Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan: All right, I'm going to keep us moving on then. So our next session is - deals with the purpose of GTLD registration data services, final issue report and Marika is going to give us an update on the final issue report and then we'll have an opportunity to discuss it. It's essentially the next generation registry data services.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you very much Jonathan. Hi everyone, this is Marika. There are quite a number of slides in this slide deck, but I think (unintelligible) go through them relatively quickly and a lot of this is more for your background and reading at a later stage. Just as a reminder, I think most of you remember that this initiative basically started back in 2012 when the board requested their PDP on the topic of defining the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to (unintelligible) registration data, which was done. Combined with a preliminary issue report that was published at that time as well as a launch of the expert working group on this topic.

So basically once the - after the expert working group complete its work the board redefined - or reconfirmed its request and as quite a few things have changed in the meantime. We basically published a new preliminary issue report for public comment on the 13th of July and what happened in the meantime as well after the finalization of the EWG report, the board and the GNSO council got together to develop a framework that would serve as a basis for managing this PDP as, I think, it was recognized that it is, of course, a very big piece of work with a lot of different parts. So the GNSO and the board worked together to outline a framework for how to best manage the

PDP, which basically served as well as the basis for the preliminary issue report as well as the charter that was included in that preliminary issue report.

So 12 comments were received at that report and, you know, we basically looked at those and finalized the issue report and submitted it to the council on the 7th of October. So the issue report itself follows to a large extent, I think, the - all the issue reports that you see. There's a lot of background information on the issue.

We've tried to cover as well as much information as possible on input that has been received on this topic over the years from a different group such as the GAC, also the article 29 working parties information on who it studies as well as a formal stakeholder group and constituency views that have been submitted. (Unintelligible) had a report of (unintelligible) expert working group and final report and their recommendations talks about indeed the framework and how that is expected to manage the different independent areas in this process. The discussion of the proposed issues that are expected to be addressed in the PDP and, as I said before, as part of the PDP improvements we also included a draft PDP working group charter as that reflects basically the outline of the processes agreed to by the GNSO and the board and the process of framework working group.

(Unintelligible) briefly received 12 comments, which I think to a large extent were - could be divided in three different (unintelligible). So the first of one of those were clarifications or corrections or enhancements to the issue reports. All of which we basically included - or addressed in the final issue report. There were a number of comments on the process framework itself and there we didn't make any specifics.

I think some of those comments were similar to issues that had already been discussed or considered by the process (unintelligible) framework group and as such, you know, from a staff perspective we didn't feel appropriate for us to make those changes and felt that those were probably items that should be either further discussed by the council and or in consultation with the board

working group if (unintelligible) council would feel that changes would need to be made to that overall process framework. But I think it's important to note that the charter itself as it's written like with other charters there's a lot of flexibility in there - I mean it outlines the issues that need to be addressed at minimum.

It doesn't restrict or restraint the working group as such and, of course, it's also envisioned that a working group would develop a work plan in which it would provide further details on how certain things will be done and handled. So, again, that's another opportunity for further fine-tuning and some of the proposed steps in the process. And there was a third category of concrete inputs and potential recommendations and implementation guidance. And, again, you know, we've - that information is included in the summary report, but that is information that is more appropriately considered either by the council as well as the PDP working group when it gets to the stage of - as deliberations.

So (unintelligible) we now - as you see there are quite some steps that this process has already gone through and, of course, this is not the end stage, but this is just the end stage of maybe the first phase in the PDP process where we're at the - the phase where the council is expected to consider the charter for adoption and as you may know as this is a board initiated PDP there is no intermediate vote of the council on initiation, which is the practice where the PDP is initiated by the council. So basically the really next step here is the consideration of the PDP working group charter. And once the council agrees on the charter next step would be a call for volunteers and forming the working group in our standard PDP process.

Just briefly mentioning the process framework because I think that may also facilitate maybe subsequent conversations that the council may have on the charter as well as the process and I think here it is worth noting as well that since I think the completion of the work of this - the board GNSO process framework group the board has formed a specific committee and I think it's - I'm not exactly sure the name. I think it may be that the RDS committee, but

at least a specific committee within the board that is expected to be able to (unintelligible) and have a dialogue with the council on topics (unintelligible) to this PDP as this is a board initiated PDP.

So for the consideration and discussion may need to be held as well with the board to see how they would like to be involved and engaged. Whether that is at the council board level or whether, you know, the board foresees as well active participation in the PDP working group. Either in the form of a liaison or through that group. But, again, that may be a topic that you may want to add to the agenda for tomorrow's conversation with the board to get some feedback on how they're envisioning that going forward.

So basically the framework breaks down the work in three different phase. So phase one is really focused on the policy requirements definition - so the if and why we're doing this. Phase two is really focused on the designing of the policy based, of course, on the requirements defined in the first phase. And then phase three is focusing on the implementation guidance. And the framework also very clearly foresees and I think (unintelligible) as well the inputs specifically from the council that after each of these phases the council would basically take a decision, whether, you know, sufficient progress and agreement is reached in each of these phases before the group moves on to the next phase.

And here again I know that Avri is not here, but I know that she had some specific questions on why certain things weren't included in phase one and, you know I can comment on it now because I think she was asking about (unintelligible) impact assessment. Why that wasn't done at the end of phase one, but I think, again, that was something where the board and the GNSO process working group, you know, discussed that basically phase one would have the requirements also for, you know, which impact assessments would need to be done or what kind of criteria would need to be met while the actual impact assessment would be done at the end of phase two once you actually have, you know, specific policy recommendations on the table that can actually be assessed. So just on that specific point.

So (unintelligible) happens next, you know, PDP has - once all the work, of course, is done and after the PDP working group, you know, council would consider recommendations, the board would consider implementation review team - implementation and a final policy hopefully it's at some state.

So (unintelligible) I wouldn't dwell too much on this just to note that there is a lot of detail in the charter on how to work or what the questions are that the working group is expected to be guided on for each of the phases and so I'll just leave that - nothing behind or if there's anything you want to specifically focus on. I think the most relevant here may be to show you this table again. I think you've seen that already a couple of times, but this is one of the outputs of the board GNSO process framework group.

Where you see that each of the themes that are expected to be addressed come back in the different phases, but with a different focus, of course. Phase one, policy requirements. phase two, policy functional design for each of the topics and then phase and then phase three, implementation and also addressing, you know, (unintelligible) and guidance. I think it is, you know, one of the things that, of course, a working group will need to discuss and think through, you know, what of this can be done in parallel and what needs to be done in sequence. How to manage, of course, a workload.

It's obvious that probably in phase two and three there may be overlap or linkages between the two so that even though they're written out as separate phases the work actually may be done simultaneously because (unintelligible) discuss policy recommendations, implementation guidance may be directly linked to those conversations. So, again, those are some of the details that will need to be worked out as part of a working group work plan on how to manage that. Also taking into account, you know, a number of volunteers, time that may be needed to discuss these issues and time available, of course.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Again, some more parts of the charter. Again, so - again, this clearly spells out as well that after the end of each phase that the council is expected to address, you know, whether a number of questions have been addressed by the PDP and sufficient progress has been made to move on to the next phase and, you know, engage in further work.

So (unintelligible) basically the - a motion submitted on the charter that was included in the preliminary issue report. So that is on the agenda for the meeting on Wednesday. So it's now for you basically to discuss whether the charter, as was submitted, that meet the requirement set out by the GNSO and board process framework working group. Are there any issues that, you know, should be further considered or discussed? And are there any further questions on, you know, the process itself? And I noted here as well - because I know we're already running a little bit behind that there's, of course as well additional time available later today on the item of discussion of motions should more time be needed. I think that's all I had (unintelligible).

Jonathan: Thanks Marika. That's helpful. Actually it makes sense to just have any clarifying questions now and then to discuss anything to do with the motion - we might as well pick up in the motion session as you said later. So any questions (unintelligible) clarify - go ahead (James).

(James):   Yes, thank you Marika. Question about the charter because it does contain some guidance to phase two and phase three. But is it possible that those could be changed as a result of the work in phase one or the result of the decision point or do we have to kind of decide that now or are those still left open for?

Marika Konings: No, it's that - I think that this is basically the best current thinking that the board and GNSO council that when they developed their framework, but I think it is recognized, of course, it should go through the motions. Things may come up, but things may need to change. And I think that's as well why the board working group is created to have that ongoing discussion. Do we

indeed need to course correct and, again, I think (Dan) at that point, you know, the council may need to review as well.. Do we need to change the charter or, you know, is there sufficient - because, as I said, basically (unintelligible) most of the cases at a minimum they should be considered.

So it doesn't mean that additional things cannot be added. So at that point it will need to be, you know, considered by the council. Do we need to modify charter based on where we're at? Or is there (unintelligible) just provide additional guidance to the working group that based on, you know, where we're at in phase one these are the things we also expect to happen in phase two even if they're not explicitly called out in the charter. At least that's my understanding and maybe looking at - (Susan) as well because, of course, she was the chair of that board process working group to see if indeed that was (unintelligible) the sense of the group. You know, it's the best current thinking, but - oh, you were...

Man: I just want to make sure the - that planning ahead for phase two doesn't lock us into a course for phase two if we uncover something in phase one that would make us want to change that.

Woman: I mean as I read the charter I think it's flexible enough to - that we can make course corrections along the way.

Jonathan: Okay, so let's pick that up. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: And, again, I think if you think there should be something specific in the charter, you know, I think you should - you know, you can always make suggestions. If you specifically want to call out or look at the charter - if you think it's not flexible enough. If you specifically want to call out, you know, at the end of phase two the council is also expected to review the charter again. (Unintelligible) also be, you know, a part of the motion, for example, (unintelligible) not need to be in the charter, but it could be as part of the motion that at the end of each phase the council commits to reviewing the

charter again and, you know, either editing or modifying it if it deems needed or appropriate.

Because I mean the charter does foresee that if at the end of phase one the council deems that indeed not sufficient progress has been made or actually the outcome of the working group is that the current (unintelligible) can be modified in such a way that it can meet all the requirements that have been set out that you don't even go to phase two or three. So it's written in such a way that it does make clear that there are certain decision points, but (unintelligible) the specific suggestions on how you want to clarify that either in the charter or maybe in the motion that may be a way of reaffirming that again.

Jonathan: And if you do want to make any changes to the motion please make sure they're friendly. All right, thanks Marika. Let's pick this up further then as we discuss the motion itself and we've got a reasonable session four left. Just a reminder to everyone, please state your name before talking into the microphone so that you can be - your comments can be properly attributed for the transcript.

Okay, we'll nudge straight on to the next session, which - for which I think we might hear further from Marika. Is that correct? That's the new GTLD auction proceeds next. I'm sorry, did I miss someone? I'm sorry (Stephanie), go ahead.

(Stephanie Paren):   (Stephanie Paren) for the record and I do apologize for not thinking of this until a moment too late. Just to a question - does the fact that this is a - not a GNSO generated PDP that it is a board PDP make any difference to our ability to, for instance, slow it down? I'm a little concerned about the burnout rate at the moment given what our colleagues are doing downstairs and the fact that some of our people are triple booked today. You know?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So, no, basically the only difference between council initiated PDP and a board initiated PDP is really at the starting phase. So there's no

vote by the council when the issue report is requested nor on the initiation. So, I think, and thank you for offering the point because I think that's another thing that the council may want to discuss is either part of the motion or in Wednesday's session, you know, if you indeed agree that, you know, the charter is fine as is, indeed what is the timeline by which you think, you know, we should be putting out the call for volunteers and bringing people together? How much time should we allow for that because I think we all recognize that there are a lot of other things going on in the moment that, you know, draw a lot of our usual volunteers to other work.

So I think that is a very good point and something for the council to consider. But, again, it probably is about a good topic for conversation tomorrow with the board to understand from their side how engaged their planning to be or, you know, how much guidance they are expected to provide because, you know, they did request for this work. So the assumption is that there is going to be a kind of dialogue between the GNSO and the board on an ongoing basis, but there are no other requirements linked to the fact that it's a board initiated PDP although the board may, of course, ask the council to deliver something by a certain date, but you're not bound by that (unintelligible).

(Stephanie Paren):   Thanks very much. This is (Stephanie) again and just a little heads up I'm also very concerned about staff burn out. I mean as a retired manager I don't know how you folks are managing because I see your names on all of these procedures. So this is a real concern as we will need a lot of staff support on this project. Thanks.

Jonathan: Go ahead (unintelligible). Thanks (Stephanie).

Man: Yes, thanks (unintelligible). It's just that's what Marika said. It doesn't matter whether the board initiates a PDP or the GNSO council does the (unintelligible) working group is still chartered by the GNSO council. So it really doesn't make much of a difference at all. Thanks.

Jonathan: Thanks (unintelligible). So in my haste to keep us moving through the agenda, I mean, there's a very good point that (Stephanie) makes sand Marika and I had a prep session yesterday and we talked about the possibility of - that the timing is an issue and when might this work commence. And so I think that is something to think about and we can pick that up in either our later discussion on the motion or indeed when we pick it up on the Wednesday session. There's also, as Marika rightly points out, thoughts to be had about what we talk with whom in terms of the board and in particular meeting with (unintelligible) and so on. And I think it's no secret that (unintelligible) has been pretty focused on transition.

So whether or not that's the main topic of our discussions with him is something to think about. Volker had previously sent out a list - a call for subjects (unintelligible). So we'll work on that in a later session. We'll try and bring that together with anything like that that's come up and structure some sensible topics for conversation with the board. So a couple of points there, (Elliot). It's dealing with the motion on the chart. Thinking about resources and when the work and when and how the work should commence and how we discussed that and what the board's role jointly with us in this work.

Okay, that feels like we can appropriately draw a line under that topic.