
ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO Council Meeting
Wednesday, March 11, 2020 – 15:00 to 17:00 CUN

KEITH DRAZEK: All right, Nathalie. Let's go ahead and get started.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Keith.

Tech support, could you please start the recording.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is being recorded.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 11th of March 2020.

Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it. Thank you.

Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

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.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg Diabise.

GREG DIABIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon.

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tom Dale.

TOM DALE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks, Marie.
Scott McCormick.

SCOTT McCORMICK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: John McElwaine.

JOHN McELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, John.

Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

Philippe Fouquart.

I believe I saw Philippe in the Zoom room. We'll circle back to him.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Can you hear me?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Perfect. Thank you, Philippe. Wonderful.

Oswaldo Novoa.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Sorry about that.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Osvaldo.

Rafik Dammak.

RAFFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

Elsa Saade sends her apologies and has given her proxy to Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Present for both myself and Elsa.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Farell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Juan Manuel Rojas.

Juan, you may be muted.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (indiscernible).

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Perfect. Thank you.

James Gannon.

JAMES GANNON: Sure.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Carlton Samuels.

I don't see Carlton in the room yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Present, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

Erika Mann.

I don't see Erika in the Zoom room.

Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

On the call, we also have GNSO and technical support staff.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for recording purposes.

Reminder to councillors that there is no secondary Zoom room as per our habit during face-to-face council meetings. To other participants on the call who would like to follow this session with the live scribing, please don't hesitate to use the closed caption option at the bottom of the Zoom room.

Over to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. This is Keith Drazek, the GNSO chair. And I'd like to welcome ever to the first public council meeting, GNSO Council meeting, that's being held virtually, entirely virtually. And just

to note that we have a formal council meeting before us, but we also, on the line and in the Zoom room, have guests and visitors and observers. And you are all very welcome to observe the GNSO Council at work over the next two hours.

At the end of the council meeting, we will have an open mic under AOB. And so if anybody has questions along the way, please make a note of it, and we will ensure that there is some time allocated at the end for any questions for the GNSO Council.

So thank you, all, very much for joining us today. And we hope it's interesting.

So with that, what I will do is just do a quick review of the agenda. But first, let me ask if there are any updates to statements of interest from GNSO Council members.

I'm not seeing any hands, so I will take that as no updates to statements of interest for this meeting. And we will then move on to a review of the agenda.

So after we address some administrative issues, we'll have a short review of the projects and action items list. And I say a short review because the -- the next substantive item on our agenda is actually a deep dive on the GNSO projects list. And I'll provide a little bit of context here for councillors as well as for our observers.

In January of this year, the GNSO Council met face to face in Los Angeles for a three-day strategic planning session. This was the third strategic planning session that the GNSO Council has done over the

last three years. It's essentially become an annual -- annual gathering. During that strategic planning session, we spent quite a bit of time going over the projects list or the action items. But there was a recognition that the projects list is really something that we as GNSO Council and councillors need to have a solid grasp of in terms of being able to manage the policy processes and the follow-on implementation work and engagement that we're responsible for.

So just as a little bit of background, the GNSO Council is the body, the policy-making -- sorry, the policy management body that manages GNSO PDPs or policy development processes. And as the process manager, it's really, really important for the GNSO Council and all councillors to have a solid grasp of the work that is before us, the work that has been pending for a while, the work that needs to get done. And this all fed into a further discussion on prioritization and prioritizing the work of the GNSO, the GNSO Council, supporting our PDP working groups and leadership, and essentially recognizing that there is currently more in our funnel than we're able to conclude in any given calendar year.

And so that led to, I think, some healthy discussion at the council level about how are we going to understand the work before us and then prioritize it appropriately.

So the council agenda for today's meeting is a deep dive on the actual projects list. And when we get to that, we will rely heavily on the support of our ICANN staff colleagues in terms of getting through

some of the detailed substance of where we are, where things came from, and where they are in progress.

And then at the end of the council meeting, before we get to any other business, we will then transition to a further discussion of the prioritization work.

Coming out of the strategic planning session in January, the GNSO Council and councillors took it upon themselves to work with their stakeholder groups and constituencies to go through the process of trying to help identify what the priorities were for their respective groups. And this today is an opportunity for us to come back together and to compare notes on things that the various stakeholder groups and constituencies see as priorities for them. And then following from that, we will end up with, you know, some better information, some more information that the GNSO Council leadership will then work with staff on to develop a -- you know, sort of a framework for feedback about next steps and about prioritization.

So we have two substantive issues on the agenda. Item 4, which is the projects list review. And item 5, the GNSO Council discussion on work prioritization for 2020 and, really, 2021, because there's, as I said, so much work, we're not going to be able to get to everything this year.

And then we will get to any other business, item number 6 on our agenda today, which will be council discussion -- this is further guidance sought from the EPDP Team to the questions of data accuracy, the WHOIS accuracy program, the letter that we received

from ICANN Org where there's some further guidance being sought from the EPDP Team. And then we will get to an open microphone.

So with that, let me ask if there are any suggested changes, any questions, any comments on the agenda for today's meeting.

Okay. So I'm not seeing any. So my introduction there is a subtle warning to everybody, all the councillors to be prepared when we get to item number 5 to be able to engage in that discussion for work prioritization for the council.

All right. Back up to administrative matters.

I will just note that the status of the minutes for the previous council meetings, the minutes of the 23 January 2020 meeting were posted -- and if we could scroll down, please. Thank you very much -- were posted on the 10th of February, 2020. And the minutes of the GNSO Council meeting of the 20th February 2020 were posted on the 6th of March.

So thank you for that.

And we will now move to discussion of item number 2, which I think I've covered in some part in the opening remarks, sort of an introduction. And then review of the projects and action list.

Thank you very much, Steve.

Okay. So for everybody's benefit, this is our action items list that is the -- basically, this is our tracking device, our tracking mechanism for the action items that develop over the course of our meetings and the

calls that take place in preparation and follow-up to the formal GNSO Council meetings. This is the way that we ensure that we're keeping up to date and on track for the various things that the council has either discussed or needs to discuss.

Maxim, I note you have a comment about the project list PDF. So if you would like to jump to that now, please go right ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba, for the record.

Speaking of project list PDF, I think on page 10, they need to be mentioned that the extension to PDP time line was granted, like it was made on page 11. And on page 6, project progress bar should be set to 20,000. It could be some technical mistake. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Maxim. And thanks for having gone through the projects list in that level of detail.

I believe I saw a note from you to that effect on the list, or to Berry. And I think Berry did respond, if I'm not mistaken. But we will double-check on both of those.

I think -- yeah, I do want to note, though, that as the project extension request that Maxim referred to was the project change requests that were submitted by the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group leadership and by the RPM PDP Working Group leadership. Over the course of the last four to six weeks, both groups had submitted

projects change requests. And as of I think it was a week ago -- or as of the end of February, there had been no opposition from the GNSO Council members, so those two project change requests were approved.

The project change request for Sub Pro extended the time line out to December of 2020. And RPMs extended their time line out to October of 2020. So those are both now approved, in place, and we will be having regular touch points with our GNSO Council liaisons and staff to ensure that those two PDP working groups are, in fact, working efficiently and effectively and working towards the time lines that we have currently approved. And certainly if there's any indication of further slippage, that we would need to be aware of that and be prepared to take whatever remedial action we might decide is necessary at that point as a council.

Okay. So thank you, Maxim. And we'll circle back to that.

And let's go back to the action items list before us.

I'm sorry, I'm moving zoom boxes around so I can see everything.

Okay. So the first item on the list is GNSO prioritization. It is color-coded blue because we are actually discussing that today. That is the subject of our last substantive action item or substantive discussion point during today's meeting.

So -- And, again, this is an opportunity for a discussion. We're not making any final decisions today about prioritization. But it's an important touch point for the GNSO Council members to be able to

contribute so we have -- we as the leadership team, working with staff, will have the information we need to try to develop a proposal for full council reaction.

The next item is related to the PDP 3.0 final report. And the action items here are to -- for the GNSO support staff to work with council leadership on the deployment of improvements based on the effective time frame proposed by PDP 3.0 small team and the council to carry out other future action items in the resolved clauses at the appropriate time as directed in the motion. So there is further work to be done here.

If anybody from -- Rafik or Pam or anybody from the PDP 3.0 small team would like to speak to this now, you're more than welcome to. Otherwise, we can move on.

Okay. I don't see any hands.

PAM LITTLE:

Hi, Keith. Hi. Pam Little for the record. I just want to provide a very brief update about this.

As you know, the Council actually adopted all the deliverables or work products out of the PDP Small Team effort at our Council's meeting in February.

And we are in the process -- Rafik and I and support staff are in the process of sending out some of those documents to our working group

leadership to let them know some of those improvements that are relevant to them or to their working group.

We are just holding that back for now considering everyone is probably tied up with ICANN67 remote meeting. So that correspondence will go out to PDP working group leadership shortly after ICANN67.

Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Pam. Appreciate the update.

And Jeff has a question also in the chat. I think it's related to what you just discussed. But forgive me if I -- I just want to make sure Jeff's question is addressed.

And the question was: Where are we on the outside consultation report on the consensus building tools?

I just wanted to note that there's -- there was some plan for us to be providing updates to different parts of the ICANN community during ICANN67 on PDP 3.0 implementation. We've had a request from the ICANN Board for an update. The GAC had also requested an update.

And I know that ALAC was also interested.

And so with the changes in the ICANN67 schedule because of the remote participation requirements, we decided to push off those updates. And we've been discussing the possibility of holding a

Webinar, an update Webinar. But that's something that the Council leadership has been discussing with staff. But, frankly, with all of the dynamics around having to adjust for ICANN67, that sort of took a bit of a backseat.

So with that, Pam or Rafik, is there anything further would you like to add in response to Jeff's question? Or did Pam's comments cover it? Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. So I think the question is specific about the consensus playbook.

So as far as I know, we are waiting for the consensus builder to finalize that playbook within this month. So we are still waiting to get the final version. And after that, I think we share it with the Council.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Rafik.

All right. Jeff, I hope that addressed your question. I think the answer directly is that it's still in progress but it is still on the radar and planned. And we do recognize that there's broader community interest in the topic of PDP 3.0 generally and the consensus playbook which, as just a reminder, is a set of sort of recommendations or guidelines. It's not a change in policy or anything like that.

But understood there's interest and that we as a council need to ensure that there's, you know, good outreach and explanation of what it is and what it's not.

Okay. Thank you. So let's move on. Next item on the action items list is managing IDN variant TLDs. I think as everybody understands or the Council understands, we received a report from the IDN drafting team, that we asked to come together to give the GNSO Council advice in terms of its thinking on what the next steps might be for dealing with the question of IDN variants at the top level.

And I think at this stage what we have is a recommendation for policy work to be initiated around some components of the topic on IDN variants.

And one of the things that we will discuss as a council during our prioritization discussion is, you know, like, timing for that and does it make sense to perhaps start to charter that group using the PDP 3.0 improvements and some of the things that we've learned moving forward, making sure that we're connected with the ccNSO, at least through liaisons and making sure that we're able to meet the obligations outlined by the ICANN Board in its Kobe resolution related to this topic.

And so this is definitely something that's a topic for potential future work for the Council and for the community. That's one of the things we'll discuss, is the timing for beginning the drafting for a charter for such a group.

Any comments or questions on this one? Okay. Thank you.

Scroll down.

All right. Next item is the evolution of the multistakeholder model of governance. This has been discussed quite a bit following the efforts of 2019 to identify the challenges that we as a community broadly have in ensuring that the MSM can continue to evolve and be effective.

We have had discussions about the fact that our PDP 3.0 work actually in many ways has had a jump start on some of the actual work of identifying ways that we can actually move forward in terms of evolving the multistakeholder model. Under the GNSO Council's remit, we have responsibility for the GNSO PDPs. And our PDP 3.0 work, I think, is a step -- a significant step in the right direction in terms of addressing some of the challenges that were identified in the discussions around evolving the multistakeholder model.

And so one main action item here was for us to organize a community sharing session or Webinar about PDP 3.0 implementation. And that's what I referenced earlier, is the opportunity for us to have that conversation with different parts of the community. And we'll circle back with more information about how we actually achieve that.

Any comments or questions on the evolution of the MSM?

Okay. Not seeing any hands, we can now move on. The rest of the action items list is a tracking of the items that have been completed. They are color coded green. And I think we are set to move on to the next part of our agenda.

Okay. So Item Number 4 -- I'm sorry, Item Number 3 was typically our consent agenda but we have no items on the consent agenda for today. So we will move now to item Number 4 which is our council discussion on the projects list review.

So what I will do is I will give an overview of sort of the summary page that I think we are all very familiar with. We covered it during the strategic planning session. It's something that we frequently but perhaps not often enough project during our council meetings during this initial sort of update on action items and projects list.

And then I'm going to engage Berry and Steve and other members of staff to help us get through some of the more detailed substance so we all understand where these things are in progress.

And I just want to remind everybody that during our SPS meeting in January, we all agreed that it would make sense to have a deep dive on the projects list and that that would establish a baseline or a level-set understanding for all of us as to where things are and in future meetings we would focus more on things that might have changed. So basically set the baseline today and then during the rest of our meetings this year, we will focus then on the -- any changes to this list.

Okay. So looking at this -- sorry. Let me move my Zoom boxes around a little bit again.

All right. On this list -- and it's updated regularly prior to each GNSO Council meeting, each monthly meeting -- the issues are sort of categorized as issue identification. And that first line item right there

is the action items list we just went through. Just so everybody understandings what that line item is. It's sort of our tactical and regular tracking mechanism for things that come out of the meetings or that need to be focused on moving forward.

And then there are a couple of other items here still at issue; identification stage or phase; expired registration recovery policy, policy review; and then the policy and implementation recommendations review. And so those are items that are in the issue identification phase.

You'll see that because they are essentially in that initial phase, there are zero days listed. And I will turn to Berry for more detail in terms of the actual -- sort of what the detail all means and the columns.

But we go from issue identification to issue scoping. That one right there is the transfer policy, policy with the scoping team. This is actually a group we have stood up but is working and has been working to provide recommendations to the GNSO Council as to how we might consider reviewing and perhaps redoing the existing transfer policy. And so that's one that's under way.

We have then initiation as a category, PDP -- the IDNs. So this is the IDN issue that we just mentioned where we've received the report from the scoping team. And now it's a question for Council as to when we actually initiate the group by charter.

And then also have under that initiation a WHOIS procedures Implementation Advisory Group.

And then from the initiation phase, we actually get to a category of working groups. And the working groups are existing PDP working groups. You see the RPM PDP, the EPDP phase 2 that's under way, CCWG on auction proceeds, PDP on RPMs and all gTLDs, and then the subsequent procedures PDP.

Note that the cross-community working group on gTLD auction proceeds is not a GNSO PDP per se. It's actually a cross-community working group chartered by multiple groups. But it is a working group so we keep it in this category because the GNSO was, in fact, one of the chartering organizations for that group. Just wanted to call out that distinction but to, you know, acknowledge that we consider it a working group like the others for the purpose of this tracking.

We have five council deliberations. And so there's nothing specific to that line item at this point. But any deliberations that we might have, any discussions or deliberations we might have on something that could be coming before us for a vote would fall into this category.

And then we have another category for items pending a Board vote, and Berry will speak to this in more detail. But you'll notice that a couple of these things have some pretty significant days assigned to them in terms of how long they've been pending. And that's something that we at some point may want to and will want to engage with the ICANN Board on to better understand the thinking of the Board in terms of where some of these items are hung up and is there anything that Council needs to do to help move things forward.

There's obviously some correlation on the IGO curative rights issue with some of the IGO recommendations that have come before.

But, anyway, just wanted to flag that as a couple of items sort of in pending status for the Board vote.

And then, essentially, the rest is items -- or are items that are in the implementation phase, things that have been the result of consensus policy recommendations that have gone through the board vote phase and are now in an implementation. And certainly there are items here where we as the council have a responsibility to continue to engage with ICANN Org as they carry out their responsibilities for conducting the actual implementation.

And then a couple of other items in the very bottom, which is a reference to the GNSO's Standing Committee on Budget and Operations, the SCBO, and our Standing Selection Committee. And those are regular standing committees that meet when they need to, but there's no specific, you know -- not always a specific deliverable for those particular groups.

So with that, Berry, I'm going to see if there's anything you'd like to add to my high-level overview and summary of this. I hope it's teed it up for further deep dive discussion, and I will hand it to you. Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Berry Cobb, for the record. Great summary. In fact, you took some of my talking points, so I hope not to duplicate.

The one thing I would mention about phases 1, 2, and 3, absent the council action items line item there, is that is, you know, more or less meant to show the beginning of the work that's about -- that's in front of us as kind of our pipeline. And I would say one of the deficiencies in what we have here is, this doesn't fully square up with what the council reviewed at the strategic planning session with regards to what we've been labeling the "scary spreadsheet" that attempts to look at all of the other work that is within the radar of the GNSO, things like some of the reviews that GNSO participants participate in, such as ATRT3 and those kinds of things, the GNSO3 review and those aspects as well.

And, if necessary, when we get into the prioritization, I have kind of an updated version of the scary spreadsheet. But I don't think we'll have time to get into that in the detail.

So, really, just to kind of repeat, this first three sections is really kind of an evolutionary artifact in how we were trying to build out this pipeline, but it was -- it was always scoped really just to working groups that the GNSO Council would consider initiating. And perhaps we can entertain looking at future evolution and how we can broaden that scope to get this better picture of the total work ahead of us, certainly in relation to prioritization.

The other -- second thing I'll say about it in terms of traversing the summary list, when we go through each one of the groups in detail, you know, I know that we'll want to stop on each of the items in the working groups. But just as a heads-up, you know, based on recent

council activities either through project change requests or one of the new PDP 3.0 implementations about a monthly project package that is -- that was also submitted for the EPDP Phase 2, we already have a pretty good idea where those groups stand. So, you know, in terms of time, we probably don't need to spend real extra time in those. But, of course, we should touch on them.

And then, you know, secondly, I think where our -- our workload becomes challenging to monitor, track, and prioritize is from the board vote through implementation. And as noted in the SPS and previous discussions, you know, this group doesn't have direct ownership of those activities anymore. They're all very important to the GNSO, the GNSO Council to their eventual outcome, but the participation is typically less or they're not -- they're not true policy development. Their policies have already been discussed, but ultimately, they're being implemented. And typically, that touches different areas of the community participants than what we may experience in our true policy development sections.

And then if Steve can just scroll down just a little bit, one other new feature here is a listing of the projects that were completed or removed from the prior period.

And I decided to implement this mostly just for the sake of this very agenda item so that it would lessen the number of projects that we needed to review today. But ultimately, because this project list is really only developed on a monthly cycle, in prior versions, we would keep a completed project up in the color-coded section and then just

have to type in whether it was completed or not just to kind of draw attention to it. But in terms of managing this list itself, it made more sense to really just kind of create an exit parking lot, so to speak, just to draw attention to those.

And so, for example, you know, looking at the IDN Working Group that is now in the initiation phase, I won't go into the details, but you talked about the possibility of spinning up a group to get into the chartering aspect. So we actually closed out the scoping team and have kind of created the next version in preparation for the -- the charter team for the IDN Working Group.

GNSO PDP 3.0, of course, you know, we've closed out that project. There are a few action items that will be managed on the council action item list, such as final delivery of the consensus playbook and some of that aspect. And then, specifically, the reconvened working group about the Red Cross names, recently, there was a posting of the policy effective date on 1 August 2020. I decided to go ahead and have that one removed out of the implementation section because, in effect, that IRT has completed its work. There are no expected future meetings leading up to that policy effective date. So, in essence, it really becomes a compliance function from that point forward.

The last things I'll say is, over to the right-hand side of the project list -- and, you know, this has probably been the most innovative part of previous versions. We never really tracked at a summary level the health of our previous projects nor the percent complete. I think in some ways, we tracked the total number of days that this particular --

a particular project had continued forward. But I will say -- and I think that it's proving to be effective immediately is this concept of the status and condition codes and the procedure for managing those from this point forward. In recollection, we've already gone through a couple of project change requests. I think that definitely helps to -- for the council to understand when a project is about to enter into problems or at least how to manage a project when it is in a problem-type condition, like it is right now. So I'm very pleased with the outcome in that regard.

The other point that I'll make about the status and condition codes here -- and I'm probably slightly a broken record -- is, my only concern about a few of these, especially for projects that are entering into phases 6 and 7, because the council doesn't have direct oversight or ownership of that, the management of these status and condition codes become a little bit more challenging. And most importantly, the idea or the concept behind those is that, you know, this project list, everything should be green. And it's only when a project starts to enter into trouble when it begins to turn yellow or red based on the status or condition issue that's causing that change.

And so my fear is that if some of these maintain their yellow or red coloring for too long, that it starts to diminish the -- the attention that is required for a yellow or a red indicator.

Lastly, the percent complete. And then hopefully to answer Philippe's question.

Most of these percent completes are a thumb in the wind kind of guess, with the exception of EPDP. Now that we've implemented the - some of the other components from PDP 3.0, specifically, I believe it was recommendations or improvement number 11, which was creating a consistent work products of status reporting for the -- for each project, one of which actually is to start to include the use of Gantt charts or formal project plan. So specifically for EPDP, I know it's at 81% completion, because at the close of each month, in preparing the overall project package, that contains not only a summary time line, the situation report, but it also includes an export from Microsoft Project of the entire Gantt chart, showing each task that the group is to accomplish, as well as the duration and the dependencies that have been set up since then. And each month, I will review through each of those tasks and assign a percent complete as the group accomplishes each of those tasks.

In some cases, at a task level, they may only be 50% complete. In some cases, at the task level, some of those may start to flip yellow as you'll start to see in the more details of our -- of each project down below.

At the task level, you know, it turning to yellow or red may or may not have influence on the overall health of the project, but it's kind of a snowball rolling uphill effect. If things start to get out of hand at the task level -- or at the tactical level of the project, enough of that or a long enough duration of being -- not being completed can eventually negatively impact the overall health of the project.

So the 81%, I'm very confident that that is a fairly accurate number. The others that are listed here are a thumb-in-the-wind guess about where the project is complete. The reason why it's not more precise is, it's been -- it'll be challenging to kind of create a whole new project plan for many of our in-flight projects. That is something that the council can consider going forward. But, again, these are just kind of guesstimates around the percent complete on where they are, and especially as it relates to the phase that that particular project may be in.

So, for example, EPDP shows 81% complete. At some point in time, it's going to move down in the council deliberations, board vote, and implementation. For sure, once it hits implementation, it should reset back to zero, because it's a completely different project plan for moving that forward.

So I'll stop there. Sorry to ramble on. I see other hands are raised. I'll turn it back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. It's great additional detail and context.

I have a reaction and a question for you, and then I'm going to hand it over to Pam, who's next in queue.

So, you know, as you referenced the scary spreadsheet, the list of all of the sort of other inbound work that the GNSO Council needs to consider, do you envision that once we come to some, you know, agreement or some agreement on the prioritization discussion, that

those items would then start being added into the issue identification at the top of this list?

And, of course, that means the list gets a lot longer, because there's a lot in that. But I'm thinking of EPDP Phase 1, wave 1 issues; right? And specifically the policy issues that the council needs to consider as it relates to other impacted GNSO consensus policies.

And so I'm just sort of curious, as we look to evolve this, is that sort of the thinking? Or something else?

Thanks.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Just to respond quickly, kind of, sort of, not really. I don't know that I have a direct answer. I -- as you noted, if we were to put everything that could potentially be in the pipeline from the scary spreadsheet, this list becomes a lot longer to handle, and therefore it may be more difficult to tease out. What the original intent of the project list was, was ultimately to focus on our active policy development.

So perhaps, you know -- I think that there are several routes that we could go. Kind of like how we have a line item for the action items, maybe we have a line item for -- labeled "future work" or "near-term work," or something along those lines, just so we don't overcrowd the usefulness of this.

But at the same time, in working this scary spreadsheet in this, there is a disconnect. It definitely doesn't reconcile well. So we definitely should come up with some sort of solution to get to that. And especially in terms of the prioritization.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Berry. That's really helpful.

Okay, Pam, over to you. Thanks for being patient.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith. Pam Little, for the record.

I also have a clarifying question, if I may, for Berry.

Looking at this list, we are trying to capture or give a snapshot of all the projects that are ongoing at the moment. Some are strictly under council's remit, such as those PDPs. Some are actually not so, like once the PDP has been -- or a final report or policy recommendations are sent from the council to the board, and it's -- that process is really not much within the council's control.

So that's kind of -- Berry, you alluded to that. But I'm just wondering whether there should be a different way of differentiating those projects that are within council's control and remit and those that are not.

The -- I also have a second question, Berry, if I may. In relation to the percentage -- sorry, the days, the accrued days of each project and the percentage of complete, I -- it's unclear to me. It seems to me that some of the dates are depicting the -- that particular phase, how many days have been accrued to date. And the percentage is measuring that phase only.

But if you go down the chat, other projects, for example, we're looking at the board vote, the first one on PDP curative rights, we have over 2,000 days and 85% complete.

So I'm just wondering, are these days and percentage complete only referring to that phase, board vote, as previous some of the items earlier? Or -- Because it seems to me we are not measuring the same things. So I just would like some clarification.

Thank you, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Pam. Keith, I assume you're giving me a chance to opine?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, please. Go ahead, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Very awesome questions, Pam.

You know, the number of days is not a perfect science as they sit now. As an example, the RPMs PDP, what I've tried to typically do is, it's

when the council has resolved to launch the PDP is when the clock would typically start. And so, you know, the RPMs is -- I think this has been adjusted -- I need to go look at the details. But the RPMs, for example, is a pretty good example in that even though the council resolved to launch a PDP on RPMs, it also resolved to wait 18 months that turned into two years before it actually got started.

So I think that there's a -- technically, those number of days would probably be even more than the 1466 that are listed there.

There is no correlation to the number of days and the percent complete. Again, I -- you know, I wouldn't put a whole lot of credibility behind the percent complete numbers here other than, as I said before, them being a thumb-in-the-wind guesstimate about where the work is at for that particular PDP.

As noted before, I think it's very important that, you know, the PDP leadership, the liaison, as well as staff support, need to collaborate, and, you know, if necessary, spend the time to better understand where they're at and the progress of their work.

You know, the reason why I think EPDP is working very well is, you know, when you go down into the page and look at the EPDP situation report or, you know, the single page of this particular project, you know, the intent is to show what we're working on, what we're about to work on, and what we completed in last period. And so when you look at that changing from month to month, you'll quickly notice that there's a -- what's the word I'm looking for? -- you know, there's context to showing what was completed. The EPDP launched its

public comment on such and such date that was completed in the prior period. But I can also provide a number. And if you look closely, I'll show -- I'll list what percent was completed on the prior period versus what is being advertised now.

So even in the slower portions of a particular group, I can still show that there is activity or progress being made, even though it may be 2 or 3% incremental increases here or there from any particular given month.

So ultimately, just to answer your question, there is no correlation between the number of days and percent completes. They're not perfect.

The second thing that I would just add about what I think was your first question, you know, about the status and condition codes or for those projects in phases 6 and 7, you know, perhaps the council can entertain doing kind of the same thing that I mentioned about the action items. You know, maybe we collapse this particular section into a single, you know -- a single row for things that are board vote and a single row for those things that are implementation and they lead to a more detail page of each one of those projects. Because, you know, again, as you rightly noted, the council doesn't really own this anymore, but they have a stake in the outcome or the ultimate delivery and implementation of these projects.

And kind of the same applies for policy staff on the inside, is, you know, we actually, you know, from a department perspective, don't own those, either. So somehow, there either needs to be increased

collaboration amongst the council and the board or the council and the IRTs as well as internally between the policy department and GDD board support staff. But it becomes very complicated on this particular instrument of the project list and how people that are responsible for the delivery of these projects can provide input and content into -- to make them more informed and up-to-date.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks a lot, Berry.

And, James, I'm going to come to you next.

So I just want to make sure that -- doing a time check here. We're eight minutes before the top of the hour, and I do want to get to the substantive, more detailed updates on at least a portion of these. I'd like us, you know, in the next half hour to get through the -- you know, at least through the working groups, you know, in terms of the items on this list. As we've discussed, the things that are at board vote or later are probably less critical to us at this time for the reasons that we've just discussed in terms of our level-setting and baseline understanding.

So, James, over to you, and then we'll move on to the page-by-page detailed deep dives. Thanks.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. James Gannon, for the record.

I'll keep this brief, because I think it's possibly a conversation me and Berry can follow up on after.

Just, you know, putting a program manager hat on, I think, particularly for let's call them the legacy PDPs, you know, the ones that don't have the structure of EPDP and the PDP 3.0 controls, maybe instead of treating each of them as a project, you treat them as a program in and of themselves and break them down into phases. So that gives you an easier way, then, for us to actually track of completion through each phase if we treat each phase as a project and roll them up into a program.

And then one other thing that I don't think I've seen but I think would possibly be useful not just for council, but for the broader community, is a RACI matrix for each of those phases, because, as you said, we kind of lose oversight, really, at some point. Whereas, if we have a RACI matrix for each of the phases, particularly after they leave the council's remit, that at least gives us a point of contact to really kind of own the accountability of the next phases after that. And I think that will be something useful to get some feedback loops going.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, James.

Berry, any quick reaction.

BERRY COBB: Just quickly, the program concept is something that the scary spreadsheet is starting to take account. And I would say, you know, there's other work in flight that kind of takes on that concept of a program management that will manage a project through its various phases.

So thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Berry.

Thanks, James.

I just want to go back to one point here just to reinforce it. I think it's been made clear, but just to reinforce. That -- The reference to the EPDP and having more confidence around the numbers assigned to the EPDP, as Berry described, are because of the scoping effort and because of the project plan that was developed for the EPDP. Whereas those did not -- you know, the project plan concept did not exist at the same level of detail that currently exists in the EPDP approach and under PDP 3.0.

So I think what we have is an opportunity as a council this year and moving forward is to -- you know, as we scope and charter new policy development work and that the project plan approach is implemented, that we have the ability, looking ahead, to have a much better handle, a much more -- just a better handle on how to track these things where the data will actually be more meaningful than perhaps what, you know, some of the after-the-fact stuff is here.

So I think, again, we're evolving this. We're working toward something better. And I think this is, you know, a perfect example of how the proper chartering, the proper scoping, proper project plan, and tracking of that project plan on a regular basis will help this effort moving forward.

So, Berry, thanks for that.

Let's move to the next page, please.

Okay. So Berry, Steve, anybody else on staff that would like to contribute to helping us get up to speed on all of this on a detailed basis, more than welcome to jump in.

So, Berry, I'll hand this one back to you. And if there's others on staff who can speak to them more specifically, then let's get them engaged.

I think, again, some of these things have existed for a while, and we just want to make sure that we have the full context.

Berry.

BERRY COBB:

These two should be relatively quick. I don't think I have anything else to say other than that this is our parking lot for work to be done. So it's really more a function of the prioritization exercise than a status on this.

They need to be done. They were part of individual recommendations of the final reports way back in the day. It's just a matter of priority and urgency.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Berry. Would anybody else like to speak to these?

Okay, Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Keith. This is Steve.

I'll preface this by saying I'm not an expert on this subject. But just to Berry's point, I would note that this is potentially a subject for a policy status report. But it's also part of the Wave 1 EPDP Rec 27 report, too. So I think there's -- and, again, to what Berry just said, for prioritization, I think there's maybe a meta question either here or eventually that looks at whether or not you want to try to tackle just the standard work of the council to review the existing policies and initiate policy work and how to interact with the work related to the Rec 27, Wave 1 report.

So what I mean by that is whether or not they get initiated separately, whether or not they get initiated in conjunction in some way, just how you plan and organize that work. And maybe that even is sort of a touch point on what James was saying about the overall program

management for the RDS topic. And this is, I think, one of them. So just wonder if that makes --

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Steve. This is Keith again for the transcript, Keith Drazek.

Yeah, I think that's a really good point and a perfect example of how we need to consider these from a program level because if there are multiple components or things that are related while we're looking to prioritize, we really need to make sure that we have a full understanding of what those are. And that Rec 27 Wave 1 report has quite a bit in there. So, yeah, I think that's exactly right.

All right. Any other discussion on this one before we move on? Any questions from councillors?

All right. Let's move on. And I think we can move down to -- yeah, this is, I think, Berry, you mentioned this is pretty much in the same bucket. Marika, thank you. Go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Keith. This is Marika.

On this specific one, I think this may also be a candidate at a point that you decide to review. I think you originally resolved to start this process (garbled audio).

It's actually one of the recommendations that were part of the work of the policy implementation working group and seeing which aspects, if any, need to be prioritized and ability to see if that has already been reviewed on an ongoing (indiscernible) -- implementation review team. Guidelines, I think, were suggested to maybe more work could or should be done there as well as some of the other processes that were developed, some of which that actually have not been used to date. So does that mean that they weren't designed for a purpose, or are there other reasons why they're not being used as they were originally intended?

So, again, that might be one to have a closer look and see what, if anything, needs further work at this stage.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Marika. Your line was a little bit choppy there, but I think we got it.

Yeah, I think that's definitely one that needs further investigation. And thanks for that additional context.

And I hope this is providing everybody, councillors and observers alike, how complex and interrelated some of these things are. And as we go through the prioritization effort, that this is an important factor for us to consider as to if there's a question of urgency, there's a question of correlation of questions of whether there are new policies that are incompatible with old policies. So lots to consider.

And that's one of the reasons we need all councillors to be sort of up to speed on where these are. So I hope folks are taking notes. And if you have questions, this is your time to ask.

All right. Let's move on. Okay. Next item is the transfer policy and specifically the policy review scoping team. Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. Just briefly, I'd say this project is tracking the target. The scoping team will be delivering its scoping report by the April document and motions deadline. It was originally going to be -- they were considering an EPDP on one specific topic. That urgency has been removed so it looks like they're going to be suggesting a PDP with outlining several issues. Really not much more to say on that one. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Great. Thanks very much, Berry.

Questions or comments? Okay. Let's move on.

All right. This is the IDN -- this is the IDN scoping team that I mentioned earlier when we were going through action items.

Berry, anything you want to add on this one?

BERRY COBB:

I'll ultimately defer details to Steve. You reviewed it as the action items, other than to say this is an example of this project being reset

for the initiation phase anticipating the work for the charter. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Berry. And, Steve, feel free to jump in if you'd like. Go right ahead.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Keith. This is Steve.

You alluded to it in the review of the action items. So I think on the outside of this ICANN meeting, so after ICANN67, we will actually start that drafting process which certainly doesn't mean that the future work, which could be a PDP, that action needs to initiate. But we'll start the exercise of drafting the -- drafting the draft charter after this meeting.

We're open to any volunteers to help us. But we're also willing to take a first cut on the staff side. So just wanted to throw it out there. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, thanks very much, Steve.

And, again, this gets into our prioritization discussion, is that we can tackle some work at council working with staff, for example, the drafting of a charter for this future PDP. But that doesn't mean that we have to initiate the PDP immediately upon concluding the charter

draft. We can actually have two different discussions there about where we slot in the work. And if there's small bits of work that we can accomplish and get out of the way and then sort of be ready to initiate the PDP at the appropriate time based on other prioritization concerns, then at least that work has been done.

And so I think this is also an opportunity for us to take our PDP 3.0 improvements and incorporate them into the charter drafting process to start developing our capabilities and to go through the process and basically have the experience of working with the PDP 3.0 improvements as we charter these future groups.

And I think there is also some good and timely things that we can consider looking at the EPDP in terms of the project plans and things like that and making sure that we're learning from the processes of scoping and chartering these other groups. So thank you, Steve.

Let's move on.

Okay. Berry, back to you, WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith.

It's been on hold for a long time. The dependency has been the conclusion of the EPDP work on the temporary specification. I think ultimately the council needs to make a decision here, is -- does this still need to be on hold or based on phase 1 work, is this still even

necessary to do? Is the procedure still required and some of those aspects?

If not, then maybe it can be removed from the project list. If we need to keep it here, then we should find out when and how soon this can be launched. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. Marika has noted in chat that this procedure is also identified in Rec 27 Wave 1 report. So it could be that there's multiple things in that Wave 1 report as we get into the review and prioritization discussion where this could be part of that program as we discussed.

Rafik, I see your hand. Go right ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. Thanks, Berry.

I think this is more a general comment in how to deal with such case. So as was mentioned, we have Recommendation 27, Wave 1 report. And that we probably -- the GNSO Council need to evaluate and make decision how to cover the different impacted policy and so on including this.

But I guess one way, since we are doing, like, here program management, we think instead of just putting on hold, just maybe putting it back to another phase. I know we don't have kind of -- we have, like, the spreadsheet that is displaying role of more roadmap or

forthcoming activities. But if we have kind of a backload, so if we just move this back to the backload, to make it clear that it's something that needs to be discussed, scoped again, and prioritize it later on. So something maybe Berry can think of how we can visualize this.

But definitely it's not -- it doesn't make sense now to have it in the initiation phase because we have to think again about probably the scope and the dependency or relation to other work related to PDP phase 1.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Rafik. I think that's good points.

So I think -- let me just pause for a second and just note there's been a lot of reference to the EPDP phase 1, Wave 1 report on Rec 27 so far today. And we received just prior to our last council meeting, if I have my dates correct, the final Wave 1 report. We had seen the draft back in January prior to the SPS. We now have the final in hand. And I think that's going to need to be a focus of some focused discussion, some detailed discussion during our April council meeting.

So I'm just going to put a marker down for that and that we as councillors working with our stakeholder groups and constituencies need to review that and have a good handle on that before April.

All right. Let's move on. Okay. This item is the IGO curative rights work track that is now under the umbrella of the RPM PDP working group. So just briefly this is the referral of Recommendation 5 and the IGO protections issue over to the dedicated work team under the RPM

PDP umbrella. So it's not RPM phase 1 on URS. It's not RMP phase 2 on UDRP. But it's a separate track under the umbrella of the RPM PDP working group.

And we have a next step to develop a charter so to bring together a charter drafting team and also to identify a chair and do a call for -- a call for volunteers and to identify members of that group.

Actually, I may have misspoken that we actually have the charter that's been approved. It's now a question of identifying the chair and the members of the team and initiating the group.

Steve, I'm sure you're going to correct me there. Go right ahead.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Keith. This is Steve. I was just about to correct you, but you corrected yourself.

Indeed, the addendum was adopted I think in the January meeting. Just to provide an update on the call for volunteers and the expression of interest for the chair, we are in the midst of -- we've already prepared and I think it's fair to say we're finalizing the drafts for those two documents. So they're essentially ready to go, but we thought it was maybe not timely to do it shortly before ICANN67.

But at least from the staff side, we're prepared and ready to start that effort. And I think in the context of some of the items that were covered on the overview of the project list related to other IGO items, it's probably timely to actually start this effort.

So with the council's blessing, we can probably get those initiated shortly after ICANN67. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Steve. And thanks for the additional detail there and for the work of staff in the background to develop those drafts. So I think it makes sense to the extent you've got something that you can share that we get that out to the list so folks can consider and react. Thanks for that.

Okay. Next item. All right. This is the EPDP phase 2. And I think we're all pretty familiar with where we are on this, but I'm going to give the floor to Berry. As we've discussed, this is one of -- the PDP that has sort of the work plan that was designed and developed from the beginning.

So, Berry, over to you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. My original hand raised was for the previous project. You don't need to scroll back to it other than to say that what phase 2 is about here is everything -- or most everything that's come out of PDP 3.0. And it should be reinforced that any new project that's launched will be using all of the aspects of PDP 3.0 in terms of the catalog of work products that will be produced, Gantt chart project plans and all of that fun stuff.

The only thing I'd like to draw attention here is to something that I was stating in some of our introductory comments, is you had this progress bar to the left of the status and condition codes.

It's a little difficult to see that that says 81%. But if you were to scroll down to the bottom of the left-hand chart, you can see how I have a prior period percent complete at 73%, which was when the phase 2 group achieved its milestone to open up for public comment.

And then, secondarily, I also started to include the original planned completion date. The reason for that is in terms of the true Gantt chart project plan, the moment that we submitted the project change request, I created a baseline against the original plan versus our current dates.

And so we had that ability to start to track the gap between our original planned delivery date to what will hopefully be our final delivery date, which is targeted for June. So thank you.

I don't have anything else to say about EPDP except, again, the project package we produce on a monthly basis, that will be sent to council. And at the very least, for every PDP we have, that should start to be the status quo.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah, thanks, Berry. I think to your point, in terms of tracking, in terms of the project plan, in terms of all the work you've done in support of this, this is what "good" looks like and we need to try to replicate that going forward. So thank you for that.

Any other comments on the EPDP? Rafik, is there anything you would like to say on EPDP phase 2 at this point?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

No, nothing to add. Just maybe that we are waiting for the end of the public comments and we are working on priorities. Not so much to add in terms of the states of condition as shared by Berry.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay, thanks very much, Rafik. Any questions or comments before we move on? All right.

Next item is the CCWG on auction proceeds. Was Erika able to join us? I am not going to put her on the spot just this second, but just wanted to see if she's actually here.

Berry, is there anything you would like to provide on this one just in terms of an update?

BERRY COBB:

Just briefly that they're tracking to conclusion after they concluded their last public comment.

I don't actually have specific information on when they plan to deliver the final report other than what's stated here targeting the May 2020 time frame. So -- Marika has got her hands up. Perfect. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Berry.

Marika, go ahead.

And then, Erika, if you have anything you would like to add, you are welcome to it.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Keith. I hope my audio is slightly better.

Just to note, indeed, this is correct in that the group is in the process of reviewing the comments it has received on its proposed final report and, indeed, hopes to deliver the final report to the chartering organization at the latest end of May, May time frame.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Marika.

Erika, anything to add? Okay. Not hearing Erika, so we can move on and come back if she's got anything later.

Okay. The RPM PDP working group, as we discussed at the top of the call, as I mentioned, this was one of the two projects change requests that we received and approved. So this group went through a process in working with the staff and with the GNSO Council liaison, John McElwaine, on this one to basically make sure that as something was changing significantly in terms of time lines, that there was a rigorous process of discussion and agreement among the co-chairs and with the council liaison and staff that the actual proposed time line, the

new time line, was not just a best-case scenario but that it was a reasonable scenario and an attainable scenario and that there was sort of consensus among all the parties that it was something that would be delivered.

And I see John has his hand up. So, John, you are more than welcome to jump in here. Thanks.

JOHN McELWAINE:

Thanks, Keith. John McElwaine for the record. And I appreciate that overview. What I just wanted to report, basically, since the project change request was approved by the GNSO Council, essentially early in the month on March 4th, some of the efforts that had been promised by the three co-chairs, we've really been working on as a working group. That was a commitment to work together, to come -- to basically have a method to come to agreement when there were not a unanimous decision amongst the co-chairs.

There's been reinforcement with working group, and you're really seeing that now of the urgency of getting work done.

And then, three, to work on detailed plans and to clearly communicate that out to the working group.

And pleased to report that the RPM working group met on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week. We covered our entire agenda and finished actually a little bit early this morning East Coast time on our Wednesday meeting. So at this point, we finished our review of the initial report to be put out for public comment, which is great. We

finished early. The working group and the co-chairs really understood the urgency of our work.

And then the last part to kind of develop that plan, the initial -- well, the initial report is out for public comment. The co-chairs and leadership have committed to work together to put together a plan to review, analyze, and consider the public comments and then communicate that to the working group.

So pleased to note that the project change request and the thought that went into solving some of the problems is -- we're seeing the fruit of that already with being ahead of the current plan schedule. Let's knock on wood this all continues, but good progress so far. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thank you very much, John. And thanks for your direct engagement in that process. Very helpful. And just another example now of what "good" looks like, right?

We have a PDP working group that is actually ahead of its new schedule, the new project plan schedule, and that they were able to sort of conclude their work during this virtual ICANN meeting a little bit early. And I think we're still on track for the March 18th publication of the initial report, if I'm not mistaken.

John, back to you. Is that a new hand?

JOHN McELWAIN:

No, sorry. Taking that down.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay, not a problem. So thanks again.

All right. Any questions or comments on this one? All right. Let's move on.

Next item is subsequent procedures. Again, another -- this is another PCR, project change request, that we received and approved. Current time line December 2020. And I'm noting that on the previous topic, Julie confirmed they're on track for March 18th at which point the status will change on the project list. So thank you, Julie. That was RPM.

So sub pro, we have got a project change request that's been approved. December 2020 is the current time line. I don't know if Flip or anybody else would like to speak to this one. You're more than welcome to.

I think we're on the same page here. This one is now moving forward on a new time line.

Yeah, Flip, thank you.

FLIP PETILLION:

Hi, Keith. Flip here.

Nothing much to add. Yes, that has been approved, and it's much up to speed. We have Jeff and Cheryl in the group as well. If they have

anything to add, it would be very welcomed. But, frankly, it's going smoothly. And I don't have to add anything at this point.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Flip.

I think the key point here for us as the GNSO Council and as councillors is that we have approved these change requests but we've also agreed and committed to ensuring that the current time lines are met and that we will be watching and working with our council liaisons to the various groups and to ensure that these new commitments are met and realized.

And so I think this is a sort of new era for us as the GNSO Council in terms of holding ourselves and the PDP leadership, the working group leadership, accountable for the proposals that they've submitted.

And so I just want to put that marker down, that that's the case for both of the groups. Fortunately the EPDP is on track at this point. And our goal with all three of these is to bring them to a conclusion this year. Obviously the RPM group is focusing on its phase 1 work for October 2020. They will then transition to phase 2. So I just want to make clear we're focusing on the phase 1 RPM work as we discuss these project change requests.

Jeff, I see your hand. This session -- this portion of the meeting is supposed to be for council and councillors-only discussion. Can you hold your thought until we get to the open mic?

Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Keith. This is Steve. I will try to predict Jeff's question. He probably has a question about the condition which was discussed in the chat extensively.

So I guess the first thing I want to point out is that the condition is not the same as status. So the status is about the time line. And then the condition I think Berry used an operative word here. The condition can be better thought of as "health."

So I will partially fall on a sword here and say there's probably better coordination with the working group co-chairs in filling out this status -- sorry, the condition. But the reason I felt relatively secure in leaving it as "at risk" is partially because it's been at risk for a good while actually. And so I think some of the rationale and reasons are actually captured in the page that you're staring at right now for why it's considered at risk.

Partially it's because of the high number of topics within the PDP as well as some of the challenges that have been seen in reaching consensus on certain topics.

So, first, I just wanted to say -- point out the differentiation between "status" and "condition," the condition is the health. And then the second is the reason we -- like I said, I do accept some fault for not consulting more with the co-chairs because obviously there's some disagreement here.

But, like I said, this has been the condition for quite some time. So to me it didn't seem to be much of a departure to leave it as is. Hopefully that helps a little bit, but I'm sure it will not satisfy Jeff. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Steve.

And, Jeff, your disagreement is noted in the Adobe chat. And if you want to speak to it when we get to the open mic, that's fine. But I think we all need to recognize here that this is also an evolution in terms of this document and how we're approaching the management of these PDP working groups.

The project change request was just approved. And so this is something that ideally what we would have is ongoing engagement with the PDP leadership, the GNSO Council liaison, and the ICANN staff supporting the effort to make sure that there's general agreement on these documents, right, on these tracking codes and on these codes. That's not to say that everybody is going to agree on everything all the time. But I do think that's the process that we should be looking to, is that type of an engagement.

But let's all recognize that the project change request was just approved. We've all been busy getting ready for ICANN67. And there's an opportunity for us to engage, consult, and coordinate a little bit more moving forward. So thanks.

Okay. Let's move on. Okay. And we've gotten to the topics that are listed as Board vote. And then after this would be implementation. So

I think we've covered what we need to cover today on the projects list. And so in the interest of time, let us then wrap this agenda item up and move to the discussion of prioritization.

Berry, is there anything you'd like to add as sort of last words here?

BERRY COBB:

Yes, please. I'm hopeful that the council will circle back to the review of the rest of this at a later time because I do think that this is the most important element that needs to be reviewed and that the council's collaboration with the Board on these particular two items and more specifically the status and condition codes of those.

As I mentioned, I don't -- I fear that the status and condition codes or status and health codes that we have assigned here are tainting the effectiveness of the status and condition change procedure. So we really need to work these through and either reassign them the appropriate status and health codes or something. So I'll just stop there. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah, thanks, Berry. And it's a question of how do we categorize these or is there a different way to categorize things that are -- you know, have sort of been on hold outside the responsibility, the direct responsibility of the GNSO Council, and is there a way to categorize those or indicate those in a different manner that doesn't, as you said, sort of taint or pollute the benefit of, you know, a more consistent tracking and condition codes.

So we will commit to do that, to come back to that and have a more detailed discussion in terms of how we engage in terms of those tracking.

Let's move on, then, to our discussion on prioritization. What we will do is, we will put up on the screen the list of work items, inbound work items, that we discussed as a GNSO Council at the SPS in January. You'll remember we conducted a very informal, nonbinding, sort of sense-of-the-room survey at the end of our SPS to get a sense of where people thought priority or urgency or timeliness of, you know, getting these projects into the funnel might fit. I hope that each of you have had the opportunity, as requested, to work with your stakeholder groups and constituencies on that list to be able to bring back some input for us. As I said earlier, the GNSO Council leadership team, working with staff, develops a proposed framework or a proposed straw man for sort of the ordering of the work going into the funnel this year and next.

So with that, I'm going to ask if anybody has any initial input, thoughts, contributions that they've sourced from discussions with their group, any questions that anybody may have.

I'm going to open the floor here and ask for councillors to weigh in, speak up, and engage on this one. This is important, and we need to start getting a sense as to, you know, do particular groups have interest in certain areas, don't care about other things, and, you know, what your priority considerations are.

Michele. Thank you.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. Michele, for the record.

So within the Registrar Stakeholder Group, we did try to get a kind of sense of the room in terms of what our members considered to be important topics that required focus and work. We also, I think, made it quite clear -- and I'm sure Greg and Pam can jump in if they feel I'm going off track -- that there was a limited amount of bandwidth available at present. There's also a limited amount of bandwidth anyway.

So of the work items that are listed there, the one for the registrars I think that has the -- the highest priority for us is in relation to transfer policy.

The one that -- again, to reiterate what I said at the meeting we had face to face in Los Angeles, the one that we would give least priority to until there was a specific ask is around abuse, which, again, just to reiterate for those who wouldn't have heard what I said specifically, it's not that we don't take abuse seriously, but unless there was a specific ask, a specific action that's being asked of council to do with this, then we wouldn't prioritize it because all the other items on the list have specific asks and actions linked to them.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele. That's really helpful sort of summary of, you know, high-level concerns. I'll just summarize here, high-level concerns about limited bandwidth, rating transfer policy as number one for the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and the topic of DNS abuse as last because there's no specific ask or sort of policy work to be done by the GNSO Council at this time. I think that's a great summary.

So if others would like to follow that type of a framework, I think that's really, really helpful, a really helpful construct.

Farell, you're next.

FARELL FOLLY:

Hello. Thanks, Chair.

I will not report directly the discussion within the NCSG, but I think Rafik will do it, since I was the one that led within us.

But I wanted to point out something rather differently in the method we are using. And I'm happy that Michele reported that they did it slightly different, because what I think is, of course, the council represents the community through the stakeholders, which are all represented. However, I believe that this kind of survey should be broadened to make it more inclusive at some extent if we want to achieve a certain level of accuracy. Because what is now reflected in this survey is only the view of 20, 21 councillors. But if you want to make it a list that will be -- will engage more people within the community, perhaps we should have a deeper discussion on that and even open it. I don't know exactly the objective, if it will just be a list

for us to know how we prioritize tasks or it will affect the whole GNSO, but I guess it will affect the whole GNSO.

And while I am making this comment, is -- why I am making this comment is, from a statistic point of view, the issue is, being only 21 councillors, it's not a really significant sample here. Because when three persons vote for something, it's highly likely that it will be at the top. And all the councillors who vote for an issue as the most important might not necessarily vote for the same thing as the second most important. So unless an issue got 11 votes or more than ten, it shouldn't be normally considered the most important or dominant. Because if two or three councillors voted differently, the result could have been dramatically different.

I will give an example. Within the GNSO Council, if we want to elect a chair and two vice-chairs and we do that one within election only and do the top three, and we do it differently, choosing first the chair and then another election to select the vice-chairs, we will have a slight difference between the two results.

So what I would suggest here, if the staff could give us the real statistics behind this, and assuming that we want to keep this voting within the council, we can get those percentages. And if no item got more than ten votes, then it means no item was dominant, so we have to, let's say, sum up the most important item that could at least get above 50%. Let's say the three following points is by the registry recovery policy, the policy implementation recommendation review or EPDP. For instance, just an example, when we sum the percentage,

we are above 50%, then we can say, okay, those have been informally accepted as the most important. Then if we want to go on among those ones, then we should conduct a second round of survey to elect the most important one.

Otherwise, the vote will be very, let's say, disseminated and we will only have a random result. That's what I think, from a statistical point of view. But staff can correct me if I'm wrong.

So I'm done.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Farell. And just to comment on, you know, the informal and nonbinding survey that we conducted in our face-to-face in Los Angeles, it was just that, it was just to try to get a sense of the room.

And what we did following that was to send around just a list to councillors who are socializing that list with the -- with the actual stakeholder groups and constituencies. And I don't know that we necessarily will ever need to vote on what we're talking about here, but it is something to try to inform the discussion, to inform all of us to try to figure out, you know, where the interests and where the priorities might be.

So I recognize that the survey was imprecise and imperfect and certainly perhaps not statistically viable. But, you know, I think it was just intended to be a tool to help inform the discussion. And that, really, now the discussion should be about what did you hear from

your stakeholder group and constituency when you presented this list to them and where does your stakeholder group or constituency have strong feelings one way or the other.

I hope that helps. The survey was not meant to be binding or even to lead us in a particular direction at all.

Okay. So back to the queue. I have Marie, Sebastien, Maxim, and Rafik.

We're going to run short on time and I do want to get to an open mic, so let's try to be brief.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Keith. This is Marie. Can you hear me okay?

KEITH DRAZEK: Sure can, Marie. Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you, Marie Pattullo from the BC for the record.

Hi, everybody. We also, of course, talked with our members. Very happy to send this through by email. But to keep it short, as requested, the main collective points, if you like, from the BC was, when we're looking at new action, it should probably be dealing with that stuff that's already gone through PDP, we've already got agreed results, and then nothing happened, it's been stalled or recommendations weren't implemented, you know, we're thinking

about things like SSR, whatever is coming out of ATRT, CCTRT, and so on. So perhaps first is to make sure that that which we've already agreed happens.

After that, from the list, clearly working forward on the EPDP, working forward on the link for the MSN and 3.0, making sure we get solid improvements. RPM, naturally. IDNs, and universal acceptance. And this, to us, is key, bearing in mind the new round, that both of those need to move much faster and get to some kind of result if we're going to have a useful new round.

And there is also something that you mentioned on a separate mail which is not in this list, and it won't surprise you to hear the BC say that. And that is data accuracy.

But I will, of course, send this through by email.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Marie. I appreciate that.

Sebastien, you're next.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah. Hi, all.

I sent yesterday to the secretariat and the x-com of the group the result of a poll that we ran last week within the Registry Stakeholder Group. In very brief terms, expired registration recovery policy was on

top of the list. There's a few WHOIS-related items on top of the list, IDNs, that sort of thing.

It's all in the survey, if you want to take it. We did not have a discussion about it per se in the group. As Farell noted, this is a very small sample democracy. In the case of the Registry Stakeholders Group, I think that eight people answered, and some didn't even answer fully. But this is what we have.

Just a little note. If anybody intends to compile that, because it tricked me, too, the way the poll was set, because you rank from 1 to 12, the graph that comes out of the poll looks inverted. So the smaller the bar, the higher the priority on the item. But I think it was the same thing in January when we used a polling system for the internal stuff.

And that was me.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Sebastien.

Maxim, do you have anything to add to what Sebastien said from the registry group? And if so, please be very brief. We've got to get through this and need to get to some other items.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba, for the record. Just nod to Farell that we are not acting on ourselves. We are guided by the constituency. And there was a poll, so we represent their views.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Maxim.

Just to be clear, I think Farell was probably -- or at least potentially referring to the poll, the survey that we did back in January when he said it was just three councillors. So let's -- but let's not spend any more time on that. But thank you for the clarification.

Okay. Next is Rafik, and then Philippe, and then we'll probably need to move on. And, again, if others have additional feedback or input on any of this, we'd love to see that, feel free to send it to the list or to the leadership.

Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith.

So just to make a quick comment. I think, as you stated, there was some confusion. So I don't think there is implication that what is shared here is only councillor views, because the expectation is that's what's happening, is to get the input from the different group -- stakeholder groups of the constituency. So I think that now it's clarified.

For NCUC, we shared the list of future GNSO work items. But I think what was mostly kind of pointed or highlighted as maybe in terms of

top priorities, the work what maybe we might call Phase 3 for EPDP, and then the Phase 2 for the review of RPMs. And just also to make maybe the point that we still need, too, maybe clarification for the GNSO Council, I think also we have that as action item regarding IDN. I'm not saying it's one of the priority, but it's something (no audio) -- something about the scope and what is expected. And we should follow up the action item that was made before. It's not IDN. I'm sorry, the IRD. Even me, I just confused it right now.

So thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Rafik. Good points.

Okay. Philippe, you have the last word on this one, and then we will move on to AOB.

Philippe, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

Okay. Philippe has an audio problem.

Philippe, if you can connect, you are welcome to jump back in. Otherwise, we are happy to receive any input you have got via email.

With that, let us move to AOB. There's a couple of different substantive items. One I want to focus on is current discussion that's going on in the EPDP phase 2 group about -- Rafik, I will probably turn to you and to Marika for some help on this one.

But, essentially, there's discussion coming out of the EPDP phase 2 group and a question that related to the topic of data accuracy from -- and this came from the EPDP phase 1 final report, that there was a reference -- and I think it was a footnote, a reference to the fact that the topic of data accuracy within -- as being discussed would require further discussion or further consideration. That was in the EPDP phase 1 report. And that there's questions -- or there's discussion taking place now in EPDP phase 2 about the topic of data accuracy. And I think my understanding of this situation is that, you know, there's a question as to whether the topic of data accuracy can reasonably be handled in the very limited time remaining for EPDP phase 2 as they develop the SSAD.

And I think on this particular case -- and this is my view in terms of how this could be handled, is that the topic of data accuracy is an important one. And it deserves appropriate attention and appropriate discussion.

I strongly question whether that topic can reasonably be and successfully be addressed within the time remaining within the EPDP phase 2 time line, which is looking to wrap up its work in June but it also is moving in the priority issue back to the discussion of the EPDP - - sorry, the public comments here coming up in a couple of weeks when the public comment period closes on the 23rd of March.

So while there's a recognition that data accuracy is a worthwhile topic, an important topic, and something that needs further discussion, I don't know -- and I don't believe -- that there was an

expectation that that discussion would take place within the scope of EPDP phase 2.

So the group is actually looking for some input and some guidance from council as to whether this is in scope or out of scope. And my suggestion would be that perhaps we as the council could call for a small group, a special group, a dedicated group to be able to come together outside of the EPDP phase 2 effort but to initiate this conversation and start talking about it. So just a thought from me in terms of how to acknowledge that it's an important topic worthy of input and discussion but that, you know, the time and bandwidth remaining in the EPDP phase 2 won't allow for it to be taken there and that it's probably out of scope anyway.

So just my initial thoughts on this one. There's some time urgency about this. So just want to hear if anybody has anything to say.

I see Maxim, Tatiana, Greg.

Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba for the record.

In terms of "accuracy," there are two things called "accuracy." One is ICANN term about how correct WHOIS record was. And another is GDPR. It shouldn't be conflated. Just same word, different meanings. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, thanks, Maxim. My understanding on that point is that the references to "accuracy" within GDPR are specific to obligations of the data subject and not specific to accuracy of data for storage or anything like that. But, again, I'm no expert in that area.

Tatiana and then Greg.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much. Tatiana Tropina for the record.

I want to address several items and include something that was said in the chat.

Well, first of all, Keith, I fully agree with you that there are two issues related to the scope and work of EPDP team. First of all, I do not believe that this is in the scope of the charter. And, secondly, EPDP work has a very short time frame.

So if they are going to consider accuracy, I do not believe that it would be considered inappropriate manner taking into account the time frames.

Now I'm going to go to the chat and discuss something that Marie just posted in the chat about legal team discussing the questions related to accuracy.

I'm a part of this legal team. And I would not say that these questions of accuracy are supported by all the members of legal team and all respective stakeholder groups participating in the EPDP.

I will not go to the legal discussion here, but I do believe that, first of all, the Bird & Bird addressed data accuracy already. And the EPDP report said already that the findings of EPDP will not affect data accuracy.

And also to what Maxim just said and you, Keith, said as well, the term and the scope of "accuracy" in the GDPR is very different to the questions that ICANN Org is asking in their letter. And if we are going to conflate it with the remit of EPDP, it's going to lead us nowhere because as far as I understand, right now the discussion of the EPDP, if we put it within the remit of GDPR is who is actually benefiting from accuracy. Is it only the registrant, or is it also Org and registries and registrars and so on and so forth, data controllers versus, you know, data subjects?

And this is a very, very narrow discussion. Even then I believe this is outside of the scope of the GDPR.

Anyway, I would say the way forward for this would be to scope this issue separately, to see if it's necessary for ICANN to deal with this as an additional PDP or additional EPDP, whatever you name this process.

But it shouldn't be the remit of the EPDP because it is so outside of the scope of the GDPR compliance. Basically if we look at the GDPR, I do not -- and the EPDP charter, I do not believe that the question that ICANN Org is asking in this letter or the question that EPDP is asking actually is within the remit of this process. Thank you very much.

So there should be another group formed. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, thank you very much, Tatiana.

Greg, you get the last word on this one and then we will move to an open mic.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Yeah, this is Greg for the record.

I agree mostly with your comments when we first started talking, Keith, and you introduced the subject. The registrars do not believe this is within the scope of the EPDP.

And then just as a practical matter, this is a really broad issue that warrants a lot of consideration. And to try to, I guess, discuss this weighty topic on this really small time line we have left in EPDP phase 2 just doesn't seem advisable.

So the registrars do not believe this is in scope. And just from a practical standpoint, this issue needs to be discussed perhaps in another group or somewhere else in the policy development process.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Greg. Rafik, over to you as the vice chair and council liaison to the group. And that will be the last word.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. So I heard your (indiscernible) also getting the stance from the comments and also from the chair. But I just want to be sure what kind of response -- what response I should relay to the EPDP team since they are waiting for our input. And that will impact their work for priority. So have that time constraint. I just wonder if we can get clear guidance here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, thanks very much, Rafik.

So question is: Can you clarify for me what the time line is that the EPDP team would need? In other words, when do you need a response? Sorry to be direct.

I know the team is supposed to be moving on, what, 24 March to be focusing on consideration of public comments. So I'm just wondering when do you need a response from us. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. So it was suggested if we can get response by the 13th, so it means this Friday, if I'm not mistaken, in the way for us to adjust our plan and so on.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Rafik. What we'll do is we'll take this to the list. I'm noting that the BC does not agree with the comments that have been made by others. So we'll take this to the list. Watch for an email from me in terms of possible next steps.

All right. With that, we have five minutes left on our agenda and I would like to get to an open mic.

I'm going to ask staff, do we have some flexibility in terms of going over a bit? I know it's getting real late for some folks. But I would like to give open mic an opportunity.

So, Jeff, go right ahead. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Keith. Sorry. Took me a second to get off mute.

Yeah, I want to talk about that Gantt chart. And I will start with the real positive. I think those charts are great, and I think it's a great addition to really give a readout of where the PDPs are. So fantastic on that part.

What I think we need to also work on, though, is I don't believe there's a consistent understanding of what any of those statuses actually mean. And so, in fact, there's been some side chatter amongst different people that, you know, everyone seems to have a different view of what it's supposed to mean.

But the third thing -- and I think this is more important -- is that as policy managers, if something -- it's already noted that I disagree with the status of our group.

But putting that aside, if something is truly at risk or in trouble, shouldn't that trigger escalation procedures as the managers? Normally, if you're in a project -- let's put it into the business context --

and you are a project manager and something is labeled "at risk," that would immediately kick into an escalation procedure which would -- you have meetings with the project manager. You would have to do a remediation plan. You would have to do all sorts of things in order to get that project back into compliance. And if it was, God forbid, in trouble, it would even be at a second escalation, even higher for more things.

So having the statuses is great. It's a great start. But if it doesn't trigger any action or it doesn't mean anything, then what good is having any kind of status?

Now, from Maxim's question, no, I don't believe I'm asking for escalation for our PDP. But if others do believe that our PDP is at risk or in trouble, then shouldn't help be offered or suggestions as to what to do to get it back on track? Otherwise, it's meaningless. That's where I'm trying to get at.

And Berry said (indiscernible) interaction, just to address that, the new dates are in the form. But the statuses are still the same as at risk. So there's definitely some huge miscommunications there.

But, anyway, Berry, it would help to know what the statuses actually mean, what each status would trigger as escalation path, and what council does to help in those situations. It's not just sub pro. It's all the PDPs that are yellow or red or whatever you want to call it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Jeff. I will respond to this, and then we will go to Amr next.

If anybody else who wants to get in queue, please do so.

Jeff, look, I think you have raised some good points. I think this is an evolving process and an evolving tool in terms of how we use it.

But, yeah, this is one component coming out of PDP 3.0 that actually is designed to hold the GNSO Council accountable for managing the PDPs and to give us tools to hold PDP leadership and PDPs accountable for meeting its commitments and time lines and obligations.

That's what this is all about to make sure we are all more efficient and effective in doing the jobs that we need to do.

So, absolutely, I think your question about if something is at risk, shouldn't there be an escalation, the answer is absolutely. And I think that's what the council with the -- sorry, the approval and implementation of PDP 3.0 is moving towards.

And there's also some additional links being provided in the chat about the PDP 3.0 final report and what the status codes and all of that means. So I think there is some definition around that, the definition that you're asking for.

And certainly as I noted earlier, we will make sure the GNSO Council working through our council liaisons and with staff and with the council -- sorry, the PDP leadership coordinate better.

Jeff, I understand you're reacting very negatively to the color on your sub pro page. I get that. So we will take the action to engage with

you, to engage through our council liaisons and with staff to make sure that everything is consistent.

But the point here is that, yeah, looking ahead, the GNSO is going to be more active in engaging through our council liaisons with the PDP leadership to make sure that things are being -- that things are being delivered on time and in scope.

And (indiscernible) is not alone in that. I understand. And as I said earlier, we will do more coordination and more engagement. This is a new document following the PCR that was just submitted and approved, and there's some more work that needs to be done. So thanks.

Amr, over to you.

AMR ELSADR:

Thanks, Keith. This is Amr.

I had originally planned on speaking to internationalized registration data as part of the future work of the GNSO, but I noticed that James Gannon put in the chat that I'm meant to speak to that during the council's April meeting. So I would like to briefly talk about, you know, the last issue you guys were talking about, which was accuracy within the context of the EPDP.

In GDPR -- and I'll try to keep the substantive part really short -- accuracy is very strongly linked to a data subject's right to rectification, which is not exactly the same thing in the ICANN scope.

In the ICANN scope, there are penalties involved for contracted parties as well as registrants, if accuracy requirements are not fulfilled.

There are some overlapping, you know, requirements in GDPR and, you know, what contracted parties are meant to do, sure. But those are largely already in place.

But, again, I'm going to just cut this short here, the substantive part, and focus more on the process part next, which I think is more important.

The EPDP is scoped by two main documents, the temporary specification as well as the charter. In no part is accuracy mentioned. I think if you do a word search for "accuracy" in either one of those two documents, it just won't pop up. And there's a good reason for that. I don't know if this was a conscious decision on the council's part, on ICANN Org's part or not, but -- when coming up with those two documents. But there is a good reason why accuracy should not be within scope of the EPDP. And that is, if you look at annex 4 of the operating procedures, which is the expedited PDP manual, it addresses scenarios where EPDPs in general is a suitable to address policy questions. One is to address a narrowly defined policy issue that identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the ICANN board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation.

And the other is to provide new or additional policy recommendations on a specific policy issue that had been substantially scoped previously. And then it gives some examples to that.

Accuracy has not been scoped properly. In fact, some of the accuracy issues that have been popping up, like the ARS, the Accuracy Reporting System, was not subject to a consensus policy or any PDP in the past at all. So I would say that the topic of accuracy is not only not -- unsuit- -- it's not only unsuitable to be within scope of this EPDP, it's unsuitable to be within scope of any EPDP. And this isn't just some sort of red tape, procedural roadblock that, you know, we need to -- that I'm trying to use to stall any progress on accuracy discussions.

There's a good reason why the Policy and Implementation Working Group put those requirements in when it proposed the EPDP as a new process at the disposal of the GNSO. And that is to make sure that the -- that EPDPs, which don't have an issue scoping phase, are not abused to address issues where you would need to solicit input from the broader community on what should be within scope of any policy discussion that is going on.

So, you know, saying that it's within scope of this EPDP, to me, is clearly wrong. But I think there's a more general issue that the topic of accuracy is not suitable for any EPDP. If accuracy is going to be, you know, taken on as a project or an undergoing for policy development within the GNSO, it does require an issue scoping phase, which means a traditional PDP, where there would be a public comment period on a preliminary issues report and people would be allowed to provide input on what would eventually land in the final issues report and the charter for whatever PDP working group takes this on.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Amr. And appreciate your input on that.

So there's also some exchanges going on in the Zoom room chat on this topic as well. So on the question of data accuracy and the scope of the EPDP, watch for an email from me on the council list so we can continue the conversation. I apologize that we ran out of time. And it's obviously an important issue, as I noted earlier.

So thank you for that.

I believe we are out of time, and I apologize for short-shrifting everybody on the open mic. But we actually had quite a bit of substance to discuss today.

So with that, thank you, all, very much for joining our remote ICANN67 GNSO Council meeting in the month of March. And thank you, all, very much for joining. And we will wrap up the call.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much, everyone, for joining.

Thomas, our technician, if you can please stop all recordings. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect remaining lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]