
ICANN76 | CF – ccNSO: Governance

Tuesday, March 14, 2023 – 15:00 to 16:00 CUN

ANDREA GLANDON:

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Governance Session. My name is Andrea, and along with Devan and Kim, we are the Remote Participation Managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if you put it in the proper form, as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. Information for this session will include English, Spanish, French, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, please be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time

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.

transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Sean Copeland, chair of the GRC. You may begin.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thank you so much and welcome to the governance session of the ccNSO, third time is a charm at Cancun, I suppose. Can you bring up the agenda slide? So today we'll be talking about the conflict of interest and statement of interest. David McCauley will be covering that. We will be talking about an introduction to implementation of PDPs that we are doing and then going on to next steps. Part of this process will be a conversation with Karen, Marika and myself and hopefully taking some questions from the crowd. Over to you, David.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Hello everybody. My name is David McCauley. I'm employed by Verisign and I participate in the ccNSO by virtue of our management of the .cc country code top level domain. I've been part of the Guidelines Review Committee for seven or eight years now, I can't actually recall. But I'm going to talk about the conflict of interest and statement of interest work that's being done by the Guidelines Review Committee at the request of the ccNSO council.

Let's just briefly review the timeline. We introduced this concept at ICANN 74, the virtual ICANN 74, and then talked about and introduced what the purpose of it would be. We developed a headings document basically to show our direction of travel by ICANN 75. It appears to us that that direction of travel was fine with the group. We therefore, between then and now, created a template for the statement of interest disclosure form. We will talk about that today, and we will do a little bit of polling at the end to again ask your approval for what we're doing in this respect.

The document is available on the web, I believe that you've been sent the link, but it's clearly available from the slides today and from some of the materials today. And so following our development of a form, it would then go on for legal review and finally for council approval. So next slide, please.

So this slide is a bit of a parenthetical talking about the conflict of interest procedure. I'm going to be speaking mostly today on the statement of interest procedure. But this is part of the context in which it operates, and so I thought I'd mention it. And this conflict of interest procedure only applies to members of ccNSO council. That's it. And it starts with transparency, that is the actual statement of interest that we're talking about. And it will go on in the conflict of interest procedure to deal with recusal of councilors when certain circumstances exist onto removal, actually moving out of the room when a discussion ensues for certain other more important reasons, and then how they get returned to the discussion. So as I said, this is a parenthetical, it's part of the context in which the statement of interest resides. Next slide, please.

So introduction of the statement of interest. We spent a lot of time on the language that we use with respect to the statement of interest. We drew heavily from the Generic Name Supporting Organization and the good work that they have done on statement of interest. They're actually looking at it as we speak again. We have tried to be lightweight and have a positive disclosure. The impetus obviously for a statement of interest, a statement of what motivates someone to participate in a group is transparency. That is so other participants in a group can understand exactly where someone's coming from when they make their interventions. Next slide, please.

While we're waiting for that, let me just mention that a statement of interest will be public, publicly available on the website, and that's an important thing to recall about statement of interest and as they're filled out. So a statement of interest, unlike the conflict of interest which simply applies to councilors, a statement of interest is going to apply to anyone within the ccNSO or anywhere else for that matter who participates in a ccNSO PDP or other working group that's working towards a certain end. It does not apply to staff, however. They have a separate employment provisions to deal with this.

A statement of interest is to be updated annually by the person who writes the statement of interest and submits it in order to participate in this working group. Or the statement of interest could be updated more frequently than annually if a significant change occurs in the person's circumstances, employment or otherwise, financial, or other circumstances, who submitted that statement of interest.

Once the statement of interest is submitted and the person is participating in a working group, the policy will instruct that during working group meetings, the chair at the outset of the meeting asks if people have updates to their statement of interest for something that may have changed in the intervening time, such as change in employment or something of that nature. And we are working on a form I'll talk about shortly that the Secretariat will provide an electronic form for the statement of interest. Next slide, please.

Well, okay, we'll get to questions. I would like to talk a little bit about the form, and I'll do that now without the benefit of a slide. We do have slides, but we put them in the background here. They are really a copy of the form. The text is much too small. But let me talk about what the form is going to be asking people to disclose in order to participate in the working group.

The form will have definitions. Principally, there will be a definition of a material interest and a financial interest. And a material interest will be, as the name implies, an interest of consequence, something that is a motivational factor in someone's participation in the working group. And obviously, it won't disqualify them from working in the working group, but it will allow others to understand just what their perspective might be. A financial interest will be typically some kind of reward, payment, compensation, etc., for participating in the group or relative to participating in the group.

The form itself will ask for someone's full name, their current employer. Even if they're self-employed, they would put themselves. The category of work that they do, legal, financial, policy, whatever it might be,

operational. It will have a blank place to talk about financial interest and to indicate whether they have a financial interest consistent with the definition in the outcome of the working group or the PDP working group. And that disclosure will indicate that one thing that would be a financial interest is ownership of 3% or more of any corporation that has a relationship with ICANN, a contract with ICANN. There's some kind of a financial benefit for that corporation in working with ICANN.

The form will ask about representation. This is one of those matters that the GNSO is currently looking at again, representation. Who does the person filling out the form represent, if not just themselves or their employer who's already been identified? And that will ask if there is, in fact, some representation to identify that party, person, whatever that they are representing, and to describe the relationship. The form will go on to talk about material interests and ask about, do you have a material interest, something that is relative to the work of the working group and the desired work of the working group or desired outcomes of the working group? Disclose it, please, in accordance with the definitions in the instructions.

It will ask about interests not just respecting the working group but that might have an indirect consequence in other work being done by the ccNSO. The form will be checked for completeness and accuracy. For completeness, the secretariat will review the form. If there are any questions about completeness, the secretariat will work with the individual on a cooperative basis. All of these steps on checking completeness and accuracy will all be done on a cooperative basis. That will be explicitly stated as the goal. We'll work with that person to

complete it or otherwise resolve it. Or if that doesn't work, then it would be referred to the working group chair to step in.

There will be a check of the form for accuracy, which can be raised by anyone in the working group, theoretically. And again, the effort to check whether it's accurate and to take steps to make it accurate if that wasn't the case would be done on a cooperative basis and would be done with the chair of the working group. Or if it's the chair in any case that is the subject of this inquiry, it would be done by a person designated by the working group.

And so in rough form, that is the form that we're talking about. And we will be doing some polling very shortly to ask you if this direction that we're taking is in your mind worthy of support. So with respect to anything I've said so far, now we're at the slide that talks about questions, comments, and then we'll get to some polling. So I will look for hands up in Zoom and also in the room. And I don't see any right now. So maybe, Sean, we should go to the polling.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thank you. Kimberly, can you bring up the first poll question? So the first poll question for you guys is, do you support the proposed statement of interest template? And everybody in the room can participate. So that's not bad. 88% of you guys are supporting it. Let's move on to the next question. Have I messed that up, Kimberly? Okay.

The next question is, do you think it is reasonable to require completion of the statement of interest to join a ccNSO group? Thank you for that,

you guys. It's greatly appreciated. 95% of you are supporting that. Okay. With that, can we have the next slide?

ANDREA GLANDON: do have a comment in the chat from Mike Locke. I guess the issue for using national SOI standards is that we are international orgs, so need our own.

SEAN COPELAND: Thank you for the comment. So why are we discussing implementation? Really, when you think about it, from the PDP point of the world, we've done all this work in the ccNSO community. It gets handed over to the Board, and off it goes, and we think that somewhere down the line, it's going to magically appear. It's not really that simplistic. So we reached out to the GNSO, to Marika here, and to Karen, and to Lars back in November to discuss this within the GRC.

The purpose was to understand the role of the ccNSO, if any, with respect to our policies after Board adoption. Next slide. So as part of this discussion, Bart did a graphic for us, which you're looking at, and within that, you're going to see a lot of work effort that goes into a PDP after a Board has given its approval, and this is where the GRC has been starting to work to give an implementation process for us going forward.

So again, we've been learning from the GNSO, from Marika Konings here and Karen Lentz. Marika's Vice President Policy Development Support of ICANN. She's been with the community since 2008. She's got a background in cybersecurity, public affairs, consulting, and she has a

Master's in European Political Administration Studies, which I found quite fascinating, to be honest. Karen has also been with ICANN since 2003. She has two Master's degrees in Fine Arts and Writing, so I apologize for my horrible handwriting on these cards, and a Master of Science in Journalism.

So again, as I said, Marika joined a call with Lars Hoffman in November with the GRC, and that was appreciated, and it was very informative, and I hope that members of the community have taken the opportunity to review that material. I know I have suggested it on more than one occasion.

Saying that, before we begin to get into questions, do either Karen or yourself, Marika, do you want to add to a little bit about yourselves?

MARIKA KONINGS:

So I think you covered it very well. In 2008, I joined, so I'm really speaking from kind of the GNSO perspective of things. I've been supporting the GNSO since I joined in 2008, and I'd be very happy to talk to you and at least tell you about our experience with regards to policy development, and then subsequently the implementation process and the conversations we had at the time, which I think are very similar to the ones you're going through at the moment.

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you. Yes, I've done a number of things since I've been with ICANN, but I've always kind of gravitated to this area of policy implementation. To me, this is where the interesting questions are, and it's really, I approach it, I think of it as maintaining the integrity of the work that

happens in the multi-stakeholder model to come up with policies to carefully shepherd that out of an idea and into reality. So that's how I think about implementation work.

SEAN COPELAND: Okay. So we'll start with a question. So first question, and it's for both of you or either, how implementation works for the GNSO policies, including the role of the Board from your perspective.

MARIKA KONINGS: So basically we've come quite a long way, both I think on policy development side as well on the implementation side where policy development is setting the policy recommendations and subsequently those need to be implemented. The challenge has always been, you need to provide sufficient detail in the policy recommendations for the implementers to know what they're supposed to be doing without stepping into the role of also implementing the policy. But at the same time, there also needs to be enough detail there to be able to do that.

So basically the GNSO is responsible for developing those policy recommendations and we also often try to provide implementation guidance to help with that process. Those recommendations go to the ICANN Board and then they decided to adopt them or not adopt them, but assuming those are adopted, they moved them into implementation. The Board basically directs ICANN org to go ahead with implementation and that's where I think Karen and her team then step in and take on that role. So it's kind of really handing over the responsibility where community has been in the driving seat when it

comes to the development of the policy recommendations to then moving that into the implementation part of things.

Actually something that has just come up, because I think we'll also maybe talking a bit about kind of implementation review teams that the GNSO uses to ensure that the community is able to ensure that intent of the policy recommendations is met through the implementation, suggestion has actually just come up in one of the conversations that there should maybe also be a Board liaison as part of that implementation review team, because that is something that currently hasn't happened. I don't think the Board has played a specific role in implementation apart from oversight. So that's something as well, like a kind of an ongoing conversation that I think is happening on the GNSO side of things.

KAREN LENTZ:

Sure. And to carry over from that. So when we receive direction from the ICANN Board to implement a set of policy recommendations, that have come from the GNSO process, we follow what is called the consensus policy implementation framework, or you may hear it called CPIF for short. But that is really defining a repeatable set of stages and roles and responsibilities for different parts of the policy and implementation lifecycle.

So as Marika talked about, when policy development is happening, when the GNSO undertakes a PDP, the policy decisions are happening through the bottom-up process. We, within the function that I'm part of, which is global domains and strategy, we typically have a liaison, somebody from my team, who is helping to support the work of the

working group in a PDP, both from either providing subject matter information or data, and also providing an implementation perspective to the discussions. So identifying if something isn't clear, or have you thought about X, Y, Z. And how that would work.

Then, when the Board does direct the Org to begin implementation, we convene what is called an implementation review team, or IRT. And that is a group of volunteers. And they have a couple of roles. The first one is a kind of review step to make sure that the implementation does accurately reflect or does not go against what was intended and what was written in the policy recommendations. And then there are often some operational details to be worked out, where it's really helpful to have people who will be living with the policy on a day-to-day basis, be able to inform on those kinds of questions. So we work with an IRT on that process.

The other thing I'll say on that is that. You really need all of the parts. You need the policy makers. You need the people from the Org who, that's what they do, is implement policy and have those, have that experience to bring, and then you need the Board to understand and be informed on the work of the implementation. Those roles can change throughout different parts. So if you think of passing a ball, you start out with the bottom-up process and the GNSO doing policy work. That then passes to the Board to make a determination on, are we accepting these recommendations? And then if they do, that ball passes to the Org to lead the implementation. So even though there's somebody having the ball, they're not working in isolation. We continue to work with all of the other parts.

SEAN COPELAND: Thank you for that. So beyond a Board liaison, which I think is a great idea, personally, who would act as a counterpart for the ccNSO for the implementation of the ccNSO-developed policies?

KAREN LENTZ: So this is an interesting question. Within the group that is now GDS has kind of always been there as the other side to the GNSO for implementing their work. And I noted in one of the documents that's under discussion, it talked about for the ccNSO, there's a range of different kind of subject matter of the kinds of policies that the ccNSO works on. And that is true as well, I think, in the gTLD space, where the topics that are part of the PDP might be trademark protection, or they might be data privacy, or they might be how do you ask for new registry services? So there's a great diversity of topics.

And even when GDS is the one leading the policy implementation, we're not the only ones who touch it. So there can be a policy that relates very heavily to technical services or something that we work quite a bit with compliance on the details. But the kind of anchor of who's administering the process and making sure that the project moves forward to completion, that doesn't change, that stays within GDS.

I think that I probably in this room know the least of anyone about ccNSO policy, but I was looking at the bylaws and the part that talks about the scope of the ccNSO and how there's the data entry function, the name server function, and then there are these different roles in terms of policy and execution and accountability. So I thought that was

interesting and potentially a structure that is already existing and could be used because I think in some instances, the policies relate quite a bit to the IANA functions and others, they may sit somewhere else.

So I thought that was interesting and I think I'm interested in the conversation. I will offer myself and team also to be available if we can be helpful in developing that aspect.

MARIKA KONINGS:

And yeah, maybe just to add, because of course for the GNSO, it has always been maybe easier to find that home because GNSO policies typically result in new contractual requirements for contracted parties that need to be written into the agreement. So that is maybe a more direct line to GDS compared to ccNSO policies that are more wider ranging. So I think the conversation will be very helpful to better understand that and see how to best do that. But as I said, I think we've gone through the process of well, where I think in the beginning times, it was also, it was kind of, the ball wasn't handed over, it was kind of thrown over the defense and someone was expected to pick it up and it would be thrown back at some point. And it kind of, the black box, I think comment that you made as well, we heard on the GNSO side as well, where people felt that it wasn't clear who might be doing what or who would be involved. And I think a lot of transparency has been created on the GNSO side, at least on where those things are, where those conversations happen. Because even on the IRT, even though there might be one person leading that IRT, there is engagement and participation as well from other ICANN Org departments that are involved in that conversation. And again, from the GNSO side, it's often

compliance, for example, is one of the partners, legal might be one of the partners, technical services may be involved. So I think that has also greatly helped kind of that dialogue with the community and at least the understanding that it's, and there's engagement at earlier stages, there's not a final end product that's kind of thrown back over the wall. And then the comments might be, oh, we had no idea that this is what you thought we wanted. But there's an earlier opportunity to kind of say, this is what we had intended. And let's see if we can make sure that attendance is met through the implementation.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thank you for that. That's actually very informative for us. Next question for you guys. What is missing or is not relevant in the initial thinking of what we were doing in the GRC that you have seen based on your experience? Any thoughts? Or still too soon?

KAREN LENTZ:

Well, I don't think of it as anything that's missing, but I would say from the benefit of experience, we've had the consensus policy implementation framework in place since around 2015, and we're still making updates to it. So I think it's very much a learning process and that—build in room for evolution. Some of the things that we're working on now do relate to defining the responsibilities of how we can bring in some of the implementation information earlier in the PDP. And as Marika noted, even in the discussions this week, people have opinions about how to make the IRT work better. And I think that's what we want. So I would expect some evolution.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, to add, and I think Karen also mentioned that, making sure that there's sufficient flexibility in there, because again, not every implementation is the same and making sure that there is predictability in it, but give yourself as well enough flexibility to deal with different circumstances that may emerge and indeed ensure that you have continuous improvement in that ability to update as you learn.

Because I think, as Karen said, we started off, but immediately already realized that further detail might be necessary. In practice, there were certain steps we were taking that we had actually, we hadn't documented in the CPIF. And the GNSO was actually expected to start looking at the IRT guidelines as well. Is it a good opportunity to look at those? Are they still fit for purpose? Are there certain updates that should be considered or should be made?

One very important factor for the GNSO, and again, maybe it's less relevant for the ccNSO, is also how can you make sure that if during the implementation process you identify policy issues or you identify that there's disagreement between the IRT and ICANN Org on how something should be implemented or that intent is not being met, how can you take that back then to the GNSO Council for resolution? And at least from the GNSO side, the GNSO Council liaison to the IRT plays a very important role in that at the moment. But I think it's something that might be good to look at as well. Is that the most efficient way? Should there be more detail around that? Because again, when everything goes well, it's okay, but you also need to foresee what if there is disagreement or there are things that come up that you just

didn't think about during the policy development process. How can you make sure that those are dealt with as well in a way that, again, that's predictable and transparent for all those involved?

SEAN COPELAND: Thank you for that. Lots to digest. Now, is there any questions from the floor?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Does ICANN allocate the full estimated cost of an implementation after Board approval of the community developed policy? Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: Can I repeat the question? Make sure I understood. Does the budget include funds to support for us to do the policy implementation work after the Board approves it?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, that's the spirit of the question. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: Okay. Thank you. I guess typically this is part of our—speaking for my team specifically, this is part of what the team's remit is, is to do this implementation work. And we're not just sitting waiting until the Board takes action. Because as we've talked about, the team is also involved during the PDP in planning and engaging with the working group.

So I'll say in most cases, when we have a new policy project coming from the GNSO, it's not called out as a specific line item, because it's

just work that's ongoing, part of normal operating procedures. When there is something that is, I'll call it significant in terms of cost, expected to be very costly and take a fair amount of time, those things sometimes have a special budget allocation. An example is the operational design work on new gTLD subsequent procedures on those recommendations relating to the next round. I think that the fact that there were going to be so many more resources needed to do that than would occur in a, I'll call it standard project, that there was a special budget allocation for that.

MARIKA KONINGS:

And maybe just to add, not specifically on the budget, but more kind of the planning cycle, because I think that's something we learned as well through doing and seeing that there was a gap, the regular conversations between the GNSO team and those that would likely be involved in implementation to make sure that they were aware of the policies the GNSO was working on and the timeline for those, because that of course impacted their resources and would allow them as well to plan ahead and know that something would be coming likely to them in a certain timeframe.

Obviously now through liaisons that participate from ICANN Org in the policy development team, it's even more transparent and they're of course more actively engaged as well to already on the front end think about what might implementation take and indeed are there additional resources that might be necessary that would need to go through a separate approval process so that indeed it doesn't need to wait until

the moment the Board says yes, then you start thinking about what does this take and what do we need for it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Sean, may I ask a follow-up? Can you address this same question with regards to PTI? Because it looks like the ccNSO policies are being mostly, if not exclusively to date, being directed at PTI, not ICANN org. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: I'm afraid I'm not qualified to talk about PTI and that process, how it works. There is a separate budget from the ICANN operating plan and budgeting process. I believe it follows a similar approach in terms of posting for public comment and feedback and so forth, but I see Amy in the back. Maybe you can add.

AMY CREAMER: Hi, this is Amy Kramer, director of operations for IANA. Yes, we do have our own budget and we do put together an estimated cost for implementation. For the retirement PDP, there was no additional cost. It was something we could do just within our regular daily operations and we're estimating that also for the next PDP coming up. So, we really haven't hit a PDP where we see costs that we would have to do a special budget allocation yet. Thank you.

SEAN COPELAND: Thank you, Amy. Does anyone else have any questions from the floor? No? Okay. A couple of follow-ups for you. Are there any obvious fixes

that would require a formal change that would reduce implementation? And I suppose, Karen, that's at you because you've looked at our bylaws. Is there anything yet that jumps out at you?

KAREN LENTZ:

I don't know if I would call it a fix, but something to keep in mind, and this is something that I think the GNSO community and the org have been working on for a while, is to make sure that major policy questions aren't left to implementation because I think sometimes it's tempting for people to want to be done or certain questions being difficult to get to consensus on.

And so, I think at times those things are just left to be figured out in implementation, which means implementation takes longer. And it also means some of the really difficult questions get people involved in something that they thought was already done. So, I would say that that's one principle is really working to make sure the policy discussions are complete because you don't want to be having policy discussions in the middle of implementation.

SEAN COPELAND:

Fair enough. With the implementation process, how much of it with the GNSO is actually involved in legal contractual issues? How much time, just for comparison purposes, for us?

KAREN LENTZ:

Sure. So, with the gTLDs, their agreements with ICANN specify that they will comply with policies that are developed through the policy process.

So it's hard to say if something's typical. But in most cases, we're spending our time working on a policy document that is a draft with language saying these are the new requirements. So, whether it applies to registries or registrars or both, we're drafting a policy document that lays out what those requirements are.

In most cases, that becomes part of their contractual obligations because the contract includes the reference to those policies. In some cases, for example, if the policy recommendations would change or overwrite something that's in the agreement, like a specification, then we would spend time rewriting and updating that to conform to the new policy requirements. But typically, we're not spending time working on the contract itself so much as defining the requirements and spelling those out for the contracted parties.

MARIKA KONINGS:

And maybe just to add, I think we've seen a little bit of evolution there as well because I think in some of the earlier working groups, there was a tendency to already try and write the contractual language and provisions. And then it turned out as well that you're really tying the hands of the implementers in that way because, again, those making the policy are policymakers. They're not the implementers or often not lawyers either. I think it now has much more evolved to indeed setting the principles at a high level, which is then indeed translated into a policy document that's produced during the implementation phase.

SEAN COPELAND: Okay, so would it be safe to say if this fell under your auspices that we might be looking at a more streamlined process, perhaps?

KAREN LENTZ: Perhaps, yes.

SEAN COPELAND: All right, you guys. No other questions from anyone here? I would like to thank both of you very, very much for your time and coming here and talking to the ccNSO. Thank you. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Marika, Karen, Sean, for that very insightful conversation. Very helpful. So what I'd like to do now is just catch all the members of the community up on what we in the Guidelines Review Committee are doing vis-a-vis coming up with an implementation process. And so could we go to the next slide, please? Okay. So obviously, why is it important? We obviously see it as important, and it's to define the roles of the ccNSO and our responsibilities regarding implementation of ccNSO policies. Let's go to the next slide that's very much related to this. And it talks about the bylaws provision and gives an example of a recent resolution.

The bylaws in Annex B talk about what happens when the Board approves one of these recommendations. And as you can see, it says upon adoption of a PDP process outcome, the Board shall direct or authorize ICANN staff to implement the policy. And the resolution

quoted, and you can read it for yourself on the screen, is from the recent retirement policy approval. Next slide, please.

So the Guidelines Review Committee is getting involved in this because seeing what happens when the retirement policy has been approved and what can happen, noting what's coming along, and the increased number of ccNSO PDPs—you see the examples, the review mechanism, the one relating to IDNs, the retirement policy, these are coming, I mean, some are here, but these show an increase in ccNSO PDP work, some of which you can imagine. Look at the IDN PDP-4 that's underway and some of the examples Bart mentioned this morning about variant management, confusing similarities, some of the potentially confusing things that can come from those PDP recommendations.

So we want to articulate a process for assisting ICANN Org staff. So it's staff under the bylaws that's going to do it. We want to assist. We want to have a policy available in those instances where we feel we need it, as opposed to desperately looking around for some kind of a process to use and not having one. So we're coming up and designing this based on the GNSO practices that Karen and Marika just spoke about, but we're going to tailor them to our context. Next slide, please.

This is an important one, the first bullet. It indicates clearly that what we're calling an implementation consultation group, not an IRT, is not mandatory. Council doesn't have to do this, obviously. We can't dictate to them. But it's a tool that will be available to them in case they wish to convene an ICG to help staff implement any one policy recommendation. Some of the principles that will underline what we're doing mirror some of what you just heard about. Avoid relitigating

policy issues. The implementation team, the implementation consultation group, their job is not policy. It is implementation, helping staff. And so it will be clear that their job is not to allow for relitigation of policy issues, not to allow for discussion or addressing individual cases. That's not the role of this. Questions of those natures should be sent back to council. Council is the one that's controlling the PDP process. Council can then give guidance to the ICG, give guidance on implementation steps. Theoretically, they could re-institute that same PDP or start another.

Another thing we're going to look for in what we develop is a strong encouragement that PDP members join the ICG. That is already developed wisdom as to what was intended by the PDP. And so we're hoping that those members will join in the implementation side. Next slide, please.

As we've mentioned, and as Karen and Marika mentioned, it's the staff's job. What will happen with our group is they will interact with staff on the implementation process and on the organizational steps that you can see there. Picking a chair for the ICG, meeting logistics, agendas, schedules, cadence, things of that nature, keeping records and milestones. And then at the end of the process, the ICG will have a job under the approach that we're taking to check for consistency of the implementation work and to make sure that the sign-off by Council prior to sending it to the Board is consistent absolutely with the results of the PDP working group. And that should be it. Let's see the next slide, please.

So these are the members of the group that are working on this. This is the direction that we're taking. We wanted you to be aware of it. This is what we think, as I said, this will be discretionary. Council does not need to do this, but if they have a particularly complex result or if there's some circumstance that Council feels that they should have an ICG assist staff in implementation, this will be there as we continue our work. Sean, I think I should turn it back to you now.

SEAN COPELAND:

Thank you so much, David. So I would like to thank members of the GRC, and particularly David [inaudible] and Irina, for their work on getting the language just right, especially on the SOI. Trust me, we spent a lot of late nights on that. I'd like to thank Bart, Kimberly, Joke, Andre, Kevin, Jeffrey, the interpreters, who without you, this would not be happening. And finally, a little bit of humor, and I appreciate the Sesame Street reference might go past. This was brought to you by the letter V for vote, the letter P for PDP, and the number 3. And with that, I yield back your time. Thank you. Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]