ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
29 September 2016 at 12:00 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: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-wg-29sep16-en.mp3

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

Coordinator: Your recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Phil). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. And welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on Thursday, 29th of September, 2016.

On the call today we have Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Pascal Bekono, Jennifer Wolf, Sara Bockey, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. We received no apologies today. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Larisa Gurnick, Lars Hoffman, Charla Shambley and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And welcome, everyone, to the GNSO Review Working Group kick-off meeting. And today on the 29th of

September. I'll just – I'm – pardon me – I am with ICANN staff, Policy Director in the policy development department, and will be supporting this working group.

And so because we don't have leadership selected yet for this group I'll go ahead and start things off. And then – and then we'll move along to see if we have volunteers for our chair or vice chair.

But to start with, we've done the roll call. Just a reminder, everybody who participates in this group as a participant or a member does need to have a statement of interest submitted. And we also always take a moment at the beginning of calls to ask if there are any updates to anyone's statements of interest. So I will ask that question now. If anyone could let us know if they have any updates to their statement of interest.

Not seeing anyone raising their hand so I'm going to assume we don't have any updates. And move along then to the administrative issues. And the key – the first item of the administrative issues is whether or not we have any volunteers for chair and or vice chair.

Do we have anyone here who is interested in volunteering while they're on this call and of course we can extend this to the list as well after the call who would like to volunteer as chair or vice chair? Jen, I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Jen Wolf: Yes, thanks, Julie. This is Jen Wolf. And I was the chair of the GNSO Review Working Party. I would be more than happy to volunteer to chair or cochair or whatever the group would like. But certainly happy to bring the context and experience that I had as we arrived at these recommendations and the way that we grouped them together to provide that context as we move forward. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. That's extremely helpful. Unless anybody has any objections, and we can of course announce this to the list as well, I would like to suggest that we have Jen chair this meeting but I also see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up. Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks. And thanks, Jen, well, I would appreciate if you could do that job. I was wondering, you know, looking to the charter of this group because this group – I would say the task right now being split in three parts. The first one is, you know, providing the implementation plan for the deadline of the end of this year to send it to the Board. And the other one is then really to come up with the implementation and to execute the implementation. And the third thing is then the – or the other things, you know, having taken over the jobs from the SCI.

So this should – you should have that in mind. And I think you have it. But the question for me was just whether we should leave it open for in case more people are going to join whether we should have a cochair or so for that group. But at the moment so I'm satisfied but leave that question open so we could come back to that another time. That's what I have to say here.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I think that's a good idea. I think it would be very helpful to also have a vice chair and, you know, with your extensive experience I don't know if that's something that you might consider but I don't want to also put you on the spot here at this point as well. We'll certainly leave it open for other volunteers. And as you note, this work will definitely be continuing into the implementation phase.

And I see that there was a question in the chat that Pascal Bekono asked the role of the vice chair and what it is and Marika Konings has noted the vice chair would support the chair and take on chair responsibilities in his or her absence.

And yes, indeed, as Marika notes, we will share with the workgroup an overview of the desired qualities and expectations of the leadership. And this is also something I think that's included in the charter.

So with that, I would like to go to the next item of administrative issues and that is the frequency and scheduling of meetings. I know that we have noted already that we're late in starting and we do have a deadline to get a plan in place quite quickly, no later than December of this year. And so I would like to suggest, unless people have objections, that we at least schedule on a weekly basis. I don't know whether or not this is a good time since we have fairly light representation, perhaps we'll need to follow with a Doodle again today.

But I might suggest a weekly 60-minute call or possibly a weekly 90-minute call. We could start with 60 and see how – whether or not we need to expand that time. But let me open it up for comments from others as far as how we might proceed with the scheduling.

Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks.

Man: Hello?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, hello?

Julie Hedlund: Hello, Wolf-Ulrich, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:

Man: Yes, this is (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry, I think we have someone who's speaking. If you could mute, we have Wolf-Ulrich who has the floor at this moment. Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Man: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. Thanks, Julie. With regard to the timeline, well, okay the timeline is tight. If you would like to keep it, you know, to come up with an implementation plan or a first draft to the Council meeting in Hyderabad so this is – which is fixed in the charter as a first deadline. So we have to do something. And I would follow that so that we have a weekly call and tied it with something in between and maybe so we can prioritize or step wise, you know, move forward, you know, with regards to the – to the plan for the different recommendations.

                 That may be a thing. But plan, you know, to have meetings weekly would be helpful. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And I'll just note for all who are here, and I see your hand, Jen, but just to remind people that you do need to raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room. It's easier for us to recognize people who are speaking. So please do that. And let me go ahead and recognize Jen. Please go ahead, Jen.

Jen Wolf: Thanks, Julie. And I just wanted to ask Wolf-Ulrich if there's a Council meeting tonight and you're able to raise this issue to perhaps seek some feedback if Council thinks it's realistic to complete this task by the November Council meeting and particularly with the low turnout that we've had. So if you would be able to bring that feedback I think that would be very helpful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: If I may I can answer to that. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Jen, well, I can raise this point. But, you know, I just was referring to the charter I think is in the charter where, you know, it is, you know, in order, well, to come up to the Board and through the Council because the Council has then to decide on

the implementation to put it forward to the Board's implementation plan, so that was the goal for Hyderabad.

If we fail with that or if we see, you know, from our first try and after, let me say, one or two meetings we see we cannot cope with that, I think it wouldn't be a big problem to do so because there will be other meetings after Hyderabad. I think November is – there will be another meeting, so and we can put it onto the list on the Council as well and in December there shall be also meetings so we have time until the end of December that the Council is going to pass that.

I will raise this point; I will raise the question of participation as well. And I think they will support it. Yes. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And just putting myself in the queue to say also that the – my next item of business here is to go through briefly the overview of the charter and the scope of work. And I think that will help us as well as we look at organizing our work. And also then at that point I will turn things over to Jen who will run through the GNSO review recommendations. So we have a sense of what their work is going to be and then also we'll talk about working methods. We can talk about prioritization and so forth.

But right now I'll assume that we want to meet weekly and I'll go ahead and do a Doodle – we'll do a Doodle to try to find time slot where people can join. So just moving on to the slides, again, just the overview. We're going to review the – just a highlight of the charter and some of the background on the GNSO review and the feasibility and prioritization of recommendations.

We've discussed leadership. We'll look a little bit at the desired outcomes and improved understanding of the work of their review working group, the recommendations and implementation plan, and then some of the considerations as we plan the work GNSO volunteer capacity, realistic

implementation schedule and plan, and the expected outcomes and measuring results.

And this is just a timeline. I'm not going to go through all of this but as you can see, there have been many steps in the GNSO review process. And it was in just June of this year that the Board approved the final report and the 34 recommendations and in July when the GNSO Council determined the steps towards implementation and the implementation plan. The Council is expected, at least the goal is to have the Council approve the implementation plan in November in order to be able to have it in front of the Board for approval in December.

And as Marika has noted in the chat, the wording in the resolution adopting the charter said the GNSO Council directs the GNSO Review Working Group to submit the proposed implementation plan to the GNSO Council for approval at the latest by ICANN 57. And she notes that she believes this timing was put in place to align with being able to submit it to the Board by the end of December. But as Wolf-Ulrich as noted, the working group will need to determine based on progress in the next couple of weeks whether or not this is feasible.

Now just an overview of the charter. It was adopted, as noted, by the GNSO in July. And the working group – the GNSO Review Working Group is responsible for developing an implementation plan that will – and contain a realistic timeline for implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure the current state. And progress towards the desired outcome for the GNSO review recommendations that were adopted by the Board, and that's the 34 recommendations excluding Recommendations 23 and 32.

I know – thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, how will we get punished if we fail to meet this goal? It's a good question.

Moving along for the charter overview, and please do feel free to raise your hand if you have any questions for me. I will also pause at the end of the charter overview for questions.

So the implementation plan is to be submitted for approval to the Council, as noted and then consideration followed by the Board. It's supposed to be submitted no later than six months after the adoption of the Board's resolution that would be then in December. Following approval, the working group is expected to execute and oversee the implementation of the GNSO review recommendations unless specified differently in the implementation plan. So it is expected that this working group would not only develop the implementation plan but also would oversee the implementation.

Again, I'm moving along, another responsibility of this working group is to consider any new requests by the GNSO Council that have been identified either by the Council or a group chartered by the Council as needing discussion such as issues related to the GNSO Council processes and procedures and to Working Group Guidelines. Nonetheless, the first priority of this working group will be the development of the implementation plan and the implementation of the recommendations.

So I'll just back up one. That is the overview of the charter. And Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. Well one question, so – and this must be very clear because of the – what is going to happen after the development of the implementation plan. I understand the charter says that this group is also responsible for the execution of the implementation. This is – this raises some question marks. I normally understand that staff is doing the implementation.

So and I think we discussed that also on Council once. And the question is here, and you mentioned, you used the words "oversight" having an oversight over the execution. So this must be very clear who is doing what.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So, yes, as it stands right now in the charter the working group is expected to execute and oversee implementation. I will note, and as Marika notes in the chat as well, unless of course the working group determines that the implementation should happen differently. And yes, I do recognize that generally implementation is a task that is something that, you know, that staff is involved in as far as execution. But there is this language in the charter. And yet, as noted, the working group could determine to do this differently.

And Marika notes in the chat probably aligned with how the work teams worked under the last review in which the actual implementation of some of the recommendations was worked out in the form of procedures. But obviously the working group could also delegate some of this work to staff and oversee.

Does that answer your question, Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So I think it depends on the progress of the work and the type of recommendations so let's see in future.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. So at this point, I would like to turn things over to Jen Wolf and she can give some background and overview of the feasibility assessment and prioritization. And, Jen, I've made you a presenter so you can move the slides as you like.

Jen Wolf: Great. Thanks, Julie. And thank you for reviewing the charter. I think as we start to attack the implementation, you know, what we want to try to do is build upon the work that the working party has done in prioritizing each of these recommendations. Obviously with 36 recommendations there would be

a lot of work to try to create an implementation plan for each and every one. And so I think that we could focus our work on at first bucketing these into, you know, when and how should many of these be done.

As you can see on this slide right here, they were really – there were two ways that we categorized. First, we went in where – and we determined what were the recommendations where everyone agreed that those were good recommendations? And those were flagged as green. Then there were some where we said we think work is already begin done somewhere within the GNSO on these issues so that was flagged as orange.

And then the third was the yellow where we agreed but with some modifications as modifications have now all been approved so we could look at those as agreed upon recommendations. And then of course that final category which we really don't have to address in our work here because it was determined not proceed with those.

But within that infrastructure we also prioritized, do we think these are really high, very important to the GNSO and those should be addressed first? Are they medium? Are they low? So, you know, of course we can have the discussion about this but it would seem fairly logical that we could tackle the high prioritized items first and then the medium and then the low.

And I think that within that we may want to look at just grouping all of the agreed upon – getting rid of the yellow now that we have the modifications bucketing those together because we could look at what's been agreed to. We don't think that work is being done anywhere and tackle those high priority items first and then tackle the hey, work is already being done somewhere because obviously the implementation plan there may focus more on just some kind of accountability mechanism to ensure that work being done ultimately is measured against the recommendations.

So I'll pause there just to see, you know, what comments you all have on that proposed approach. Larisa, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Jen. Hi, everybody. This is Larisa Gurnick. During the development of the prioritization and the feasibility assessment, there was some discussion about looking at resources available within the GNSO community to do the implementation planning and work actually. And perhaps consider doing a phased or chunked approach.

So I just wanted to bring that on the table as well because there was a sense that there is quite a bit of work to do here and that might be another option to consider to base on some sort of priority to look at doing the implementation of a grouping of recommendations, say five or seven, and then once that is completed to move on to the next step. Thank you.

Jen Wolf: Thanks, Larisa. I think that's an excellent point. Obviously with so many recommendations only so much can be done at one point in time. So, you know, perhaps to an extent, you know, if you agree we do try to just let's put these onto tracks of how are these going to be, you know, discussed and how is a plan going to be put in place again recognizing that we've already prioritized to an extent, you know, the high, medium, low.

If there aren't any other comments I'm going to go ahead and – let me see, am I able to – oh, I'm just making it bigger, sorry. I'll scroll down. I don't think we need to read through each and every recommendation on this call. I would encourage all of you to read through the recommendations the way they've been organized in order of priority.

You can see here, you know, we've ranked these by priority so we could look at the high and then the medium and then the low and then down towards, you know, the ones that have not been recommended. So I'm not going to read through all of these right now. I do want to focus for a minute on – on just some considerations for us as we move forward with our work.

As Larisa said, one of the concerns is obviously the volunteer capacity. You can see we are struggling to get people just to participate in the call so we know that will be an issue. So with the limited number of volunteers not only to participate on this, but potentially to participate in the execution work, you know, how do we chunk these things together? What's realistic? You know, how much can really be tackled in a one-year period of time? Do we prepare a plan that is a multiyear plan?

And then I think one of the things that I would really like to see us do is that as we create this plan we're focused on how do we measure results? Because if we don't put in place ways to measure what we've done then what's the point? So I think those are the things that we really want to focus on.

Any comments or thoughts from those of you who are on the call? Larisa, is that a new hand? I'm sorry.

Larisa Gurnick: Sorry.

Jen Wolf: No, that's okay. Just was checking.

Larisa Gurnick: Old hand. Thank you.

Jen Wolf: Anyone else on thoughts on how we move this forward? Okay, I'll go to this next slide with what should the review produce, the staff put together a very nice graphic here. I love the acronym, SMART, you know, we want it to be, you know, specific, measurable, actionable, relevant and time-based. And that's what we're really focused on is, you know, how do we take what's been done, all of the recommendations that have now been accepted and asked to move forward and really create an effective recommendation plan and that's really what we have before us in this group.

I know we do have a short timeframe but I think perhaps if we keep it at a high level implementation plan it may be realistic to achieve, you know, the deadlines that we have; if we feel like we need to get more details then we might need to ask for more time. But I think we just want to keep that in perspective that right now we just need to create a broad-based implementation plan. And as Larisa said, we may be able to determine how many recommendations are focused on each year.

And then each year that we're attacking, maybe it's 5 or maybe it's 10 or maybe we change it based upon how intense that we think that work is going to be. I think that's in our phone calls that we're going to have, that's what's going to be really important.

And there are some notes here just on, you know, formulating a useful recommendation. Again, I won't read through all of this. But, you know, trying to look at, you know, what work is being done, you know, what the costs are, how much work is required. A lot of that discussion took place during the review process. That's how we arrive at our color-coding, that's how we arrived at our prioritization. So some of that work has already been done that we don't have to rehash unless there's new thoughts.

So I was just looking in the chat, it's possible to do a weekly working plan to make sure we achieve, you know, I think certainly that's something perhaps staff could help us with to keep us on track each week as we're trying to move this forward. You know, what do we need to achieve in each and every call? And I'm happy to work with staff to help say what should our goal be with each call so that particularly with the – if we have, you know, lower turnout or a smaller group we can stay focused and try to keep us on track. Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Jen. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I'm not sure, you know, looking at this chart right now so is it – is this the one we are – which we should use for our work because I see here questions right, is the

recommendation aligned with ICANN's strategic plan? And so I think that's done already because, you know, or should we start with discussions about, you know, the – about the recommendations themselves? I don't think so.

I was of the opinion, you know, the recommendations we have studied in the first one, the feasibility of the recommendations, they have been accepted and that it's only we have now to find out how to execute it, well really to find the resources of that. That is, from my point of view, the most important thing to do. Or am I wrong here? Thanks.

Jen Wolf: Larisa, did you want to respond to that?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, thanks Jen. This is Larisa Gurnick. Wolf-Ulrich, you're absolutely correct. The idea for the slide, and the reason that it's here is just as an informational piece of in general the process and the recommendations have in fact, been formulated already by the independent examiner. And then the working party had prioritized and analyzed and assessed feasibility. So to a great extend a lot of this has already been done. So it was just intended to really encapsulate the kinds of thought process that has already gone into what everybody is seeing as the – a prioritization and feasibility assessment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thanks.

Jen Wolf: Larisa, any other – any other comments on what we just talked through, what's presented? What are our scope and charter is? Okay, well that's what we had scheduled for today. I don't know – I'll ask Larisa and Julie, do you think we should try to tackle anything else while we're on the call today? Should we try to focus on getting more people to participate, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. I would really like to see if we can get more people to participate. And Wolf-Ulrich has very helpfully offered to also make this point in the GNSO Council meeting that will be later today. Since we do

have a fairly small group here. And I know we do not have representative, or even close to it, from all of the constituencies and stakeholder groups.

What – we do have one other item of business here today and that is really next steps and the next meeting. And I think, much as I hate to do yet another Doodle poll, but I'm open to other suggestions, because we aren't getting good representation at this particular time and day, I'm wondering if we do need to select a different time and day and yet I am also concerned about the amount of time that goes into running a poll, waiting for responses and then scheduling a meeting and losing yet another, you know, losing perhaps another week, which we really can't afford at this point.

So I'd like to see if folks have ideas of how we should proceed, if we should try to keep this time, if we should try to do a very quick Doodle poll to see if we can find a better time next week? And, Wolf-Ulrich, I see your hand is up. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. Well first question is, so when you set this meeting, the date of this meeting right now, was it agreed by all of the members you have asked for? Maybe some have – don't have time at this time, maybe, I don't know about that. So how the poll was, the result of the poll was, the first question.

And the other thing is, well why shouldn't we just think – talk about, you know, for next week, well, find a date, you know, for next week maybe also Thursday next week and look around right now so in our calendars whether we can find a date, a time, which is convenient to us. That would be more helpful, I think so then go to – and for the next – the meetings after that so you could send out – send a poll so that maybe it be helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So your suggestion would be to go with this time for next week but to do a Doodle for subsequent meetings? Did I get that correctly?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For me is convenient, personally. This time.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And go ahead, Jen, I see your hand is up.

Jen Wolf: So, yes, thank you, Julie. You know, and I would just say too, Wolf-Ulrich, if you can provide feedback from Council, I know that you said that you will, but, you know, I do question is it the time or is just that there isn't the interest or people are overloaded with other things. I know there's a lot of other priority work going on right now.

We did have this struggle during the review working party process where we would frequently only have, you know, a small number of people on the calls. So, you know, to a certain extent I wouldn't say let's – let's not overanalyze the time if we're sending out the Doodle poll and that we have a majority of people who say they can turn up at that time then we need to roll with that because it could just be there isn't the interest or the availability, you know, to participate.

And I will also just say too, if there is anybody who's open to serving as vice chair there are two weeks where I'm completely out and wouldn't be able to participate in a call at any time. So if somebody is open to serving as cochair or vice chair that would be greatly appreciated.

Julie Hedlund: I'll note if someone can mute, I'm hearing some background noise. Thank you. I'll just note – this is Julie Hedlund again – I'll note what Marika has put in the chat that we, as staff can also look at the spread of time zones for this group to see if it might be useful to have a rotation.

I will note, though, that if – and I don't know, Jen, if this is something that your group ended up doing, but in some of the other – at least one of the other groups that I'm supporting – rotation has meant that it is a smaller group with each meeting and it does mean that generally you have to repeat

to some extent you may have to repeat some of the work that you're doing, you know, since not everyone is able to attend at the different times. So it's certainly something we can look at though.

So just following up, this is Julie Hedlund again, on this conversation, we'll go ahead and keep this time for next week and send the announcement so that people – right away so that people can plan. We'll also then do a Doodle for subsequent times.

Other actions from today, we'll also see if we have volunteers for vice chair and I'll note Pascal Bekono, I know you had indicated possible interest there. And noting that Jen will not be available for at least a couple of weeks.

And then also another action item is Wolf-Ulrich has offered to raise the issue of participation in the GNSO Council meeting later today. So I'll send some notes out following this call. And also noting these action items. Does anybody have any questions, anything else they would like to raise? We do still have time. Please go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Julie. Well a general question because we couldn't yet today really dive into the substance so we just, well, the overview on the information, which was given that is necessary to bring us up to the same level that's really okay. The question is well how can we proceed, well, not only in procedural matters just from the substance point of view.

The question is then from my point of view to staff, is there – would there be any chance, and I wonder whether this is feasible, well, to have a look through the – to the, let me say, the procedure – Jen was here – describing on the chart with regards to the – how to deal with the recommendation and to find out a little bit some parameters with regards to the recommendation which could be filled up in the first draft, let me say, to the working group. I'm just thinking about that. I do not have a final idea but we should be clear how we can get into the real substance. Thank you.

Hello? Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Oh I'm sorry, this is Julie Hedlund. And I was on mute. Sorry. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for that suggestion. I – when you say working the parameters, you know, and doing a first draft just to clarify and perhaps Jen and Larisa are understanding what you're asking, but just to try to be more specific, is staff is going to come up with something are you saying that we should try to, you know, take the groupings that we have now – we do have them, high, medium, low – and say look at the ones that are high priority and then you say working through the parameters, I'm not quite sure what you mean there but I see you have your hand up. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Julie. Well, just specific for one parameter at least, budget. I think budget is – or cost is really important to know for the – to get a picture of it for the Board in the end. So – and I think we have to rely on you, on staff, with regards to that. That you go back and see – because it's about the ICANN budget, you know, in this regard.

So you have to think about, well, what does it mean, you know, in terms of budget. And if you have some estimates from the beginnings for which we will be more detailing in the future, that would be helpful. Give us one example, I would say. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. That's – this is Julie Hedlund – that's very helpful. Larisa Gurnick, please go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Julie. This is Larisa Gurnick. Another parameter that might be useful to think about is the measuring success and desired outcome. And I know that deep discussions took place when the recommendations were being formulated that in order to see where things are and where improvements might take us, we would need to have some tracking and data and measurement processes in place, data collection processes.

So that could be another dimension to tackle and perhaps that's an area that staff could help with is to determine how would we measure where things are today and where the desired outcome should take us from a tracking and measurement perspective.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Right.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Larisa. Jen, please go ahead.

Jen Wolf: Yes, I'll just add to that and responding to Wolf-Ulrich as well. I think part of what we can do as our first substantive order of business is determine how many of these are realistic to tackle on a year by year basis? And whatever number we determine is a realistic number, you know, maybe it's 7, maybe it's 10, maybe it's more.

But I think that deserves a discussion, how many of these are realistic to try to implement and track? And I think part of what we might do in that first call as well is determine what additional points of information do we need from staff? Perhaps we want them to go through all of them and tell us what would it cost and how does that come out of the budget? Perhaps we also want them to go in and re-rank these in terms of placing everything that's high together so that we might group them and say this is what we want to tackle in Year 1, this is what we want to tackle in Year 2.

I think in terms of the implementation plan and please, you know, Julie, Larisa, correct me if I'm wrong here, but that's the kind of plan that we're trying to present in this short time period. I don't think we have to go into each recommendation and say here's how we would execute each and every recommendation. It's more of a broader how do we move this forward and then measure it. Does that seem right, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. Yes, I think that's correct. I don't – I don't think that this initial implementation plan needs to get down into the details of exactly how everything might be accomplished but is at a higher level. I think that piece of work would come as, you know, as we get into more of the implementation.

But I see Larisa has her hand up. Go ahead, Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Julie. This is Larisa. One of my responsibilities is coordinating and providing updates to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board on the progress of the reviews and the implementation work. So in speaking based on that relationship with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, I'd just like to confirm that in their view what would be most helpful is a realistic resource bound, if you will, plan for how to tackle these 34 recommendations and discussion of bandwidth and time and resources and limits.

These were all things that had been discussed and I think a high level plan that helps address how the implementation could move forward while considering these important considerations would be very much welcome. And perhaps, Julie, as I know this group will probably meet in Hyderabad, certainly it would be productive to make sure that some of the members of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee might come and join for discussion and update of progress and perhaps offer some other useful suggestions to this group. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you very much, Larisa, that's very helpful. And I've noted that as well. And thank you also to you and to Jen for sort of fleshing out what, you know, how we could start our work having, you know, some determination of, you know, how many of these are realistic, then also, you know, to tackle year by year, what additional points of information that we need from staff.

And, you know, having a realistic resource-bound plan on how to tackle these including bandwidth, time and limits and including the OEC members in the Hyderabad meeting. And there is actually a request in for a meeting. We don't have a time scheduled yet but we definitely have requested a meeting for Hyderabad.

So taking this back, I think I'll – I will work with Jen and Larisa and others to try to put together sort of a framework for how we can tackle some of these things on our next call so that we can have a good working – productive working call and try to provide some materials that might assist in that discussion.

Is there anything else that people want to raise on this call today? I'm not hearing anything. Then I do want to also, again, thank Jen for volunteering as chair. And we will see if we have other volunteers for vice chair as well. And I want to thank everybody who did join us today. This is extremely helpful. And we will then send a notice to have the call next week at this same time but we will also do a Doodle for subsequent meetings. And we will hope for better participation if at all possible.

Then thank you, everyone. I'm not seeing any other hands up. So I'm guessing that we can go ahead and adjourn here and we can give you back 9 minutes of your day.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you.

Jen Wolf: Thanks, Julie.

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Julie. Thanks, Jen.

Julie Hedlund: …afternoon, everyone. Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

Jen Wolf: Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Phil). You may now stop the recordings. This concludes today's call. Have a good remainder of your day, everyone.

END