

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
Thursday, 10 May 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-10may18-en.mp3> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/FQ8FBQ>

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

Andrea Glandon: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 10th of May, 2018 at 1300 UTC. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Jen Wolfe, Sara Bockey and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. We have apologies from Marika Konings. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb and myself, Andrea Glandon.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it back over to Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Andrea. And could you note also apologies from Emily Barabas from staff; she also won't be able to join us.

Andrea Glandon: Absolutely.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And, Jen, I'm just going to ahead and pass it onto you to run through the agenda. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Sure. Sure. So thanks, everybody, for joining again. I know we have a small group but we appreciate your continued commitment to working through this process and completing the implementation charters and ultimately finalizing our work here. So our agenda for today, I'll just briefly ask if there are any updates to your statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, we'll go ahead and move on with our agenda. So today we're going to be looking at the revised implementation charters for Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, and then also for Recommendations 20 and 21.

We'll be taking a look at Recommendations 6, 33 and 36 on diversity and links to the CCWG Accountability recommendations. We'll take a look at an update to the GNSO Council and then we'll take a look at our schedule and our next meeting in two weeks. So with that, Julie, I'll ask if you could give us an update on the revised implementation charters for Recommendations 1, 2 and 3.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And I have brought up Recommendation - the implementation charter for Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, and that's the outreach and working group participation. Just as a reminder, this document went out for review two weeks ago and the intent was to ask if there were any further changes in particular we directed people to the section on the working group determination. And so I'll go ahead to that section.

And we did not receive any comments on this implementation charter. And I think that our determination at the last call was if there were no comments on this implementation charter then we would proceed to put it out for a consensus call. So these are three recommendations, Recommendation 1 was 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. And the determination there was that the GNSO Review Working Group has reviewed existing metrics and determined that

these are sufficient to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO working groups.

Recommendation 2, that the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in the PDP working groups given the vital role volunteers play in working groups and policy development. Here the determination is that the GNSO Review Working Group evaluated the current programs and determined that these are sufficient to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP working groups while noting that the Fellowship Community Process Review will likely result in improvements to that program and additional metrics to measure effectiveness.

And then Recommendation 3, that the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups. And here the determination is that the GNSO Review Working Group notes that participation in working groups is already a low cost or no cost option for members and observers. All meetings are accessible via remote participation and there are recordings of transcripts for meetings at ICANN meetings, real time transcription and translation of transcripts often are provided. Newcomers may be eligible for travel funding for ICANN meetings via the Next Gen and Fellowship Programs, although face to face participation is not a requisite for effective participation in the policymaking process.

Furthermore, the working group notes that a traditional RTT solution typically includes professional translators. Understanding that the costs for such translators may be prohibitive for some uses, other solutions may include automated service, volunteers or translations of executive summaries of transcripts after public meetings. And I'll note that those two sentences were ones that were suggested to be added by the Review Working Group as part of the determination. And so then there's a final sentence that based on its evaluation concerning the three recommendations, the GNSO Review Working Group determines that the recommendations have been

implemented based on current processes and programs, that no further action is required.

I'll stop there and see if there are any questions or discussion. I'm not seeing any hands up. So then, again, this is Julie from staff, then, Jen, the recommendation was that if there were no further changes to this document we would put it out for a formal consensus call. Is that still what the working group would like to do?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, unless anyone has any objection to that, I think that makes sense to move that forward. Any - Wolf-Ulrich is saying, yes. Anyone opposed? Lori Schulman says yes. Not seeing any no's so let's go ahead and proceed accordingly.

Julie Hedlund: Excellent. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. Thank you very much. Staff takes that action item. And then let's go ahead and move (unintelligible) item of discussion which is the implementation charter for Recommendations 20 and 21. That's strategic objectives and industry trends. I'll go to the determination - the draft determination because we did have some discussion on the list and some concerns that were raised.

And so in particular, with respect to the recommendation - the draft recommendation that the charter of the GNSO Council Standing Committee on ICANN's Budget and Operations be revised to include an annual review of ICANN's strategic objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's strategic objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.

Now I know that there were comments on that particular item. And let me just go ahead and quickly refer back to those just to remind us of what people had said. So we had from Sara, regarding this recommendation, and she says, "The following stands out to me and I'm not sure it's been appropriately addressed. Strikes a balance between ICANN's strategic objectives and the

GNSO resources available for policy development.” That’s the statement out of - excuse me - out of the recommendation.

She says, “To me, resources available for policy development includes volunteers and not overburdening the few and creating burnout.” She notes, “While I like the direct of the solution, primarily expanding the scope of the standing committee so that it is responsible for annually reviewing ICANN's strategic objectives and ensuring that planning a future GNSO activities is in alignment with these strategic objectives, this highlight seems - highlighted part,” that is, ensuring that the planning of future GNSO activities is in alignment with these strategic objectives, “This highlighted part seems off balance. Perhaps rewording this to say, ‘The scope of the standing committee could be expanded so that it is also responsible for annually reviewing ICANN's strategic objectives and ensuring that these strategic objectives and proposed GNSO policy development activities are aligned with the GNSO resources.”

And so that was a recommendation from Sara. And I want to note that Rafik had said, as he's expressed before, that he's concerned about the expansion of SCBO mandate and mission, was designed to cover ICANN budget related matters particular is post-IANA stewardship transition context managing PDP resources, planning or setting the objectives remains a Council task and the Council had a fair long discussion during its strategic meeting last January on how to improve things on those fronts.

Renata agreed with that sentiment. Second those concerns, budget committee should be operational and to mission-setting. And with respect to my question as to how this could be addressed otherwise, Rafik notes that it should be reviewed by the full Council and takes ownership of that task for timing, it can possibly be done after the annual general meeting as a matter of strategic planning by the Council.

And then Sara notes, "Agree, Council is a better fit for this action." And Wolf-Ulrich Knoben notes, "There's no doubt that the Council should organize the review of the strategic objectives. It just a suggestion from a part of our team that this may be done by the SCBO which reports back to the Council provided that the Council extends their mandate accordingly. From a practical point of view, an alternative option could be that the Council is every year looking for volunteers for the review who then feed back to the Council. A third option is an annual Council discussion with MSSSI where both sides exchange views on how to keep their respective goals aligned."

So that summarizes I think all of the feedback that we got on the discussion for this implementation charter and the determination. And maybe I can just turn it over to those on the call because some of those people on the call also made those comments and I'd like to see if anybody has anything to add or suggestions for alternative language that staff can include here. Thank you.

And I see that Berry Cobb has his hand up and then Wolf-Ulrich and Rafik Dammak. And I don't know what order in which those appeared. Do you know, Jen, or I can just take them in that order.

Jen Wolfe: No, yes, I can't tell how they appeared so let's just go ahead and we'll go through each one of them.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, so Berry, then Wolf-Ulrich, then Rafik. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Julie. Thank you, all. Berry Cobb for the transcript. This is not advocating one way or the other but I thought that I would just add two cents of color commentary about the SCBO. You know, this was the first time it had been enacted or deployed, so to speak. And that group is still- has its mandate to review its charter in front of the Council to see whether it should continue or not. That's kind of mutually exclusive to what needs to go on here.

But in terms of kind of understanding lessons learned or maybe some best practices coming out of the SCBO, one of the things that we as the group didn't do this time around, you know, we were more focused on the actual budget and the numbers behind that budget and where costs were being allocated and those kinds of aspects. What we didn't really do and probably didn't have the time to do because it is such a short timeframe to review the budget and prepare comments in that particular timeline, what we didn't do was actually review through in detail the changes to the strategic plan for that fiscal year.

And so I think this is probably the one aspect that I did want to highlight is that each fiscal year each one of the five objectives remain the same and the 25 or so goals underneath those objectives remain the same. But what does change from year to year is the portfolios and projects that feed into those goals and objectives. And so I'd just point out that, you know, looking at that from a five year strategic plan aspect those lower levels at the portfolio and project level are more dynamic from one fiscal year to the next. And so when the SCBO reconvenes to kind of understand its lessons learned I do intend to offer that for the group to consider that we, you know, have more time or better understanding of how those portfolios and projects do ensure that they meet those particular objectives and goals. So I just thought I'd mention that. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Berry. That's very helpful. Onto Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well this is also very good. Thanks, Berry, for this explanation. The team is doing how they shaped, you know, their character. So I think what we are thinking about is more a way of how to deal with the matter, to review the strategic objectives, you know, over the year. And so for me personally from my experience in the Council, so I think usually the Council goes that way, so if there is something to be done which may take some, well, something more time, you know, to be-

prepare for that, he's trying, well, to put it on a kind of team, yes, whatever team that might be.

So in order to prepare for that, there is no - it's clear well that the Council in end the one who is responsible for that and also to make recommendations on behalf of the Council for the review in the end. So the question is, how to make it practical, how to do that. So could it be done by staff, for example, the preparatory work for these things? And then finalized in one session, as Rafik has - may have in mind, you know, from his experience with the strategic meeting here in LA, that that would be a way viable to do so.

Or that there is some preparatory work to be done by the community, by the Council members, or on behalf of them a group out of the Council and working team doing that. So this is for me the practical question and then it was for me my thinking about that was okay, if a team is needed why shouldn't we use, you know, the - this SCBO to do that because it's represented by all the participants, well there may be - it could be for that purpose also be (unintelligible) invite, you know, other people who are interested in doing that job. So that's just a question from the practice how to do that in a practical way.

So if the Council is - and the Council should decide that if we recommend, you know, well to - going that way the Council should just have a debate, a discussion internally whether we should the pros - they should go this way or not, the pros and cons to that and then come to a final decision. So that is here the question, well, shall we come up with such a recommendation from our point of view? I personally would say from my experience, well, let's go for that just recommend as our team so that we could also put into this recommendation some arguments, you know, that it has been discussed here in our group and there is also an opinion, well, not to do that or at least well to discuss it finally on Council level.



So it's open to do that. Just wanted not to suppress that it has been discussed here and that could be a way, well, from the view of some of the participants here. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. Rafik please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So, yes, I'm still reserved about the idea of involving SCBO as (unintelligible) it still has to go through review and we are not sure if we will continue with this approach or not. For this year I think they drafted two comments and so maybe they didn't cover one area. So I think we cannot really try to expand or add more task to standing committee but I do believe that the Council needs to take ownership since we are having a lot of discussion now about being - doing more planning and being more strategic and that's why, for example, we had the strategic meeting in LA and talk about improving the PDP and so on.

So there is this concern and focus to do better planning ahead for the year. And we think that, for example, are also talking about France and so on and one thing that the Council will have that trends exercise how to say the outlook or trends exercise and in Panama. So we are in that direction that the Council - and the councilor will be more involved on those type of activities. So I would I think that it's up to the Council to decide - to delegate such tasks if they - it thinks that the way forward but at our level I don't think we can try to push for one direction.

I'm understanding from Wolf-Ulrich is that we may suggest different way or different approach like for example after the AGM the Council do some planning or the - how we can delegate the SCBO but really - in the thinking that we should leave the ownership and the decision to the Council on this area. But I'm open as we can suggest different how to say - alternatives and maybe try to put some pros and cons just not kind of try - to avoid to be prospective here and what should be done so.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Rafik. And just getting this down. Okay. And I see there's also - we have in the chat and Berry says, "While not directly related to this exercise, I will also remind the group that ICANN Org and the community will be starting its new five-year strategic planning cycle. The GNSO and Council should anticipate to be heavily involved to help shape the objectives and goals for the organization and as here, ensure that they fit the policy development mandate for the GNSO."

That's actually really a good point, Berry. And I'm wondering - I'm wondering if that's something that - sort of two thoughts here with respect to how to address this. First of all, staff takes note of the suggestion to have some pros and cons and to reflect the different sides of the discussion in this implementation charter, which we can do. I think it also would be helpful to point out that there will be starting this new five-year strategic planning cycle which definitely does also then, you know, directly relate to the review of the strategic objectives that's part of this recommendation.

We also have the update to the Council on the 24th of May. And when we get to those slides we could perhaps just suggest a couple of points for discussion with the Council and maybe what we do not have to do with respect to the implementation charter is perhaps the charter does not have to be that specific on exactly how the Council undertakes the strategic review, just that it is doing so. That is to say that the charter could say that annually the, you know, the GNSO Council will, you know, undertake the review of the strategic objectives and either as a committee of the whole or with a sub team as it, you know, as it determines, but that, you know, this action becomes part of the Council's annual planning cycle or strategic planning cycle.

So that might be one way of addressing this and something that perhaps we could bring up in the Council's update. And I see Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, to Berry's comment, this is very clear, you know, the five-year cycle when it starts and it's going to be established and discussed in advance that's what we are doing right now so also in Panama meeting. So we have this session with MSSSI and all - on all levels, you know, on constituency level, stakeholder group level and so. So this is the one I understand here from the recommendation to this year is related what's going to be happen afterwards. The year - the first year, second year, third and fourth year with strategic objectives have been established and implemented.

So that is what I understand this is recommendation - this is for to pave the way for the Council telling so what to do and to recommend something in order to follow what is going to happen with those five year cycle in the future every year. So and that's well, I don't think we are far away from each other, so with Rafik as well, maybe, Rafik, you have an issue with the formulation of the recommendation, well that it looks like a push or had to the Council, just do this, and nothing else.

Anyway, so the Council has to decide, well, (unintelligible) the leader of this whole process here. And on the other hand it's just maybe if we can't come to an agreement altogether, then we shouldn't do it as a recommendation but put it here in text and saying, okay, we see several ways how to deal with that from a Council perspective. It could be easier allocated to an existing team like the SCBO or do it annually on the entire discussion from the scratch on Council level or let it prepare by staff and then have one session with the Council and MSSSI and that's it.

So these kind of options I see and we could put it in the text and then we don't need this very strict or strong recommendation to do that just in this way. And the Council has some tasks to do. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And staff have tried to capture that. And so what staff will do then is amend the implementation charter. I think taking

Wolf-Ulrich's point, unless anybody objects, I don't think, yes, as Rafik notes, I think we have a way to go forward, exactly, to capture the, you know, to capture - note the recommendation as we do but to capture the various options for how the Council may address that recommendation without the GNSO Review Working Group suggesting that there is only one way forward, but that there are options for addressing this.

And I think that in the Council update on the 24th of May, we could also change (unintelligible) to show similarly that. But I hear - is that Lori? Hi, Lori, did you have something you wanted to say?

Lori Schulman: No, I was thinking out loud. I'll wait until you finish. I'm sorry. My apologies to the group.

Julie Hedlund: That's okay, you know, and if you do have something we should consider please just let us know.

Lori Schulman: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. All right so staff has that has an action item to amend this charter. And I guess the question is to this group if we make that amendment to the text, should we go ahead and call that out as a redline and also send it out for a consensus call?

Lori Schulman: Julie, can I ask a question...

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: This is Lawrence...

Lori Schulman: ...now? It's Lori.

Julie Hedlund: I hear a couple of people. Wolf-Ulrich, I think maybe and then Lori? Wolf-Ulrich, yes, yes. Go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I'm pretty sure I'm a yes too, I just want to clarify what we just said yes to that all of this will be side text as to possible options and then the options would be chosen by the GNSO, is that right, the order of procedure? Or the options are there and then we go back to our constituencies? I'm sorry, I'm a little confused about - I understand about pulling the options out to the side as notes, but then what happens? That's my question.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. That's - this is Julie Hedlund again from staff. That's a really good question. So to be more clear, what I think staff heard was that staff will amend - well staff will do two things. First of all, in the main text where we discuss possible solutions, staff will call out the different options that were discussed here.

And then in the determination staff will put in some language that essentially says that, you know, there's a recommendation and the working group determination is that the Council will you know, undertake to review the strategic objectives on an annual basis and has a number of options by which to do so including appointing - establishing a working team, addressing them as a strategic session of the committee as a whole or perhaps with staff preparation and in a meeting with MSSSI, which I think is what's envisioned for a planning session in Panama.

So staff will be laying out possible options, none of which will make it clear, are, you know, considered to be, you know, the only list of options but just as suggestions. And then when the - when the Council does its annual review it chooses how to do so. So we're not actually dictating any one of the options but we're laying this out in the determination that this is how this recommendation can be addressed by the Council with the Council deciding the details. And Wolf-Ulrich says, "The Council has to decide which option is feasible."

And then with that language staff would send this revised implementation charter out for a consensus call with that language redlined so that people

can see what has changed. And Lori says, "I think that works." Thank you, Lori.

And so then and Lori notes it gives Council flexibility. Good point. And so Jen, staff take that as an action item to take those changes and to get the amended charter out for a two-week consensus call.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Then the next item...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Yes, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, the next item was Recommendations 6, 33 and 36, sorry, this is Julie again from staff. And this is the recommendations on diversity and linkage to the CCWG Accountability recommendations. And so what staff did here was there are three recommendations that relate to diversity that came out of the GNSO review. And there also are now recommendations from the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 and that is actually several recommendations, not all of which necessarily pertain to the recommendations by the - that came out of the GNSO review.

So rather than first starting with a drafting of a charter for these diversity recommendations, staff thought it might be helpful to show each recommendation and then a staff suggestion of where that recommendation might be linked to a recommendation made by the CCWG. And because I'm thankful that we have Rafik on this call, who's been very much involved in the CCWG Accountability, in case, you know, staff has erred in how we've tried to match these recommendations.

So just to run through the document here, the first of the recommendations is Recommendation 6 and that is that the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on working group participation including diversity statistics. And so the CCWG Recommendation 8 states that ICANN staff should support the capture, analysis and communication of diversity information seeking external expertise if needed in the following ways: create a diversity section on the ICANN Website, gather and maintain all relevant diversity information in one place, produce an annual diversity report for ICANN based on all the annual information and provide a global analysis of trends and summarize SO/AC groups recommendations for improvement where appropriate.

This should also include some form of reporting on diversity complaints and include diversity information derived from the annual diversity report in ICANN's annual report. And apologies for the - apologize for the strange formatting but in taking the recommendations report from the CCWG Accountability, some of the formatting didn't come out quite right when it was changed to Word.

So and I'll just run through the rest of these quickly and then we can discuss. And I'm conscious of the time and I want to make sure we allow at least 10 minutes for the discussion of the Council update.

So GNSO Review Recommendation 33 is that stakeholder groups and constituencies and the Nominating Committee in selecting their candidates for appointment to the GNSO Council should aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its participants as defined in ICANN core value 4.

And then - and I'm - let's see, oh yes, there's another page - actually there's 4. Yes, so then and that when approving the formation of a PDP working group the GNSO Council requires that its membership represent as far as reasonably practicable the geographic, cultural and gender diversity of the Internet as a whole. Additionally that when approving GNSO policy the

ICANN Board explicitly satisfy itself that the GNSO Council undertook these actions when approving the formation of a PDP working group.

So there are several recommendations that staff though related to Recommendation 36. First of all, Recommendation 2 where each SO and AC group identifies which elements of diversity are mandated in their charters, that are relevant and applicable to each levels of - levels including leadership, and publish those results. Recommendation 3, that these groups supported by ICANN staff should undertake an initial assessment of the diversity for all their structures including leadership based on their diversity criteria and publish the results official Website.

Recommendation 4, should use the information from their initial assessment to define and publish on their official website their diversity criteria objectives and strategic for achieving these as well as a timeline for doing so.

And Recommendation 5, that these groups supported by ICANN staff should undertake a regular update of their diversity assessment against their diversity criteria and objectives at all levels including leadership on an annual basis or not less than every three years.

So staff did think that both of these - both of these diversity assessments seemed to link to Recommendations 2-5, that there was a significant overlap there. And then finally, Recommendation 35 is that the GNSO Council establish a working group whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole to recommend to Council ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non-English speakers and those with limited command of English.

So staff will note that this recommendation actually was a low priority recommendation and one which I think there were some concerns about how it might be implemented. And staff was wondering, you know, for this working group to consider whether the work of the CCWG - extensive work - in



developing these diversity recommendations actually addresses perhaps Recommendation 35 and that there is - there has already been a group that has done this work and has come up with the recommendations that we do have from the CCWG Accountability.

I'm not - staff is unsure how the specific working group within the GNSO would actually add to what the CCWG has already done in its work and in fact might possibly just be duplicative. So I'll stop there and maybe just a few minutes for discussion and then I suggest that we, you know, Jen, if you agree we should go onto the GNSO Council update just because that is time sensitive and we do need to make sure that we get that - the slides to the Council in time for its document and motion deadline which is on the 12th. Thank you. So any discussion on these. And Rafik, I'm particularly interested in your thoughts not to put you on the spot. Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks Julie. Yes, I want to (unintelligible) with the last I think statement you made about that recommendation. I think it will be duplicative of what was done in the CCWG as we really tried to cover how we define diversity and then set some recommendation for the SO/AC and the groups which means the stakeholder group and constituency. So I think we can - sorry, we can say that it was already done and we should focus on the other recommendation in particular like the assessment and for example like the different group have to set objectives and the strategy. So that's I think what should be the focus. So, yes, I see that we have some overlap here and so we can use the recommendation from the CCWG.

One point maybe as when we talked in particular the Recommendation 8, which is give in fact it's more of the one that, how to say, defines several requirement maybe for some background that some people were pushing for having the office - the diversity office, but that it didn't go so far, but what was kind of - there was consensus to have several requirements of maybe such function that should exist. And for example creating diversity section on the ICANN Website, maybe here we - I'm not sure if we should also create

something only at the GNSO Website but I guess we need to see how we can - we can link the existing recommendation and the GNSO review to that part.

So we may be at some level there's some work that it should be done at the whole ICANN so maybe this is kind of we need to assess, but, yes, there is some overlap in term of recommendation. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Rafik. And I'm not - I think that's really helpful. I think what I'd like to suggest as an action, Jen, is that staff would go ahead and turn these into a formal implementation charter, you know, with a bit more explanation for how these various recommendations might be linked and implemented. Now I will note that - and Rafik, correct me if I'm wrong, but the next step for these recommendations is they do have to approved by the Board, is that right? That is the CCWG recommendations.

Rafik Dammak: They have to be approved first (unintelligible) recommendation, they have to be (unintelligible) including the GNSO and after that it should be approved by the Board, so it would take time but we can have more visibility I think if it's approved by the chartering organization, how to say, there is low risk that they are not going to be approved by the Board, but yes, they still have to go through these two phases.

Julie Hedlund: Oh thank you very much, Rafik. That's really helpful. So okay, Jen, if you don't mind staff can go ahead to the final item which is the GNSO Review Working Group update to the Council.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, that would be great. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: So this actually follows the format that staff used for the update that we provided for ICANN 61 and so we have the current status, which hasn't changed since ICANN 61, which actually is the same, that Phases 1 and 2 recommendations are all implemented by previous work. The update is in

Phase 3 that the estimate is that eight recommendations are likely to be implemented by June. That would include recommendations that have already been approved which is Recommendations 7 and 12, relating to translation and transcription. Those have been approved by consensus as of the 26th of April.

That would include Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 as well as 20 and 21, which will go out for a consensus call. And so then what remains is the implementation charters for the seven recommendations that have - that have dependencies. And so those are the recommendations both that we have just discussed relating to diversity but also those recommendations, 26, 27, 28 and 29, which are all related to - in various ways to statements of interest and have a dependency concerning the GDPR.

But we note here that all recommendations are expected to be completed by the original deadline of September 2018. And then we go into some key updates so again, noting that 7 and 12 are agreed by full consensus, noting that the language that was added that any demand for services with budget implementations must be brought by the working group leadership to the GNSO Council for consideration. That was language that we added in the final determination and something that we wanted to just bring to the attention of the Council.

And then with respect to Recommendation 20, which the charter which is under review, is the possible recommendation to expand the charter for the SCBO. Now staff will amend this text and will reflect instead what we discussed which is the various options for how the Council would address its annual review of the strategic objectives. So the language here will reflect what staff will put in the implementation charter. And what staff will do - and just put out revised slides today for review and then ask for any final changes. And if none, then staff will plan to send on the GNSO Review Working Group's behalf the slides with a brief note to the Council tomorrow so in advance of the deadline for documents and motions.

Further, the update is 6, 33 and 36, and actually 35 so there's actually four there - staff will make that correction - concerning diversity and the possible dependencies with the recommendations from the Cross Community Working Group Work Stream 2 on Diversity. And then also as noted here, 26, 27, 28 and 29 and the possible dependencies with the general data protection regulation. And staff is actually noting then if I go back to the Accountability recommendations, there's - if I go to Page 2 - there's actually four of those. So staff will make the change in the slides to note that there's actually eight, if I look back at Slide 1, there's eight recommendations that have dependencies; four relating to diversity and four relating to GDPR and staff will make that change.

So those are the slides - the detailed slides. And then also we've included the timeline and we're still on track for that. So any comments please. And, yes, thank you, Rafik, it is the 14th, so next Monday and not the 12th as I said. Thank you. The Council motion and documents deadline, correct. And Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well maybe I was wrong, so I was asking whether this update is for the Panama meeting, now I understand it's for the next Council meeting, isn't it?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct, the Council meeting on the 24th so we'll need to submit it before this coming Monday or by - no later than...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so then I don't have any more questions. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. If there are no further comments what staff will do is make the correction on Slide 2 and also on then on Slide 3 we'll update the text under Recommendation 20 to reflect what we discussed here today and

to make sure it's consistent with what we'll have in the implementation charter. Wolf-Ulrich, is that a new hand?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I would like to come back. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Just with one question, I think on the second page you had mentioned with regards to the - all questions relating to the budget questions, related to translation and transcriptions have - if I'm correct and if you could just display that page I think it's...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...page Number 3 then. Should be referred to the working group is that how you phrasing that?

Julie Hedlund: The way it's phrased here, and I think I pulled it right out of the charter was language was added that any demand for service with budget implementations must - okay, I see a typo here - must be brought by the working group leadership to the GNSO Council for consideration.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay good, not to the working group, yes, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Exactly, good catch.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. But that is only referring to what we can cover right now, so that means if there is something which we would see, you know, because the working group is not supposed to exist any longer after September or the mandate is given...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes, apologies, Wolf-Ulrich. That's out of context. And so actually I think I should amend it so it's more clear. In the text in the implementation charter working group actually refers to a PDP working group so the GNSO Review - it's not referring to the GNSO Review Working Group, it's referring to, you know, if a PDP working group, you know, has you know,...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...that has a budget, you know, implication then that PDP working group needs to bring it to the Council. But you're quite right, I don't have that context here so it is unclear. So...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...more clear.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: No thank you very much, that's very, very good point. And yes, Rafik, exactly, Recommendation 20 will be amended to reflect what we discussed today to not be a recommendation for the SCBO's charter to be expanded but to list the options that we talked about say committee as a whole or, you know, working team or say a staff preparation for a meeting with Council and MSSI. So that will show alternatives and not a particular you know, one particular recommendation. Anything else on this?

Jen, I'm not seeing any other hands up so staff will take the action...

Jen Wolfe: Yes, no that's great.

Julie Hedlund: ...and circulate this for a final review before sending it off to the Council tomorrow.

Jen Wolfe: That sounds great. Any other - that was everything we had I think right? So our next meeting is in two weeks on the 24th.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's right.

Jen Wolfe: Any other comments?

Lori Schulman: Hi, this is Lori. I won't be at the 24th meeting, that's the INTA annual meeting. So and I thought some GDD I think or GDD's right before it.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Lori Schulman: So anyway.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, there's - INTA is that week, you're right, Lori, GDD is this next week along with RightsCon so I think there's a couple things. But we'll probably just go with our small group as we usually do for the 24th.

Lori Schulman: Okay, then I send my regrets now.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, noted. Thank you.

Lori Schulman: Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: So that's all we have from staff. Thanks, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you all.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: All right then.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, is anybody still - I thought I heard someone. Okay, well thanks, everybody. Thanks for a great call and we'll look forward to keeping this moving two weeks from today.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks, everyone, and thanks, Jen, again for chairing.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, all, for participating. Have a great day.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. Okay, you too. Bye.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Today's meeting is adjourned. Verizon operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all lines. To everyone else, thank you and have a wonderful day.

END