

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
Thursday, 1 March 2018 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: 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. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-01mar18-en.mp3>

**AC Recording:** <https://participate.icann.org/p7wztb89z3w/>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Attendance

Members:

Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP Primary)  
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)  
Jen Wolfe (RySG Primary)  
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)

Participants:

Pascal Bekono (NCUC)

On Audio Only: Lawrence Owalale-Roberts (BC Primary)

Apologies: none

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Emily Barabas  
Marika Konings  
Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Review call on Thursday, 1st of March, 2018. On the call today we have Lawrence Olawale-Roberts on audio only, Sara Bockey, Rafik Dammak, Jen Wolfe and Pascal Bekono and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. We received no apology for today's call. And from staff we have

Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Berry Cobb, Emily Barabas and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your lines muted to avoid any background noise. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks so much. And thanks, everyone, for taking the time to join the call today. We appreciate your continued commitment to this effort and getting this working group across the finish line.

We do have a fairly full agenda today in reviewing the status of revised implementation charter for Recommendation 34 and then moving into - and a revised implementation charter for Recommendation 22 and Recommendation 1, 2 and 3, and then we'll move on to Recommendations 7 and 12. We'll look at our updated work plan, planning for the update to the GNSO Council and then time permitting we can look at Recommendations 20 and 21 and then our next meeting is not until later this month due to the ICANN meeting falling with the next couple weeks. So we do have a full agenda. Look forward to all of your participation.

Could I just briefly ask if anyone has an update to your statement of interest? Okay, seeing none, why don't we go ahead and move onto the first substantive item? Julie, could you take us through the status on the consensus call? Was that all approved?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And the consensus call ended on the 8th of February and there were no objections to the implementation of Recommendation 34. That was the recommendation relating to rotating meeting times for, you know, encouraging participation in various regions. There was no mandate associated with that recommendation. It simply confirmed that there is a process for rotating meetings in place and that that

should continue. So that recommendation is seen as implemented and so we are done with that one.

Oh sorry. Jen is saying that her phone just dropped. She'll dial back in.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. If I may jump in here?

Julie Hedlund: Please do.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Jen is not connected. Well thanks, Julie, for this. So I think we can finish that part of the agenda if there is no further question. I don't see any here in the chat. So why don't we continue with...

Jen Wolfe: Hey, it's Jen, I just got back on. Sorry about that. Hi, Wolf-Ulrich, thank you for taking over. So it looks like we are moving on to the revised implementation charter for 22?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie. That's correct.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Great. Okay, do you want to go ahead and take us through that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you. So we did go ahead and update this charter based on our discussions. And actually we sent around an update just before when our last meeting would have occurred. And oddly that is not redlined here. Our last meeting was to be on the 8th of - sorry - the, the 15th of February. There actually - I apologize. Let me stop sharing this because it might be that there is more than one version of this document that's been uploaded. Let me see.

No, it's showing - okay. I apologize but I don't think I have uploaded the most recent version of that document. Well let me put it this way, I think what I gave to Nathalie to upload was not the most recent version so let me just

quickly get that. And many apologies for that. I will bring that up here quickly because we did have updates that we did from our meeting on the 8th of February that we were going to address at our meeting on the 15th of February, but as we did not meet on the 15th we have carried over those changes.

And it was really just a change to the determination. Very odd. It was just the change to the determination. And let me see again if this may be is correct but does not have the - okay. Okay. No this actually does have the change; for some reason it's just not in redline so apologies again for the confusion here.

But the change that was discussed on the call on the 8th was to make a few minor edits to the working group determination. So just to talk through what we have here, that the determination was that the working group has reviewed the existing ICANN-provided training options in the context of a competency-based framework and has determined that these address the recommendation that there should be a competency-based framework to identify development needs and opportunities.

And this is the part that was added. The working group recommends that training options should focus on accessibility of training and in particular real time interaction through remote platforms." It was discussed on the 8th that we wanted to emphasize that accessibility and interaction were encouraged in the training options.

And then the working group also recommends that all of the training and learning materials are linked from the GNSO Website and described in the context of the competency-based framework. That was also an addition. Staff noted that it would be quite easy to create a link to the training materials all in one place and make them easily accessible and also to organize them according to a - according to a framework which is actually what is shown here as well. If you look further up in the document we've organized the

training according to a framework so we have the training for councilors, the policy development process so on and skills for enhancing ICANN community and understanding of technology basics. So that is the framework of the training and then the recommendation is that the training options should be organized as such on the website.

But I'll stop there. I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up. Please go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Yes, thanks Julie. Yes, I checked, you know, the version which you circulated yesterday and that is exactly the version. It was also in redlines you know, the addition in the working group determination and that version which you circulated. However, that's just my question, you know, if we leave it as it is right now, so, with the addition the working group recommends the training options, blah, blah, blah and so forth and the working group also recommends, that was my question the last time so whether we should leave it as a recommendation because, you know, what we have - what our mandate is, well, to finalize the implementation, yes?

So not just give recommendations to somebody, maybe to the Council and say and then wait what this decision is going to do, rather than to tell him - tell them, okay, that's what we are doing, what we have done so far. And we determine, you know, that finalizes the work. So that is still an open question with that, you know, addition, whether we could leave it. I understand from the last time you said that some of these parts are easily to implement by staff, you know, for example provide links to specific websites.

And so I'm just asking so whether all this could be done by staff or whether there are still hesitations, well, with some activities with regards to some activities to be done by staff. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, I do - thank you for reminding me of your question from last time when we did send this

around. And I think that the response that staff had was that well two things, that even if it says "recommends" you know, we were saying to leave in the word "recommends" but that not - that does not necessarily equal a mandate that all training options must say, for instance, focus on accessibility, but they should. And many of them already do have accessibility and real time interaction as part of their platforms.

And the second item you know, one option with respect to linking the training materials is that staff can go ahead and do that and link that here and then that would be the implementation of that recommendation because that is actually quite a simple thing to do. The links are already out there, it's simply a matter of directing the tech staff to embed them into the page where the training is already gathered on the GNSO website and then for those links to be organized according to the framework that is set out here, which they are, I think already somewhat organized in that way. And so it's really - staff could go ahead and take that step and link that in this charter and that would show that this, you know, that part of the recommendation is completed.

And as to the other recommendation, that could stand as a recommendation but not necessarily a mandate. I don't know if that's helpful but let me see if you have other comments or, Wolf-Ulrich, or others as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well if I may, it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I'm fine with this, so I understand that we can take one part as, you know, ongoing work by staff, you know, and to implement it. You know, my only question is, you know, if somebody reads it, you know, so we just finalize it and determine this and that way, so if somebody reads it and reads, okay, we are recommending this and that, so if the question may come up okay, nice recommendation, but what's the consequence of it? So is it going to be - follow this recommendation or not? So that's just the only thing, you know, if you go for implementation you have to tell everybody, okay, this and that has been implemented but that is maybe - cannot be implemented, so in some case or just under certain conditions it can be implemented.

I understand the second part here is easily to be recommended, why not then determine, okay, the working group well, not just recommends but notes, yes, that staff is going to provide links, you know, here or in similar way. And that's it so that' my comment.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Well I'm wondering then if in the second sentence instead of the word "recommend" we could say, "The working group notes that - the working group notes that currently many training options focus on accessibility of training and real time interaction and the working group suggests that this," I'm not being very articulate.

Let me go ahead and perhaps suggest some alternate wording there so that it takes into account that there are currently training options that are accessible and use real time interaction and that the working group would, you know, encourage you know, future training options to incorporate these features or something along those lines and then changing that third sentence so that, you know, the working group notes that, you know, the training materials are linked from the website. And as part of this staff can go ahead and create those links so that the next iteration of the charter would reference those links as well. And I see Wolf-Ulrich is saying, "Okay with me." All right.

So Jen, staff will take the action to amend the language, send out the amended language in redline and also get the links up on the website and incorporate the link to this charter.

Jen Wolfe: Okay that's great. So we have a few weeks before our next meeting, hopefully that gives everybody time to review it and comment if there are any further comments.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And Wolf-Ulrich, so this is Julie again, is saying that could be done on the list. And so what we could do is say - get something out, you know,

asking people to respond in a couple of weeks, you know, recognizing that we've got the, you know, that we've got the meeting and so on. And then, you know, and then maybe following with a consensus call or even if possible we might be able to send this out in changes as a consensus call but give it, say, three weeks or something to allow time for the ICANN meeting and then maybe be, you know, have it finish, you know, by the time of our next meeting.

Jen Wolfe: Okay that sounds great.

Julie Hedlund: Okay great, thanks very much for that. And apologies again for the confusion on the document. So the next is Recommendations 1, 2 and 3. Okay. All right, so this is Julie again. And we have discussed this implementation charter a couple of times. And this is on GNSO outreach and working group participation. There's three recommendations.

One is that the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO working groups. That the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP working groups given the vital role volunteers play in working groups and policy development. And Recommendation 3 that the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups.

And as it stood last time, staff was requested to make a number of edits. In the first instance staff investigated the status of the CROP program. That was in a pilot and then became part of the regular budget. And what staff was asked to do was to look at the status of the proposal for CROP for FY'19. And that's the budget that is currently under review at this point. It was out for public comment and there are a number of comments coming in, so, you know, the process won't be final for a while.



But in this FY'19 budget staff noted that the budget does not include funding for CROP and that is because ICANN has instead suggested to preserve the core constituent travel support to SOs and ACs and then eliminate the fund for CROP. So the emphasis would be on moving the budget to support the constituent travelers in the FY'19 budget. And so that's the current status there. And I think there are a number of community comments coming in about that as well.

And then we were also requested to add some information about Global Stakeholder Engagement, which we did. And you'll see that here. Marika says, "Note that this is also input that the Council is considering in relation to the FY'19 budget. Yes, focus on KPIs and metrics for outreach programs." Exactly. And thank you, Marika. That's an extremely good point.

And that I think it would be worthwhile to bring - once that comment is in the public forum to bring that language into this charter as well. So staff will take the action to pull that information in once that is published. Also as an ongoing inquiry staff has reached out to the support staff for the stakeholder groups and constituencies and asked about any outreach programs that those groups have as well as any metrics that they may be collecting.

So, so far we've gotten some feedback, for example, the Business Constituency and IPC are the only two constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group that collect dues, information that's publicly available on their websites. From that they may use funds for outreach events that's not covered by ICANN but there is no structured program at this time for those groups. But we are still - we've noted that this is ongoing because we are still expecting to receive some additional information.

You'll just see that change here was just to move CROP up into the information on CROP up further in the document so that's the strikethrough that you see there. And then for suggested metrics on the last call it was noted that we should include metrics about the engagement level of activity and

sustainability, for example, gather statistics on members' attendance and participating in working groups via the attendance statistics gathered for working groups.

So this charter is still a work in progress. I think we're going to take the action to go ahead and add the language from the GNSO comments on the FY'19 budget once that is posted to the public forum. And we also have additional information forthcoming from the support staff for the stakeholder groups and constituencies. But are there any questions about the changes we've made so far? Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. Thanks very much. Well I'm fine with it, this is way comprehensive so looks like .and I also, you know, the part of the CROP and the including the Global Stakeholder Engagement, I was just looking for some details but I see it, you know, all the regions are covered here, North America, Middle East because we have, for example, with North America with Chris Mondini we have a specific exchange at the time being on that so this is all covered here, it's very good.

I have a slight question like on the note on Page 3 or no Page 4 it is with regards to the dues collected by BC and IPC. So that is okay, but I'm asking, you know, because it may be - if you put it this way here, the question marks came up - would come up with regards to, okay, these are the only two constituencies gathering or collecting dues by that, so this is a maybe a misleading discussion because the justification and the (unintelligible) are not behind of that.

So I would prefer if you could formulate that more in a more neutral way like this, you know, for example, there are, just from my point of view, there are constituencies that collect dues, blah, blah, information, publicly available, and from that and so on. So that would be more I think the more neutral to this part, so that is my suggestion. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. That's extremely helpful. Thank you very much. And we'll definitely make that change and thank you for your other comments...

((Crosstalk))

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: I would like to be on the queue.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So I see Rafik and then Lawrence. Rafik. Rafik, if you're speaking we can't hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Julie. I'm speaking now. Okay thanks, Julie, for this. But I have a question. So we are listing different outreach efforts that they are targeting for bringing more people to working groups and to participate in policy discussion. However, I'm not sure that what GSE is doing or the CROP intended they are, you know, I don't think they are - what they are doing or what the CROP is for related to this, how to say, the goals of what, I mean, regarding bringing more people to PDP working group. Can you maybe clarify more what - why are listing them?

I mean, I think one issue I think expressed by different people, not here in this group but I think from different part of the community about what - how to say - what the GSE is doing and how it's really benefiting the community in particular the GNSO in term of bringing people to participate in working groups. So if you can clarify the link or the rationale behind this I think that would be really helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rafik. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So it was included simply because it is an outreach program; it is - I will note that, I mean, it is a program that was, you know, targeted at ALAC and also GNSO, non-contracted communities, as it says here. But yes, Rafik, I have followed the discussion in the SCBO that is preparing the Council's comments on the budget and perhaps it might be useful when those - again, when those comments are posted - are finalized and posted perhaps it would be helpful

to include if there are comments in there relating to the CROP for staff to include those also in this charter.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: I'm not really focusing on the CROP, it's different. But about particular the mentioning the GSE, are we suggesting to make more clear that we are requesting the GSE effort with - by liaising with the GNSO in - to do a kind of outreach to bring maybe more expert on or not? So just when I see them we are listing, we note that they are doing something, but I think one kind of concern shared among many within the communities, we are not clear what are the added value of the GSE activities. Maybe we don't see the link, we don't have kind of metrics or so but I'm not really worried about the CROP per se so in the discussion in the SCBO.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Thank you, Rafik. And sorry to misunderstand. So it's the Global Stakeholder Engagement item that you were hoping to have more information as to how this would connect with GNSO outreach? Do I have that right? Yes, okay, he says, "Yes." All right then we will try to go ahead and put some language there. Again, we put that in because there was a question about what the GSE was doing with respect to outreach so we put it in as a reference but we can add some language around that as well along the lines that you suggest.

And I'm - I think Lawrence was in the queue. Lawrence.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Yes, this is Lawrence speaking. So one contribution that I wanted to make I guess is also relevant to this last discussion we just had and that I think there is a community onboarding program. I think it's domiciled in the GSE, if I'm right, that's more or less brings community members from different stakeholder groups together and trying to develop materials or plans

to - and reach outreach within different constituencies. I think this also should be captured alongside, you know, the other interventions like the CROP that was mentioned.

And to also give some additional context, for instance, in the light of the Business Constituency the different membership - the membership due basically helps with reaching decisions, voting decisions on, you know, policy and operational issues. So we have three different tiers of membership and for the first tier - members in the first tier have three votes while members in the two tier have one vote. So when we need to vote on any - as much as possible we try to reach a consensus but where there becomes a need to vote and also during, elections for our executives and other issues, the membership tier for which you belong also helps to determine the number of votes, you know, that you have.

So I think providing this - I'd like to provide this context such - so that, you know, like Wolf-Ulrich said we might be able to properly present the scenarios in our documentation. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. That's extremely helpful so we'll go ahead and put some language in about that activity as well. So staff has the action to make a number of updates and edits to this document and we're also awaiting some additional information to include from the stakeholder groups and constituencies and we've noted also to change the language currently there on the BC and IPC to make it more neutral. And we'll add some language around the Global Stakeholder Engagement section and also put in some language on the onboarding program. Anything else that we should address?

Then not seeing anything then, Jen, shall I go ahead into Recommendations 7 and 12?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, please continue on.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And I'm mindful of the time here so we'll proceed I think fairly quickly. I in particular want to make sure that we cover the document that was sent around which is the update to the GNSO Council since that has a deadline associated with it. And I just pulled up the wrong document. Let me try that again. Okay.

Oh I see, I did not change the title on the document, pardon me. The title should be - it relates to language translation or language interpretation and transcription. So we'll go ahead and update the title on this but these are then two recommendations we have yet to discuss but staff had the - had the action to get information concerning the costs of language services. And so we have gathered that information and created this charter relating to two recommendations, 7 that stakeholder groups and constituencies engage more deeply with community members for languages other than English as a means to overcoming language barriers.

And that - and 12, that ICANN assess the feasibility of providing real time transcription service in audio conferences for working group meeting. And in the scope that staff would provide an overview and costs of existing measures to overcome language barriers, review work that's already done, and propose possible approaches including analysis of costs versus benefits and present this to the working group and that the working group would analyze and review possible approaches and determine recommended approaches to the Council.

So here we provide an overview of current language services and costs. So there's some just overview language here on ICANN, you know, you know, using the benefit of using language services. I'm not going to read it, you can read it yourselves, but noting that there are already low cost or no cost options for members and observers to participate and there are recordings, transcripts and where there are meetings done in real time translation and there's also translation of transcripts that are provided as well as the rotation of meeting times.

And at currently the process is that the use of real time translation or teleconference interpretation is evaluated based on the needs and composition of the individual working groups. So then into interpretation, just a description of what interpretation is and the various options that are out - that language services provides, simultaneous interpretation, consecutive interpretation and teleconference interpretation and noting that in teleconference interpretation this has been used for some At Large, RALOs and GNSO teleconferences. And I'll note that we offered today in our GNSO Pre ICANN 61 policy open house teleconference interpretation simultaneous in French and Spanish. And we'll do a little survey to see how that was received after the two sessions today. And we can certainly include that information here as well.

So and here are set forth the benefits and uses of the various types of interpretation. But I think what we're most interested in looking at is the cost. So teleconference interpretation is per language per hour and that is \$230 per language per hour. And it's provided with two interpreters per language remotely. If we do this interpretation at ICANN meetings it's much more costly because we need to have equipment, technicians, travel and accommodation for interpreters. It's not something that could be done remotely.

And currently a day of interpretation, say, for the GAC in all six UN languages - I see there's a typo there - is approximately \$18,000. And that does not include travel, accommodations and the costs from the IT department, just the interpreters and equipment, booths, mics, headsets, etcetera.

Then onto real time transcription, it's noted that real time transcription is only provided in English, so this is going to be limited ability to engage with community members whose language is other than English. And then there's some description of some various ways that we might use real time transcription. You'll notice that we use it for example, at ICANN meetings at a Board meeting when you want to, you know, capture what is being said in a

session or if you have a working group that needs to quickly, you know, capture their work noting that this is not 100% accurate.

And, you know, and again, you know, for the purposes of these recommendations real time transcription being in English only doesn't necessarily speak to the recommendations that we have here. But here are also the cost of real time transcription. And Rafik says, "If I'm not mistaken, the budget for FY'19 includes reduction on interpretation and translation service to be provided, captioning seems the more reasonable option for now."

Thank you very much for that, Rafik, that is exactly right. The budget for these language services is being reduced in FY'19. And so the other piece then for this working group to consider is some approaches to using language services. To date these services have been provided when a particular need has been identified, most commonly in the GAC and ALAC, and at ICANN meetings, you know, where they're based in a country where English is not the official or primary language.

I'm going to stop there because Rafik, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Julie. Just to check, are we only talking about interpretation service or also translation which means to translate the material and documents like from the GNSO? I mean, it can be even more complicated. But are we talking about just interpretation service during the conf call and ICANN meetings?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you for that question and it's a good one. I'm looking back at the recommendations. And it talks about 7 is just that these stakeholder groups and constituencies engage more deeply with community members whose first language isn't English. But Recommendation 12 particularly speaks to real time - it's called real time transcription service in audio conferences. I think



that because Recommendation 7 is fairly broad I think it's a good point that we should put language in there about document translation, you know, that is another service that language services provides.

And I know it's one that ALAC uses comprehensively and, you know, some of the other communities perhaps less. It is another option and a lower cost option to still increase accessibility of materials. So does that answer your question?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie. Yes, I think you have answered the question. It's something that maybe we can elaborate more. I mean, I'm not really pushing for more translation of material. I think it can be useful for like the most important documents. But I'm not sure how it's feasible like for working groups and so on and they have their, I mean, then their current working document. So we have to find a balance. But, yes, I was just asking to - maybe it's something we can explore but fortunately we have now this - the budget constraints.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rafik. I think we can mention some of the benefits and uses of the translation of documents while also noting the limitations. So we can add some language on that. And Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie and Rafik. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So I understood up to now our work here or mandate around just interpretation and not translation - and transcription, not translation. But that was my understanding so if that could be clarified, I'm with that, you know, to go. Another point I have it is also about cost and with your data give a very good hint, you know, where - how much it could be, yes.

But so the question is right now so in order, well, to calculate on a basis that means what could be - what could be - what could be the impact on the budget in total if we go that way, for example, well, we determine that it may be up to the working groups to decide whether to use - to make use of

interpretation and transcription services and, well, in which languages, for example.

I think we should think about a kind of scenario what could happen. So for example, I'm thinking about whether we could just check the last year, 2016, it is about working teams, working groups, you know, using these services maybe using in future. So why not to check for the last year, for example, how many working groups we had on the GNSO with GNSO participation, on average, you know, how many times they have been meeting over the year so just to get a picture of that in average.

And then think about, you know, on average for example just a figure, 50% of them or 30% of them would use those kind of services in a way which makes it, you know, for example, to translation the translation need for two additional languages, for example, just parameters but we should put it together and think about, you know, what could be reasonable.

And then we come in the end to a calculation to a kind of scenario how does it end up on average for a year and how many hours and then we use your figures \$230 and \$120 US and so we have a figure in hand, you know, under certain conditions which we - which are transparent and that could be, you know, put into this charter and saying okay, that could be a scenario everybody is open, well, to think about, you know, the parameters of the scenario but this is the way how we calculate and that could be a figure for one of the future budget years. So that's what I have in mind.

I'm also, well, I'm just thinking about I will contribute that more in a written form to the group and then we can start. So if that idea is viable from your point of view as well, so I think that could be a way to do. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So this is Julie again. That's an excellent idea, that is something definitely we can do. We can certainly get the data on the number of working groups, we can then do a, you know, a possible scenario so that I

think we can give an example of, you know, if we did, you know, X number of meetings in X number of languages, how much it would cost.

And so we'll get that information and include that as well. And if you have some text or, you know, guidance that you would like to give us on that that's extremely valuable as well. Just noting some comments that Rafik had said that they used French and Spanish in the CCWG Diversity Subgroup. A few people used it but we got people asking for it. Marika says, "Recall that CCWG Work Stream 1 also demanded interpretation for its calls but a review of the numbers of users showed many calls there were zero or just one or two people on or more of the languages offered."

Marika says, "Maybe some more awareness of the costs involved may ensure that this is a more conscious decision when interpretation is asked and used." I think that gets to your point too, thank you, Rafik. And Rafik, I mean, Wolf-Ulrich - Rafik says, "Interpretation for webinars makes sense since the number of attendees is much higher." And Wolf-Ulrich is noting that's why we need a solid scenario. Marika and - Marika says, "Rafik, but my personal view is that should be demand-driven even for webinars."

Thank you for all the comments. So staff will take back these action items and produce another version of this charter for us to discuss at our next meeting.

And just mindful of the time, we've got 10 minutes left so I'm going to - Jen, if it's okay I'll move along quickly to the work plan; that won't take much time, just to remind everybody of where we are and how much we need to complete. So and Wolf-Ulrich is saying, "Demand should be estimated by the working group."

So here's our work plan as of today. So for this meeting reviewed the revised charter, Recommendation 1, 2 and 3 and 7 and 12. We're probably not going to get to Recommendations 20 and 21 today but people will have time to look

at those for the next meeting. And then we're also reviewing the work plan and obviously the planning for the update to the Council.

So we'll be revisiting some of these recommendation charters at the next meeting on the 29th. And then also I think we'll probably be able to start looking again recommendation - the charter for Recommendation 26 and 29. These are related to statement of interest, they're on hold pending ICANN's interim approach on the GDPR because it's anticipated that GDPR does have a potential impact on these recommendations. So we should have more information to get to - back to that recommendation charter. We do have a charter that we had discussed there.

In April then we'll be hopefully looking at implementation of some of these recommendations noted here. And then we hopefully will have more information on the recommendations from the Diversity Sub Team. I don't know, Rafik, is the Diversity Sub Team still on track to finalize its recommendations? I think we were talking about that possibly happening at ICANN 61? Okay, he says, "Diversity final recommendation passed the first reading yesterday, close to be approved." Excellent. That is really good information, Rafik. So that will help us to move along with these recommendations which might need more lengthy time to implement depending on what the final determination is.

Then in May we'll be looking at hopefully implementing 26-29 and hopefully looking at implementation of the diversity recommendations and our projection is to - right now to have everything completed by June and if that is the case we would provide a final implementation status report to the OEC and the GNSO Council, but we'll continue to see how we proceed. Our timeline actually has us completing work in September, so we would be substantially ahead of schedule if we met that goal. Any questions?

Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thank you. Well that was just my question, well, just to bring in line with our report. We report September as you mentioned and here it is our - a kind of - is that a kind of internal plan we have so until June 2018? Or that is just a guess, you know, here in order if we can follow that plan here. Because well, there is this, you know, this gap between September and June still.

Julie Hedlund: Precisely, Wolf-Ulrich. Let's call this a goal. Right now it looks like it might be possible but as we dig more deeply say, for instance, into the diversity recommendations, we may find that those may need more time for implementation. So staff was being - say optimistic in including this as a goal. Thank you. And Wolf-Ulrich says, "That's clear." Any other questions?

Seeing none, then let's go ahead to the update to the Council. And which one is that? Let's see. Oh okay. Yes. I have to - let me bring that up because - okay, apologies, that was not in the documents that I sent to - that I sent along with the agenda. So I do need to pull that up as a PDF and I will do that right now. Okay.

Am I still on the line? I heard a beeping noise.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, I still hear you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, I heard several beeps in a row so I didn't know if that was...

Jen Wolfe: I did too. I'm not sure what that was.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, it wasn't - I'm not sure what that was either. And apologies for not having this ready. And giving me a little trouble here. And in any case, okay. All right, the document is coming up and thank you for your patience. This is really very straightforward, I know we have just a few minutes here, but there's not - this actually is consistent with what we just went through in our work plan. It's just a very brief written report for the Council.

And as noted, it's not currently on the Council's agenda at this moment but it could be that after they receive our written report you know, they may decide to add an item on their agenda or to include it as any other business. So there's just a preamble of the status of summary of the working group and what it's doing and Wolf-Ulrich noted that it would be helpful to include that - the update was given to the Council also at ICANN 60 and also to the OEC and to include a link to that report which staff will add to this document.

The summary is that in Phases 1 and 2 recommendations have been agreed by full consensus, that's 18 recommendations, implemented by - via previous work. This is consistent with what we reported also in the last report at ICANN 60, except we have now more recommendations that have been completed.

And then in Phase 3 we talk about that we're on schedule, we're considering the charters for 8 recommendations and then we note that we have 6, 33 and 36 that are pending as those relate to the diversity recommendations from the Diversity Sub Team. And then also that we have pending implementation charter for 26-29 on the statement of interest as we await further guidance from ICANN on how we will address GDPR requirements.

So we note that we are envision completing all recommendations by June 2018. You know, actually, Wolf-Ulrich, now that you had mentioned that, I'm wondering that we should instead say that we envision completing all recommendations according to the original timeline of September of 2018 but we have a goal of you know, completing - we have a goal to try to complete recommendations earlier if possible.

And so we'll make that change. And then again, we note here that we do expect to meet our original timeline. Any questions very quickly? And I see we're at the top of the hour. Apologies. Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, just to be clear for the timeline, we shouldn't confuse the Council, you know, with something June and September. I think it's fine as it is at the time being here. You know, for us internal goal June maybe okay but not in the report to the Council.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, I think that's an excellent point and we will make that change. Any other questions?

Jen Wolfe: No, this is Jen. It'll be great if we can finish early, that's a good update in June.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, it would be great. But I do recognize Wolf-Ulrich's concerns that in putting a different date out there than what we have in our timeline might be confusing.

Jen Wolfe: Exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: ...confusion.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so but we can indicate that we have a goal of trying to complete earlier without attaching a date for this particular...

Jen Wolfe: Absolutely. Absolutely. Well we are at the top of the hour and we did get through almost everything on our agenda. So I think that will bring this meeting to a close. Thank you, again, all of your for your continued commitment to this effort. We're near the home stretch here and we'll look forward to continuing the conversation on list and in our next meeting towards the end of March. Thanks, everybody.

Julie Hedlund: Oh one quick question, we'll put this out on the list, the time will change for our 29th meeting so the time would revert to 1200 UTC. So I'll put a note on

the list and asking if people want to keep it at 1300 UTC or revert to 1200 UTC.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, because of Daylight Savings Time.

Julie Hedlund: Precisely.

Jen Wolfe: All right, great. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: All right, thanks, everyone.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, everybody. Have a great day.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, have a great day.

Jen Wolfe: Bye-bye.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Bye now. Have a good day.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, everyone, for joining the GNSO Review Working Group call today. This call has been adjourned. Operator, you may now stop the recordings and disconnect all the lines. Have a great rest of your day.

END