language that you did. So I'll just note that I've got Pam and Rafik in queue. We'll go to them shortly, and then move on to the next item. But there's no imminent or urgent decision required of us here. We're obviously waiting for the finalization, as Marika noted, of the EPDP phase two report. We have the phase one policy. And we'll need to do a review of this. It'd probably make sense to pull a small team together to do that review of the charter and to try to make a recommendation on next steps. But it seems to me that we have, as I said, a policy in place that needs

to be tweaked or likely needs to be tweaked, and an implementation that needs to be reviewed because it's not functional. And the question is, how do we achieve that? And/or, does the policy just need to be overturned? And then how would we achieve that? So I think those are the questions that we'll probably want the small team to consider. Pam, and then Rafik, and then we'll move on.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith. Just very quickly, yes, I agree we probably should get a small team to look into those you just touched upon, and I'm happy to volunteer and maybe invite other contracted parties, colleagues or even other councilors if you're interested.

I just want to make one point. The whole purpose or point of this procedure is because we recognize there were conflicts between ICANN requirements in the contract or consensus policy and local law. But subsequently, we had GDPR and we had temporary specifications. We also initiated EPDP. All these efforts, temporary specifications and EPDP, are designed to address those conflicts, to make sure the ICANN contractual requirements, consensus policy are compliant with GDPR.

So I just feel like the parameter or the basis have changed, have shifted, and therefore it really is time to revisit that procedure and whether it's still necessary. I'll stop there. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Pam. I think that's a good point, and I'll just note I typed in the chat that yes, while we're all familiar with GDPR, GDPR is not

the only privacy law that contracted parties will have to deal with, and so I think it remains to be seen whether a functional procedure along these lines could be necessary or perhaps not. And I guess that's really one of the open questions in my mind.

So Rafik, over to you, and then we'll move on.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. I think a lot was said, and I'm going to follow up on what Michele was suggesting. So I guess the big question here, we had or we have this—we voted on launching the IAG a while ago and it was on hold. So now decision is even to question if we still need that vehicle or not. So I'm fine with having a small team to kind of start reviewing the charter, but I guess also the question is maybe to not get stuck and what kind of vehicle here to use, but just really more to clarify the scope and what needs to be done, and also, hearing all the concern from our colleague and Registrar Stakeholder Group, I think it's good to have also, get sense from them about the priority [inaudible] will help us and how and when we need to decide on this matter.

So I think the small team to do a review of the charter and sharing their findings with the council will be helpful to decide for next steps, and also if they can suggest a practical option on how to deal with this. So why I'm saying this? Because having the charter and IAG doesn't mean that we have to go with that option if it's not fitting anymore. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. So yes, completely agree about the need for further understanding of the prioritization and bandwidth available, and I think there's also been quite a bit of engagement in chat on this one. So why don't we take an action item right now to issue a call for volunteers for a small team to contribute to reviewing the charter for this IAG and to come back to the council with some recommendations about possible next steps?

And with that, I will draw a line under this one. We have just a little bit more than 30 minutes left, so Berry, I'm going to hand it back to you. Let's keep plugging away.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Moving on down the list, this one's probably just informational at this point, but it has been on the council's radar for a little bit. And this is essentially within the phase one IRT, there's about the potential or possible impasse that may arise as a result of implementing the EPDP's phase one recommendation around the transfer of registration data from registrar to registry and whether it may or may not interfere with the Thick WHOIS consensus policy. The council will recall we received a letter back from the board in this regard and the council's also tasked Sebastien, the IRT liaison, to do an analysis about what he sees.

I think I'll just conclude on this topic to state that it's my understanding that the IRT will be meeting next week. The recommendation 7 is on the agenda and I believe we've added this as an update item under Any Other Business for next week's council meeting to determine what next steps, if any, may arise out of this.

And so if you don't mind, I'll continue on to the next one, which takes us into roughly the same topics, also identified from the phase one recommendation 27 wave report. There are high impacts in relation to the Thick WHOIS transition policy as well as the consistent labeling and display policies. These are independent of course to the outcome regardless of the outcome from the IRT. Both of these consensus policies will still continue.

Based on the analysis done in the wave one report, at some point in time, the council will need to consider how to address these issues. It's a little bit uncertain to say what the next steps will be on this. I think ultimately, we'll have to see over the course of the next month or two based on additional information, but at some point in time, these policies will need to be addressed and considered via the council, whether that be through another EPDP or an issue report or the like. So really, kind of to be determined based on additional information. Before I move on to the next one, I'll just pause there if there are any comment in relation to these two.

Seeing and hearing none, like I said, this'll be a topic on next week's council meeting and we can go from there. So moving on to the line item of operations, the council will recall—of course, this was done a while ago so it's a completely different council, but back in 2015, the council adopted recommendations as it related to the policy and implementation working group that eventually came up with consensus recommendations that formed what we know now, such as the EPDP, items like the GGP, basically a variety of tools and mechanisms by which to address certain policy topics or implementations.

One of the key recommendations from that final report was that the original recommendations as well as the implementation of it should be considered five years after that final report was submitted. And essentially, that's on our doorstep now. So ultimately, the council is going to need to determine how and when it wants to consider or review those recommendations and kind of some of the WHOIS procedure conversation. It's possible that there's a range of options. Starting on the full left is that we initiate a group to review those, or the far right of the spectrum could be that the council decides to postpone any review down the road.

I think this is one of these candidates where the in terms of the topic of prioritization and what's urgent and most important in front of the council, this is a potential candidate for one that could be pushed down the road, if for anything else, not absent of bandwidth issues to be able to address this, to my knowledge, the only mechanism that has been used from the output of this particular working group was the EPDP so it could be quite possible that there's not enough information to conduct a review. So perhaps additional time might be warranted before review of that.

If that was to be considered by the GNSO council, I do believe that in terms of formalizing the decision would probably—it should be a motion recognizing that this would be taken up or addressed in 12 to 18 months, or if the council decides to do work on it now. But some sort of formal decision that can be documented so that we can have a point or two for the next steps.

Any questions or comments as it relates to that one? Probably not, but perhaps by August or maybe September, the council, we can tee this up for some kind of decision to move forward with it.

Moving on to an accountability program, and essentially, this has been on the council's radar for a little bit. As you recall, the CCWG on accountability had a Work Stream 2 that created a series of recommendations that do have a potential impact on the council's work. Essentially, the council agreed to form a small team to review the next steps. The link there is a link to I believe an announcement or a blog about the next steps as it relates to Work Stream 2 that was submitted by Org and essentially, the small team on the council will review those next steps and provide additional information to the council for any possible next steps that it should consider.

I think I'll end on this particular topic by stating that it's my understanding based on how we have listed in the project list, there's also been what I believe from a number of days has been the geo regions review final report that is still listed out on the project list. My understanding is there's a possible dependency. So just real quick, this is the announcement I'll paste into the chat. But that there's a possible dependency based on how some of the Work Stream 2 recommendations would be implemented, that there's at least some synergy or possible dependency in how the community will potentially implement the output from the geo regions review. So at least for now, it made sense to try to couple these two together for any potential next steps. I'll pause there for any comments or questions.

And yes, to Tom Dale's point in the chat, ATRT3 recommendations, I haven't studied them intimately, but I believe he is correct that there are potentially some overlaps or some impacts as it relates between the two outcomes.

The next few of these, we should be able to run through fairly quickly. There's two line items again as part of the RDS program. There's additional wave reports that will be delivered to the council in the near term, I believe maybe towards the end of July or early August, but essentially, it'll be two additional reports basically structured or framed the exact same way as the wave one report. I don't know the exact scope of these, but I believe that they will provide information as it relates to at least one IRT that is standing, the PPSAI that is on hold as well as the remaining consensus policies that may be impacted as a result of the EPDP phase one recommendations.

So these are kind of all clustered together, kind of pending additional information, but I suspect that within the one- to three-month range, there'll be additional information for the council to consider as it relates to these initiatives. And ultimately, the decisions will need to be made about what the next steps of these particular efforts are.

The wave 1.5 report and wave 2 report likely will have downstream bandwidth considerations for the council to review through based on what that analysis, the outcome or output of that particular analysis likely will eventually produce additional actions or decisions for the council to consider. But other than that, these are kind of just placeholders that this work is heading our way.

And I think basically, to try to close out this particular range marker, as I noted too earlier, the staff is working on the transfer issue report that should be delivered to the council likely by either late August, September timeframe because which the council will consider whether to spin up a working group to address those items. Again, just to repeat but highlight that at least this is one potential coupling that we have identified from the wave one report that will be considered as part of the issue report, and then lastly, as noted, we've already talked about the IDN track two activities.

And then moving down into the three- to six-month range, as I noted earlier, we've got two PDPs that are targeting or tracking to delivering their final report around the fourth quarter of the calendar year, so those will be coming towards us. And then moving in lastly into the six- to nine-month range, we've talked about phase two UDRP, should the phase one conclude, and when the next steps on that would be. My understanding, the SSR2 review team will be concluding its efforts around the November-December timeframe and I believe they recently have had a public comment on some of their draft recommendations and I think that there's potential there that is worthy of the council's attention. Exactly what it means from a bandwidth, implementation perspective, is yet to be determined.

And then the last one—and this is probably one of these decisions that the council will need to make sooner rather than later, is in relation to the expiration program. Now, I listed it down here at the very bottom just from a conceptual testing perspective about how the council should try to balance the prioritization of these particular projects.

As a result of or an output of the ERRP, which I believe was titled the PEDNER working group, that concluded back in 2013-ish or 2012-ish, somewhere in there, eventually evolved into what is now the ERRP policy as it relates to the expiration of domain names.

One of those recommendations was to review the implementation of that policy, and it's been on our project list for quite a while. But there never seemed to be an urgency to address it and in terms of the other urgent items going on, it made sense to kind of put this one onto the back burner. But the heat is starting to get turned on a little bit, because primarily, if for anything else, the EDDP and the ERRP, two separate consensus policies related to expiration, were identified as medium and low impact. And even the low impact on the ERRP has a possible policy implication and not something just as simple as a terminology update.

So in terms of understanding what is the degree of urgency by which the council should consider this, unlike some of the other policy topics that exist within some of our other programs, as an example or two my knowledge, I haven't heard of any issues related to expiration. So the question then we would ask ourselves, is this something urgent that needs to be addressed? Maybe not, but because it was identified as part of the wave one, maybe some of that urgency is increased. But is it enough for the council to make a decision about how it's going to be addressed right away? Factoring in what we discussed earlier, can the community make some of these terminology updates in the near term but still survive a year or two years down the road before that policy is reviewed?

But at any rate, at some point the council's going to want to make a decision much like what we've done with the transfer policy, that perhaps the next step is requesting from our GDD colleagues to produce a policy status report, take into consideration these are items that were identified from the wave one report, have the council review the outcome of that report, and determine if there are any additional policy implications that need to be done that if were identified could potentially lead to a PDP.

And the last thing I'll say, and call it a day basically, is we've identified some primary and secondary program owners. This is really meant for Steve and staff to kind of identify top-level ownership on some of these key programs. This is not a mutually exclusive thing. Many of staff worked across multiple programs, but we felt it would be helpful to have kind of primary and secondary go-to staff members that the council can tap on the shoulder, should they have specific questions about any of the projects that exist under here.

So with that, I'll pause here and turn it back over to Keith. Again, I hope you liked this. I believe staff is really digging this new tool and we'll see how it works over the coming weeks and months. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Berry. Before I make some sort of wrap-up remarks, I see Michele has his hand up. If anybody else would like to get in the queue, feel free to do so. We'll try to move to a timely conclusion. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Just on this thing around the expiration, PEDNER thing, just from a registrar side, I'm not aware of any issues with the current policy that need to be address, whereas, say, with transfers, there definitely are issues that need to be addressed. I don't know if anybody else has any thoughts to the contrary, but it's one of those things that I don't see as being particularly broken. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Michele. And again, we'll probably, as we look ahead, start trying to identify some council leads or small groups to come together to make recommendations. I see that Greg is agreeing with Michele in chat, and Pam as well. Pam, your hand is up. Go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Thanks, Keith. I'm going to talk about different topic, if I may. Tom has raised in the chat about the ATRT3 final report, and his comment that it may affect the Work Stream 2 work. So I'm just wondering whether the council really should form a small team to provide some comment on the ATRT3 final report, especially on those recommendations that would affect Work Stream 2.

I would also note that in the final report, the ATRT3 report, the SAC 111 paper was raised as a cause for concern of GNSO PDP process, the EPDP process in particular. So maybe we could also add that as council response. So just want to throw that out there and see whether councilors, especially those who are in the Work

Stream 2 small team, would be willing to kind of shepherd the effort to respond, to provide a comment. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Pam. I think that's a good suggestion. And we've got a public comment period for ATRT3 closes on the 31st of July as Ariel has put into chat. Thank you for that. And Cheryl has noted that she's happy to assist the group, obviously as having been one of the co-chairs of the ATRT3. Thank you, Cheryl. So I think that's a good suggestion. I see Tom is also typing in chat as well.

Okay, I think we can move to wrap things up. I just want to say thank you to Berry and for staff for all of the work that's gone into not just developing the tool that will be operating in the background in terms of tracking, but really the output, this radar document I think is going to be very helpful for us as council to understand where there is overlap, where there are dependencies, and in looking at these in terms of timeframes.

I think it'll help us plan our work and plan our discussions and to ensure that our agendas on a monthly basis for our regular meetings are driving towards decisions. In other words, we ensure that we have sufficient time on our agendas to discuss issues and that we can actually start scheduling decision points.

As I said, we've been talking about prioritization for this calendar year, and it is now coming time for us to start making some decisions. And we have the opportunity to do that because there are some existing PDPs that are nearing their conclusion, freeing up bandwidth for the community and staff.

So I think that this has been a very helpful discussion. Berry, again, thank you for all the work that you've put into this, and for running through this today. And really look forward to everybody's input and really as a council, we need to make sure that we are working together but not waiting for our monthly meetings to do all our work. So I think we're going to have to really start shifting to identifying small teams, making sure that there are people who have the lead on a particular topic and that we're able to advance our work intersessionally, essentially between the monthly meetings.

So I really want to thank everybody, and thanks, everybody who joined this call in a difficult time frame or time zone. I know there's no good solution for everybody, but thank you for enduring this. We will go ahead and wrap things up. Thanks, all, and we will conclude this meeting.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's call. Have a [inaudible] rest of your day or night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]