**EPDP Meeting 4 of 4**

13 March 2018

08:30 – 10:15

**Action Items**

1. EPDP Team to review mind map and provide input by Thursday, 28 March 2019.
2. EPDP Team to follow up via the mailing list regarding the following questions for discussion:
	* 1. How should the team prioritize going forward?
		2. What next steps should be taken in relations to the dependencies identified?
		3. What should be the next steps in relation to the legal guidance to date?
		4. What is the target date for publication of the Initial Report that the EPDP Team is aiming to work toward?
3. EPDP Support Team to set up multiple google docs where EPDP Team can (1) identify potential legal questions needed to be addressed prior to substantive work in Phase 2; (2) identify additional questions needed to be addressed, e.g., questions to PPSAI IRT and RPM WG.
4. EPDP Support Team to review if 14:00UTC is still an appropriate meeting time given recent membership changes.

**Question for ICANN Org**

1. Does ICANN org plan to share the TSG’s report with the EPDB/DPAs? If so, please provide more information on the timeline.

**Recap of this week’s meetings**

* Council discussed Phase 2 and the potential for multiple work tracks
* Engagement session with the TSG
	+ Presentation was helpful to understand the series of assumptions the team was working under, and it may be helpful to refer to. However, it should not distract the team from getting its work done.
	+ Legal considerations need to be given priority as the team goes into Phase 2. Technical models should be based on the legal model.
	+ Work should be done in parallel and not serialized
	+ The group may consider working with the RDAP pilot group to ensure the policy implementable at a technical level
	+ Will the TSG share its report with the EDPB? Recommend not sending the report at this time so there can be coordination with the EPDP Team.
	+ Question for ICANN org: Does ICANN plan to send the TSG report to the EDPB or DPAs? If so, when?
	+ Bridging mechanism – EPDP Team to take a look at Alan’s proposed updated language and provide feedback as soon as possible

**Proposed Working Methods**

* + With respect to when the group should restart, there was general agreement that it should begin when the new chair is appointed. Proposal to start meeting as soon as possible after new chair appointment (no later than 1 week after confirmation, i.e., no later than 25 April 2019). Chair appointment could happen before 25 April.
		- Recommend starting as soon as possible and see how it goes. Perhaps the team can make more progress with Rafik as chair if he is willing.
		- Recommend NOT diving into the substance until (1) new chair is in place; (2) outstanding legal advice is received
		- There are some things from the team’s work that could benefit from more time and others that do not – noting that some items for discussion got worse the more time the team spent on it. Team should look to focus on how to work efficiently.
		- The Team could focus on what legal questions need to be answered before commencing work.
		- Opportunity to use this time wisely – hone in on the work methods and identify what is in scope and what is not
		- Propose path forward – call for people to review the legal advice that has been received and set up a google doc to identify additional questions.
		- Council leadership to communicate to the team by 22 March how many applications have been received, so the chair may be identified quickly
		- Another item the group could already work on – two areas where input from other groups is anticipated – the groups are PPSAI and RPM WG – the group could work to decide what additional information is needed from them
		- Action item: legal question google doc + identify input from other groups
	+ Based on input received – proposal is to commence weekly meetings of 90 minutes but with the objective to increase this from either another weekly plenary session that would focus on a different stream of work or small team(s) meetings, as soon as possible
	+ Allow alternates to join main AC room, but require login preceded by zzz to make them easily identifiable. Alternates are to refrain from chatting, speaking, voting, etc. Propose to do the same with the mailing list – it has been an administrative burden having to add and remove people from the mailing list. Proposal attempts to strike a balance b/w administrative efficiency and alternates’ request to have access to the main adobe room
		- Maybe the team can revisit the meeting times to ensure the time slots used still make sense
		- The word expulsion is meant expulsion from the adobe room, not as an EPDP Team alternate
		- Preserve the option of extra time but don’t assume how much time will be needed
	+ **Updated Mind Map**
		- Refer to the version sent via the mailing list as it will be easier to review on your own screen
		- There were a few questions identified in the annex which have been flagged
		- This mind map attempts to bucket similar types of questions
		- White questions come from the topics in the annex, e.g., the eligibility criteria
			* This is helpful to show what items are deferred from Phase 1, annex, pending legal advice, etc. The next step can be the team to identify the scope of the Phase 2 work.
			* This document is not intended to replace the project plan; rather, it is to use for ensuring everything is captured
			* Could the team also consider using a timeline as a visual
			* Action: EPDP Team to review the mind map and flag any issues not captured
	+ **Resources**
		- Some aspects of the support the group agreed should be requested to Council immediately:
			* Legal support
			* Recordings and transcripts
			* Mediators to facilitate F2F sessions at ICANN65
		- Make clear that additional requests for resources are likely forthcoming, but need to be informed by the work plan and timeline
		- Encourage EPDP Team members to work through their respective to secure travel support for ICANN65 and/or identify alternates that will be in attendance
		- Transcripts are very expensive – based on Phase 1, there was a 24-hr window to get the transcripts posted – would it be possible to push that out to a 72-hr window
		- Regarding travel support – this PDP is different from other PDPs and shouldn’t be viewed as a precedent
		- Agree for money saving in transcripts – rarely refer to them
		- 72 hours is fine for transcripts, however, the transcripts are very important, so perhaps we can save money by extending the timeliness
		- The use of mediators should be a decision made by the new chair
		- Interim F2F sessions were very helpful in Phase 1
		- It would be helpful to identify the rationale of why something is needed – for example, was the F2F helpful b/c it came before a milestone?
		- In terms of continuation of legal support, we had committed 50K for that, we have spent all of that, so do note that legal advice is not cheap.
		- Helpful to have a third-party facilitator
		- Would be helpful to have a F2F shortly after the new chair is appointed
		- Standalone F2F meetings are preferable to ICANN meetings, where possible, since many members have many commitments at ICANN meetings
	+ **Questions for discussion**
		- How should the team prioritize going forward?
		- What next steps should be taken in relations to the dependencies identified?
		- What should be the next steps in relation to the legal guidance to date?
		- What is the target date for publication of the Initial Report that the EPDP Team is aiming to work toward?
		- Action item – to follow up on the mailing list regarding these questions
		- The charter identified a number of questions on the system for standardized access – is there an order these should be tackled in? did Phase 1 answer any of these questions? There has been a lot of legal guidance that has already been provided, so it’s important to review these documents.
		- Will there be multiple final reports?
		- That is an option – there is nothing preventing the group from doing this