
ICANN82 | Prep Week – Policy Implementation and ICANN Reviews Update
Tuesday, February 25, 2025 – 12:30 to 13:30 PST

JESSICA PUCCIO

Thank you. Hello and welcome, everyone, to the ICANN82 Prep Week session on Policy Implementation and ICANN Review Updates. Today is Tuesday, the 25th of February, and it is 20:30 UTC. My name is Jessica Puccio, and I, along with Jen Shen and Yvette Guigneaux will be your acting as remote participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom session using your full name. Also, please state your name clearly for the recording before speaking.

During the session, questions or comments submitted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud at the time set aside for questions and answers at the end of the program. Questions written in chat will be considered part of the chat and may not be read aloud for the record. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you wish to listen during the session. With that, I will turn

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.

the floor over to our Senior Vice President of Global Domains and Strategy, Theresa Swinehart.

THERESA SWINEHART

Hi, Jessica. Thank you, and everybody, thank you for joining and taking the time to participate in this webinar. I think you'll find it very informative on the vast amount of work that's been happening since our last ICANN meeting.

You're going to be hearing from the team on a couple of areas. The agenda is going to cover an update on the status of reviews-related work and progress towards the implementation of those recommendations. And in that context, the reviews program encompasses, as you know, a wide range of areas, including the facilitation and support of the Specific Reviews and Organizational Reviews. And so, we'll be hearing an update on where we are with various aspects of the work underway in those areas.

We're also going to be hearing from the Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs team, which is responsible for the subject matter research and analysis that supports the ICANN Community Board and Organization in the strategic decision-making and implementation of the policies, recommendations, and advice that come from the community. So, the part that really informs, then, our final implementation and next steps.

The team's work supports the core value of seeking and supporting informed participation in the multi-stakeholder model, as is also

reflected in the bylaws. You'll also be hearing the GDS Research team focuses on activities in supporting informed participation, while our Policy Implementation team is dedicated to our active involvement in the current policy and implementation processes.

So, I know that many of you are involved in these efforts, are dedicating time and engagement and your expertise in these, and we really appreciate the hard work and dedication. And in particular, as we work together to find ways for these important reviews and recommendations to produce better outcomes for the ICANN Community and all of that. So again, thank you for your involvement, and this shares a little bit of what happens once it comes into the organization for the work there. So, with that, let me turn it over to my colleague, Karen Lentz, that oversees and manages and leads this fantastic team. Karen, over to you.

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you very much, Theresa, for going through the agenda, and I'll add that we do have Q&A at the end. So, we are aiming to have enough time for your questions at the end of this session. If we can go to the next slide. I'll quickly introduce Jason Kean, who will start off talking about reviews and reviews-related work. Jessica Villaseñor will cover the research activities. And Isabelle Colas-Adeshina will talk about policy implementation work that is in progress.

I'll note here that we have a lot of work to cover in this session. It's quite a bit of content, and so of necessity, we're covering each thing

very briefly and the major points. But I will invite you to, if you want to learn more, consult our PRSP pre-ICANN82 briefing, which I will drop the link in the chat. And even better, you can talk to us. I'll also add our contact email in the chat. And the next slide is the rest of the talented and hardworking team who's supporting this. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Jason to start the first section. Thanks.

JASON KEAN

Thank you, Karen. And thank you, Theresa. I appreciate that. My name is Jason Kean. I'm a Senior Manager for Reviews and Stakeholder Support. And I'm going to provide an update on the ICANN reviews-related work, of which there's four major projects, and also an update on the status of implementation of specific review recommendations.

Next slide, please, Jen. As Theresa noted, the ICANN Reviews Program consists of two sections of reviews. The first, Specific Reviews, are run by community-led review teams, of which there are four. They are as follows. The Accountability and Transparency Review, Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice review, Registration Directory Service review, and Security, Stability, and Resiliency review. Now, you'll notice two little construction signs in this diagram in front of you.

First about specific review, is the lifecycle reviews project, which notes work that's being done to introduce improvements to the specific review process. And you'll hear a little bit about that later.

You'll also see a little construction sign to the right of the Accountability and Transparency Review. And if you follow the dotted line, it goes right to two additional implementation projects, which I'm going to speak about now, and then update you again shortly.

If we look at organizational reviews, they are run by independent examiners, and they look at each individual SO, AC, and NomCom. The third, Accountability and Transparency Review team, issued two recommendations. 3.6 was to evolve organizational reviews into a Continuous Improvement Program, so you can note that on the bottom right of your screen. And Recommendation 3.5 was to create a new review, the holistic review. Both of these projects are really related, hence you see the arrows going back and forth, and we'll discuss that a little bit more in the following slides.

Next slide, please, Jen. Thank you. So here you see the four projects that we will be discussing kind of mapped onto a single diagram. We're having two projects as one work stream on the bottom, operating standards updates and ATR4, just because they're falling kind of in sequence the way they're presented. And then two additional ones running in parallel, the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Pilot project and the Pilot Holistic Review project. So just to give everyone a sense, as Theresa noted, a lot of the community members, I'm assuming many on this call as well, are participating in these. So, there's a lot of work being undertaken in parallel at the current moment.

Next slide, please, Jen. Thank you. So first up, the Continuous Improvement Program, a quick background. The Continuous Improvement Program Coordination Group was assembled last January to develop a framework that was actually published for public comment from the 21st of November to the 22nd of January of this year. ICANN org a couple weeks ago published an analysis of the comments received. And the continuous improvement community coordination group will be reconvening in the next few weeks to look at those comments, address community input received, and to finalize the framework.

Next steps for this work, ICANN or will support the community in operationalizing the finalized framework. And ICANN org will also update the Board on the progress of the Continuous Improvement Program in June of 2025 so the Board can determine whether or not organizational reviews should be resumed. And you can notice that little flag on the bottom of the screen noting that that point in June of this year.

Next slide, please, Jen. Thank you. Next, a project which is closely associated with the Continuous Improvement Program, the Pilot Holistic Review. The Pilot Holistic Review is tasked with developing guidelines and methodologies for a future review and as part of the implementation, as I noted earlier, of the third Accountability and Transparency Review team's Recommendation 3.5. The teams had an inaugural meeting on the 30th of September of 2024. And since

that time, they've been working diligently to reach consensus on the purpose, scope, and input for a holistic review.

Now, a line among review team members on these core elements of what a holistic review would be is really paramount to determine the approach to the pilot's deliverables as outlined in the terms of reference. If there isn't consensus on what it's intended to do and what things mean, each individual step and deliverable will be very difficult to work through with the team. And that makes it very difficult to develop and finalize a work plan for the team to produce its work. This has been an ongoing discussion amongst the team.

And on next steps, you'll see exactly what I stated. The team is trying to determine their approach on the deliverables. This difficulty and continued disagreement was flagged by the Board-appointed member of the team. And the co-chairs of the team are currently having discussions with the organizational effectiveness committee of the Board to kind of discuss the best way to work through the current challenges and really set the team up for success moving forward, so that each meeting and each deliverable can be productively achieved. So, this is an ongoing effort and we'll continue to update you on this.

Next slide please, Jen. Next, we have the proposed updates to the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews. A background, I mentioned this earlier in the context of the lifecycle of reviews project. This effort is to address identified areas for improvement in the Specific Reviews process. And ICANN org proposed some

updates. They highlighted them in a public comment proceeding and also produced a draft, updated draft with those embedded in the process, as well as a visual flow chart showing what that process would look like for some of those updates included.

The public comment proceeding remains open. It was scheduled to close on the 10th of November. It was extended to the 21st of March to allow additional community discussion, including at ICANN82. Next steps include the analysis of the community input received and revisions to the updated draft operating standards document as needed. Next step would be Board consideration on whether there is sufficient support for the proposed updates in April, 2025. And you can see that timeline, just noting that the public comment proceeding has been extended as per the request of multiple groups.

Next slide please, Jen. Next, we have the fourth, Accountability and Transparency Review. So, a little background for those unfamiliar with this. In April 2024, the Board resolved to defer ATR4 for a limited time, not to exceed 12 months, to allow for the progress of implementation of ATR3 recommendations, 3.5, the Pilot Holistic Review, and 3.6, the Continuous Improvement Program pilot, of which I just spoke about. Lots of work continuing to go on.

They did direct ICANN org to produce implementation updates on those recommendations to inform their decision on whether and when to initiate ATR4. ICANN org, in the update portion, is currently working on producing an implementation status update

report to inform the Board's consideration in April, 2025. So, this is an ongoing discussion and is going to be inclusive of all current work that's happening. And you can see the same timeline on the bottom of this slide.

Next slide please, Jen. Thank you. So, this is an update on the implementation status of Specific Reviews. Again, a lot of work has been undertaken and is ongoing across the ICANN community, Board, and ICANN org. Without going into specifics of each area, 72 Board-approved recommendations were put forth over the last four specific review cycles. 48 have been completed. 24 are currently in progress. And just a reminder on these that the implementation reports are published quarterly, so you can continue to see those updates.

But you can note, and Alice would be happy, unfortunately, Alice Jansen, who runs this, is not here to boast about it. But you can see that everything has been started. All of the no-started elements of this are registering zero, and the majority of these projects, the recommendations are complete. So, lots of progress moving forward.

Next slide please, Jen. And this is another visualization of all the work and the progress that's being made on the implementation of these. So, this shows the progress over all quarters, which currently 67% complete and an update with two recommendations completed over the last quarter. So, you can see 33% are still in progress. But again, they're in progress. All of them have been

started. So, a tremendous amount of work across the ICANN ecosystem to get to this point.

As Karen noted earlier, we're going to be holding questions to the end. So, that concludes the update on the Specific Reviews related work, as well as the implementation of Specific Reviews projects. So, I'm going to, at this point, hand it over to Jessica Villaseñor to cover GDS Research Services. Jessica, please.

JESSICA VILLASEÑOR

Thanks, Jason. I'm Jessica Villaseñor, and I'll be sharing an update on the work of the GDS Research Services team. As Theresa noted earlier, our team engages in a broad range of research efforts to inform policy development processes, policy implementation, and supports informed participation. We currently have a handful of ongoing projects that I'll be updating you on today.

Next slide, please, Jen. So, first is the Operational Design Phase, or ODP community consultation. The Operational Design Phase was established in the ODP Process Paper. It's an assessment of GNSO Council policy recommendations in order to provide the ICANN Board with relevant information to facilitate the determination on the operational impact of the implementation of recommendations. This includes whether the recommendations are in the best interests of the ICANN community.

The ODP Process Paper envisioned the ODP to eventually be incorporated into the Consensus Policy Implementation

Framework, or CPIF. But prior to incorporating the ODP into the CPIF, the paper calls for a community consultation examining the functionality and effectiveness of the ODP. And this community consultation was to be undertaken after a minimum of two ODPs had been concluded.

As of March 2023, ICANN org completed two ODPs. Those were the SSAD ODP and the SubPro ODP, and our team began the ODP community consultation. This consultation consisted of collecting and analyzing feedback from relevant stakeholders, specifically the ICANN Board, ICANN org, and the community to assess the effectiveness of the ODP and identify areas of success, opportunities for improvement, and considerations to evolve the ODP based on takeaways from the feedback we received.

As an update, data collection and analysis was completed for this project in Quarter 4 of 2024, and key takeaways from the consultation will be published in Quarter 1 of this year, so a little later next month. And our team will be presenting these takeaways as part of a larger conversation with the GNSO Council at ICANN82 about updates to the CPIF.

Next slide, please. Our team is also heavily involved in implementation of Specific Reviews recommendations, and we have quite a few recommendation implementation projects specific to the Competition Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team recommendations, or CCT recommendations. And the goal of the CCT review team is to review the extent to which the

New gTLD Program promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice, and it also served to assess the effectiveness of the New gTLD Program application and evaluation process, as well as the safeguards put in place to mitigate possible issues arising from the New gTLD Program.

The previous CCT review began in 2016 and concluded with the publication of the final report, which included various recommendations in 2017. Data collected in response to these CCT recommendations from the projects that we're currently working on will be available for the next CCT review team, which will assess the impact of the Next Round of the New gTLD Program, which is set to open in April of 2026. So, here we want to highlight some key advancements and implementation of a few recommendations. Specific details about the implementation progress can be found in the ICANN Specific Reviews quarterly reports.

So, we'll start with CCT Recommendation 1, which calls for formalizing and promoting ongoing data collection. Our team has been developing a model to guide and support data collection activities to inform future community work and to contribute to effective policy development processes. Included in this model is a data and research request initiative to facilitate ICANN org's ability to receive and process community requests for data and research, and more information about the model and the accompanying research request initiative will be shared with the community soon.

CCT Recommendation 6, which requires collecting regional and TLD-related data. Our team has completed the development of a framework of indicators for successful implementation of this recommendation, and we are actively exploring our options for collecting that relevant data.

CCT Recommendation 7 calls for ICANN org to collect data to understand the implications of domain parking. So, our team has been working on a paper that offers a proposed definition and methodology for detecting domain parking.

This proposal is based on work that our colleagues in OCTO have been engaged in since 2023, and the paper also offers a plan for ongoing data collection. This paper that OCTO had been working on was presented at the European Symposium on Security and Privacy workshop in 2023. Our colleagues in OCTO will be engaging with SSAC to further discuss this methodology and approach to detecting domain parking at ICANN82.

And CCT Recommendations 8, 11, 13, and 26, which call for periodic surveys to better understand consumer choice and trust. Our team published an RFP in August of last year to identify a vendor to conduct these domain name consumer surveys. As outlined in the RFP, we are planning to have three surveys, a registrant survey, an end-user survey, and a trademark holder survey.

These would build on previous surveys conducted in 2015, 2016, and 2017, and would seek to understand any changes in these groups' views over time about the impact of the New gTLD Program

on competition, choice, trust, and trademark protections in new gTLDs. We're currently finalizing vendor selection and anticipate work on the development of the survey tools to begin later this quarter.

Next slide, please, Jen. Oh, one back. There we go. More CCT Recommendation projects. So, CCT Recommendations 13, 20, 22, 23, and 24 call for ICANN to periodically collect data from contracted parties to understand practices and perspectives related to registration restrictions. Now, the ICANN Board directed ICANN org to consult with contracted parties prior to collecting this data to understand the best way to approach data collection and ensure that meaningful information is collected.

Now, our team had fruitful discussions with contracted party volunteers in Quarter 2 and Quarter 4 of 2023 to understand how to best approach data collection for this project. This feedback has informed our approach to designing the voluntary pilot contracted parties survey. And as a result, we've been assessing how to streamline data collection in a way that minimizes the burden to contracted party volunteers who would participate in the data collection. And we're currently finalizing the survey tool, which we'll share with the relevant contracted party stakeholders after ICANN82. We're planning for the survey to remain open for a few weeks, and we'll be summarizing the data from the survey and publishing findings on the Community Wiki CCT Metrics page.

CCT Recommendation 23, Item B. Our team has actually completed implementation of this part of the recommendation, which calls for a review of a sample of websites within highly regulated sectors to determine whether contact information to file complaints is sufficiently easy to find. Our team manually reviewed 385 domain websites to determine accessibility of contact information in Quarter 1 of 2024, and findings from that work were published on the ICANN Community Wiki CCT Metrics page earlier this year.

Lastly, CCT Recommendation 13, Item 3, which requires collecting information on the correlation between lower abuse rates and gTLDs that impose stricter registration policies. In Quarter 4 of 2024, findings from the ICANN-sponsored INFERMAL project were published. One of the focus areas of that project included an exploration of the relationship between registration restrictions and malicious registrations. And we are currently working closely with our OCTO colleagues to determine next steps for continued and ongoing data collection in that area.

And I know that was a lot of information, but as I mentioned, details about implementation of these projects can be found in the ICANN-Specific Reviews quarterly reports. And with that, I'll pass it to Isabelle, who will share more work about the Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs team.

ISABELLE COLAS ADESHINA

Thanks, Jessica. Hi, everyone. My name is Isabelle Colas Adeshina, and I am the Senior Manager of the Policy Research Stakeholders Program. I'll be talking about my team. As Theresa mentioned, we support all the areas of engagement in the policy process and we collaborate with multiple departments across ICANN org to support policy-related work, which I will go over in the next slides.

Next slide, please, Jen. Thank you. So, as we see here, we have the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, or what we call the CPIF. And we have a graphic that has the five steps that displays how the policy is implemented across Org and where my team plays a part in each of these steps. I'll briefly go over each of these steps, as it's a little bit difficult to read the text in the images here.

So, initially, we have the Prepare phase, which is when the policy working groups work to develop and deliberate to create the policy recommendations. We have a GDS liaison that is appointed to these deliberations, where they follow the policy development process and provide relevant info or input when appropriate, such as during the initial report period of the public comments.

We have the Planning phase. This is when GDS begins to plan to support the implementation process. This is when the recommendations have been shared over to the GNSO Council for adoption. And we have a small group of internal SMEs who are working to analyze the policy recommendations and prepare for the Board adoption of the policy recommendations once received. Once the Board adopts the recommendations, there's also internal

work that is taking place to get prepared to launch the IRT sessions or working out sessions. This includes everything from setting up the policy implementation plan to setting up the wiki, as well as circulating the call for volunteers for the IRT.

Next, we have the Analyze and Design phase. This is where the GDS staff is actively working with the IRT to implement the policy recommendations into a policy, ICANN consensus policy. This activity consists of drafting the draft policy as well as leveraging the IRT knowledge to confirm that the policy language is being drafted with the same intent as the policy recommendations. In this step also, it also includes the public comment period of the draft policy language as well as publishing the policy language once complete.

Next slide, please, Jen. Thanks. Next, we have the Implement phase. This is once the policy language has been published, and this is where GDS staff, our ICANN org, notifies the community of the published policy language as well as educates the community on the requirements related to the policy language. This is also when the Contractual Compliance enforcement begins to take place of the policy.

And lastly, we have the Support and Review phase, which is where GDS supports the community and serves as a resource to the community in their interpretation of the policy as well as provide support for periodic reviews of existing consensus policies.

Next slide, please. So now I will briefly go over each of the steps of the consensus policy framework and where all of our projects

currently sit in each of these steps. Under the Prepare phase, as I mentioned, we have an active GDS liaison for the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Working Group. This group recently started their work and they plan to have their first session at ICANN82.

We also had two GDS liaisons that were active for the Transfer Policy PDP Working Group. But as you see, that's under the Plan phase, and that's because this group recently submitted their final report to the GNSO Council for consideration. So, we have a group of SMEs who are preparing to review the final report and support the Board in their subsequent action.

We also have the IDN EPDP Phase 2, as well as the ccNSO Policy Development Process 4, or what we call the ccPDP4 that is also in the Plan phase. And these policy recommendations are also with the ICANN Board for further consideration and subsequent adoption action. Under the Analyze and Design phase, you see that we have five active IRT session or IRT working groups that are in progress right now. And I will go over that in the next couple of slides.

Next slide, please. Thank you. Under the Implement phase, we have the Registration Data Policy, which is formally known as the EPDP phase 1. This group recently, or they published their policy in February of 2024. And this policy aims to become effective this year in August 21st of 2025. We have an active IRT, which does convene from time to time as we still have inquiries coming in

about the details of the policy requirements and how they can be interpreted.

And lastly, we have the Support and Review phase where we have, my team has been conducting two policy status reports. One on the expiration policies, specifically the Expired Domain Deletion Policy, as well as the Expired Registration Recovery Policy. This work is currently ongoing. And we've completed our policy status report on the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group Recommendations, which reviews procedures such as the CPIF that we're talking about now, as well as the IRT principles and guidelines. This work has been completed as it's been out for public comment and shared with the GNSO Council for consideration and next steps.

Next slide, please, Jen. Thank you. So now I will quickly go over some or all of the ongoing implementation work that we have. Before I go over this, I'd like to note that while I'm talking about these projects, this is a large group effort, team effort actually, mostly from the rest of my colleagues in the PRSP team, as well as working cross-functionally with the support of many departments across the organization, as well as the IRT members within the community. So, there's a lot of hands that are working together to develop these policies and implement them.

So, as the first one we have here is the Registration Data Policy known as the EPDP Phase 1. As I previously mentioned, this policy was published in February of 2024, and this allows registrars and

registries to collect and provide registration data in a consistent manner while adhering to privacy regulations.

As of August of 2024, we are currently sitting in a transition period, which essentially means contracted parties can comply with the policy requirements from the registration data policy or the policy requirements from the temporary specification or a mixture of both until August 21st, 2025 of this year, which is when the policy will become fully effective. As I mentioned, usually once we publish a policy the IRT is complete, but in this particular situation, it has been helpful to have the IRT active on an unneeded basis as we still have inquiries coming in regarding the details of the requirements of the policy and how they can be implemented.

Next, we have the Rights Protection Mechanisms or RPMs. This group is also ongoing and they're designed to help protect existing trademark rights in the DNS. This work is expected to go through Q3 of this year and it's split into six groups of work where the IRT is currently working on implementing groups 1 through 3. At the moment, the implementation team is planning to publish the revised RPM phase 1 recommendation, and this includes the trademark post-delegation dispute resolution procedure, the RPM requirements, the uniform rapid suspension procedure rules, as well as technical requirements. Along with those, the team also plans to publish educational materials to assist the RPM users.

Next, we have the Next Round Program IRT. I will not give a quick update on that, but I encourage everyone to listen to their very

informative session, which took place before this one at 10:00 a.m. Pacific Standard Time or 18:00 UTC.

In orange, we have the Privacy Proxy Services Accreditations Issues implementation. This IRT has been holding biweekly meetings since July of 2024. Part of this work included clarifying questions on the 21 policy recommendations, as well as identifying implementation-related issues regarding the policy recommendations. Right now, the IRT is at a stage of where they're discussing a set of threshold questions to define the major decisions needed to move forward with implementation, as well as including any questions that should be shared with the GNSO Council.

If you'd like to learn more about what this group is doing, the PPSAI IRT will have a session at ICANN82 on Wednesday, March 12th at 9:00 a.m. Pacific Standard Time, 16:00 UTC. And this session is expected to be an open working session, which will go through the threshold questions with a focus on the disclosure framework.

Next, we have the IDN EPDP Phase 1 IRT. This group of work is part of the Next Round IRT and has had five subtract calls so far. For this group, nearly all IDN EPDP Phase 1 recommendations have been incorporated in the Applicant Guidebook, or AGB, based on their corresponding topics. For recommendations that have not been included in the AGB, the team has developed a clear plan for the implementation through consensus policy.

The group plans to continue to engage with the community through regular updates, consultations, and collaborate with the IRT to ensure a smooth drafting process. And if you'd like to hear more about this progress in this group, they also will have a session at ICANN82 on Tuesday, March 11th at 17:00 UTC.

And lastly, we have the IGO-INGO Curative Rights. This group started their work internally in Q3 of last year, and it combines the recommendations of the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, as well as the EPDP-specific Curative Rights for IGO. So, it's two recommendation reports we're putting together.

And then given the specific context of the approved policy recommendations, my team has approached a small group of community members possessing the necessary expertise in this area to develop and implement these policy recommendations. And this group is planning on holding their first IRT session in Q1, shortly after ICANN82. So, this is the general universe of the policy implementation works that are underway right now.

And next slide, please, Jen. Thank you. And lastly, I'll briefly go over some of the upcoming work that we have in queue, or projects that are in queue to be implemented. As you see here, they're a bit color-coordinated, and there's a reason for that, which I'll explain. We have the ccPDP4, as well as the IDN EPDP Phase 2. These items are in orange, and that is because they are currently sitting with the Board for consideration and next steps. So, as I mentioned before,

we have a small group of SMEs who are working on each of these projects to support the Board for subsequent action.

Next, we have the Transfer Policy Review, which is in purple. That's because this group recently submitted their 47 recommendations to the GNSO Council for consideration, and it's sitting with the Council, and which will eventually go to the Board once they've adopted and approved the recommendations. Here, we also have a group of internal SMEs who are preparing to analyze and review the recommendations, as well as will begin supporting the Board in their consideration of these policy recommendations once received as well.

And lastly, we have the EPDP Phase 2a on the temporary specification, as well as the translation and transliteration of contact data. These two are in dark blue, and these are essentially in queue to be implemented, and we expect that we will be able to take on one of these two items once one of the projects, which I discussed in the previous slide, have been complete.

So, this is generally the overall overview of what's ongoing in the policy research stakeholder programs team, and now I will pass it back, I believe, to Karen Lentz for questions.

JESSICA PUCCIO

Actually, I'm going to take this one, Isabelle. We actually received two questions in our Q&A pod, so I would like to read out the first question at this time. The first question comes from Anne, and it

says, if the Pilot Holistic Review delayed ATRT4, and yet the Pilot Holistic Review is stalled, what are the Board's options in relation to April, 2025 end date for the delay of ATRT4?

KAREN LENTZ

I'll take that one, Jessica. Thank you. Thank you, Anne, for the question. So, Anne is asking-- Oh, let me state my name. Karen Lentz for the record. So, Anne is asking about the Pilot Holistic Review and the fourth Accountability and Transparency Review decision that Jason mentioned.

So, when the Board deferred the ATRT4 about a year, a little over a year ago, part of what they were looking at was some of these other tracks of work that they envisioned would be able to inform the next Accountability and Transparency Review. So, that was one factor. They also solicited feedback from all of the various parts of the community on whether to undertake the review at that time.

And so, I think that the same kind of analysis will be relevant here, looking at where both the continuous improvement and Pilot Holistic Review team are in terms of what a review team could look at, as well as what the community's appetite is for supporting a review team at this point. So, I obviously can't speak for the Board, but I think the Board will be interested in hearing from the community as well during the ICANN meeting on that question. Thank you.

JESSICA PUCCIO

Thank you, Karen. Anne, did that answer your, are you?

ANNE AIKMANN SCALESE

I think it does. This is Anne. I'm a NomCom appointee to GNSO Council, non-voting. It almost sounds like, Karen, that the Board is going to end up being required to go through all the same steps that it went through over a year ago. I know that there were some community members that were not too happy with the delay of ATRT4. And I think that these reviews like ATRT4 were really part and parcel of the approval of the IANA transition process. And so, I don't know that--

I mean, I guess, are we suggesting that we'll potentially once again go out for public comment on continued delay of ATRT4? And I actually don't know nearly as much about this as Cheryl Langdon-Orr. So, I would really appreciate any comments that Cheryl might have on this point or questions.

KAREN LENTZ

So, Anne, oh, Cheryl is on. Let me see if I can--

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Cheryl is on. Cheryl is biting her tongue a lot on this. I personally have made a number of comments in the past, Anne, about the efficacy of running ATRT4 as planned. So, I've already said that it could have been running in parallel with the activities that are

going on now, but the rest of the ICANN community probably didn't seem to have that similar appetite for it.

But remember, ATRTs have very defined focuses under the existing bylaws, so it's not as if they have to wait in any way, shape, or form for any outcome of any of the newly proposed review processes, i.e. holistic. So, there's nothing stopping the Board just getting on with it, telling us to get on with the job. Thanks.

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you. So, I know we have more questions in the queue. I also invite people to raise your hands and we will alternate there.

JESSICA PUCCIO

I can read the next question, Karen. It was also from Anne, but this time it was on Jessica's presentation. The question said, incorporation of the ODP into the consensus policy implementation framework is a matter referred to the GNSO Council Standing Committee on continuous improvement. What is ICANN org proposing regarding the timing of ODP, given that PDP working groups need real feedback on feasibility of recommendations long before the issuance of a final report from the PDP WG working group? In other words, how can ODP be taken into account before the implementation phase to one, avoid delays and two, avoid Board non-adoption of PDP recommendations?

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you, Jessica. I will take that as well. This is Karen Lentz, And Anne, that's an excellent question, and pretty much what we plan to discuss with the GNSO Council in our session say next week, but very soon, it's March 9th.

But to engage on your question a little bit. So, Jessica spoke about the community consultation, which was envisioned before we would incorporate the ODP as a mechanism into the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework. The Consensus Policy Implementation Framework is the diagram that Isabelle went through and that we worked on with the community some years ago. And so, because we have gone through the exercise of learning what we can from the two operational design phases, experiences that we've done, we would like to discuss with the Council what the next steps should be.

For example, and not to steal Jessica's thunder for this presentation, but pretty much it came up very strongly in the consultation what you're saying, and in that it would be beneficial to everyone and to the efficiency of all of these processes to make sure that we have information on the costs, design questions, implementation issues, while the policy development discussions are happening. And so, some of our questions relate to how that can happen, and if, for example, there is a circumstance where it is appropriate to have a certain phase just on that, what would be the criteria, what would be the methodology and so forth. So, we're hoping to get into more of that discussion in Seattle. Thanks.

ANNE AIKMANN-SCALESE

Thanks, Karen. Looking forward to that discussion. And the SCCI has a lot of work in front of it, including digesting the policy status report, which has also been referred to as SCCI. So, see you in Seattle.

JESSICA PUCCIO

There was another question and I need to think if it went in relation, but we do have a question from Avri in relation to the response that you just provided, Karen. And for our interpreters, it's Avri Doria. And she's saying-- Oh, sorry. I think the other question from Nigel is also related. So let me just go back and I'll come right back to Avri because I think they're both on this topic. Nigel asks, can you give a timeline for IRT on IGO work given time since the policy agreed?

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you, Nigel. This is Karen Lentz. So, as Isabelle noted in her slides, we have spun up this implementation project last year in 2024. We have convened an IRT and are getting ready to have the first meeting. So, if you're asking about the timing of the IRT to become active, that is very soon. If you're asking about the overall timeline, the current implementation plan has us aiming to finish this implementation by the middle of 2026.

JESSICA PUCCIO

Thank you. And now I guess I'll go to Avri, and I apologize for going out of order. Avri asked, isn't part of the ODP analysis supposed to involve whether it shortened the time to develop a PDP and save us money in the long run? And if so, how can the Board decide it works before the end of the New gTLD implementation?

KAREN LENTZ

Yeah, thank you, Avri. This is Karen Lentz. So, as you're pointing out, one of the aims or hopes, I would say, of the Operational Design Phase when we started this effort to try it is that if we had this phase where we would spend time looking at implementation, looking at models, looking at how long things would take, et cetera, that this could potentially actually streamline the implementation work when that began.

I think we don't know. To your point, there's been no conclusion on that because we don't know how long the implementation of the Next Round take or would have taken. And in the case of the first ODP on the standardized system for access and disclosure, those recommendations haven't been implemented at all, though we have the Registration Data Request Service. So, I think we're in agreement on your point that there's no conclusion on that and the report doesn't seek to make a premature conclusion on that.

JESSICA PUCCIO

Thank you, Karen. That's all of the Q&A that was in the pod at this time.

KAREN LENTZ Give it a minute for any other questions.

JESSICA PUCCIO I'm not seeing any hands. Okay.

KAREN LENTZ Go ahead, Jessica.

JESSICA PUCCIO I was just going to say that we'll conclude our session and the recording will be posted on the ICANN82 Prep Week session page. And I just wanted to thank everyone for their participation.

KAREN LENTZ Very good. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]