ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
GNSO Review WG Update
Friday, 04 November 2016 at 17:00 IST
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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

James Bladel: Okay our next session is a update from the GNSO Review Working
Group which would be Jennifer Wolfe and Wolf-Ulrich which we could
maybe, you know, if it was a celebrity band it would be Jennifer Wolf-
Ulrich and combine them all together. Is Jennifer on the line or is she
here in Hyderabad? I haven't seen her?

Jennifer Wolfe: I'm here. I'm here.

James Bladel: But Wolf-Ulrich is here yes. Okay we'll start with you Wolf-Ulrich
and…

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

James Bladel: …if you could walk us through the slides and then we'll go from there.
Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thank you, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. While I could be brief
with a small presentation of the status for the - of the GNSO Review
Working Group. Jennifer Wolf is the chair as James said and I was
just recently appointed as vice chair and as just we say empowerment
I'm going well to present your status here.

So let's stay a little this - with that first chart because this is just I - at the middle part of I would say the overall review cycle it starts with the time and the final report of the independent advisor was published and was posted then in September 2, 2015 and it ends here with the preparation of an implementation plan. So it doesn't show the time which was spent for the review itself and that time. And I think if I'm right (Julia) started in 2014 or 2013 already. And it doesn't show, you know, where it will end with the implementation what does it mean, you know, how much time you need for the implementation?

I would say at least if I look at this it's the whole cycle will take around five to six years. And this brings me to that warning to you if anybody is going to complain in future about any let me say structural or procedural or whatever issues here in the GNSO he or she should immediately be charged to participate in such a group so there will be work for years to do to come over with that work.

What does it mean with regards? We are a small group. We have been calling - well all the constituencies to participate. So we are still lacking in our ability though to find time or so that all of these constituencies could participate in this important project. So we try our best now to go along and to develop a plan, implementation plan.

So next slide please. The next one. Thanks. So the money is, you know, really still be lacking still with regard to the volunteer capacity to blend improvements. And so the question is really here how should other work so which is done in the Workstream 2 for example or in other PDPs could be effected and determine what is here realistic in order to continue here working?

Yes we are trying now to establish a time plan or an implementation plan including time scheduled which could be realistic so it could take into consideration all of the dependencies between the recommendations which were developed by the Review Team itself

and the other work or a ongoing and to be done in future besides the (unintelligible) interview implementation.

So and the big question for us is as well we are dealing with that to how shall we measure, you know, the outcomes of the implementation so how we shall measure it against the what was intended to do. So there's still discussion going on shall we put at first expectations on that and then try to implement to develop this implementation plan or shall we just try well on a practical basis well and then come up with some measure, measure results later on? That would lead you to the next slide please.

And there what we have is a basis right now and it's really, really helpful. It's a straw man which was developed by staff regarding all the recommendations how shall they filter it, how shall they sort it out and under which conditions shall these recommendations be implemented?

So a big part of that are the dependencies well to other recommendations, to other work within the GNSO to be done and the implications of these dependencies on the plan itself. So that's - there is a proposal on the table which staff has covered these points and we are discussing already this in the groups, you know, whether that is that - that could fit into what they expect to do.

Well therefore we need a lot of data to collect, data with regards to the question what should be the resources should be noted – needed for implementation? What resources in terms of budget, resources in terms of more or less staff, not staff our resources also from the community. So we are working on that as well.

Then as the recommendations and the council who approved the recommendations has outlined the implementation itself could be part, could be done in parts by staff. I would say the bigger part of that is on

the staff side but it's also some of them will be done by the community especially if it comes to the recommendations which deal with well procedural matters within the community.

So there could be also to some from some the recommendations could be a mixed staff plus community could work on that. So we are working on to find out the metrics and determine what could be the metrics well look at these recommendations and the result of the implementation and report on this is one thing so it should also be a part of this implementation plan. And at that so we just started to do that so we will be let me say in the position to come up with a more general plan in the timeline we have envisaged for that. Next slide please.

Yes it comes back to the question of participation here. And the deadline of providing this plan has been set by the 20 of - it's the end December of this year because that is according to what the board is expect as was well from us to have an implementation plan available.

So in order to meet that that is really a challenge because we shall have only one council meeting on 1 December. We will try now to come up with a first outline of the implementation of a general implementation plan which is also may be structured in a kind of batching see recommendations and how to implement (unintelligible) so that we have a - and very first estimate if you batch several counts of the recommendations in two or three batches - well depending on the outcome of the discussion what does it mean with regards to the timeline especially to a realistic timeline and the resources we needed.

Next slide please. We have a face to face meeting. We have - we are working on a weekly basis right now. So this time we will have a face to face meeting in Hyderabad on Tuesday and the next one shortly then on the 15th of November. And so we have advised a strawman

available based on the first discussions we had about that and so I encourage everybody so for of the group who is available at this time to participate. Also if you are only a participant, not a member or if you're just a - as an alternate member of that and you would find time we - you are welcome to participate. I think that ends my presentation for the time being thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Before we jump into questions I actually have a question for you and for staff regarding the timing of the report because it's only now occurring to me that all of these things are probably going to miss some of the dates because I believe we have a council meeting on the 1st December and is that our last council meeting for the year?

Okay and when is our first council meeting scheduled for January? We don't have one yet. Oh that's great. So then the question then becomes to the council when we receive this implementation plan which may or may not include the level of detail that Wolf-Ulrich has outlined will we adopt that via formal motion requiring a council meeting or would it be acceptable to review and adopt this implementation plan via the mailing list?

And I'm noting this because I don't think it's realistic to ask this group to have their work completed in time for the December 1 meeting particularly with the document cut off just being a few days after we get back from Hyderabad. I think that's unrealistic. But if we go beyond that and we require a separate meeting then we're going to go beyond the date that the board has established for a due date there. So it sounds like we're going to have to consider this on the list just generally. Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Are we - go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I should note there's two meetings in December so the thought in the working group was that we would try to get the report to the GNSO Council by 21 November which would be the document deadline for the 1st of December and then if it did - if the council did want to defer for any reason they could still defer to the 15th if the council indeed did want to do this as a vote.

James Bladel: So December 1 is not our last meeting for the year. We actually have one after that? Okay. That's good to know. That dials off some of the pressure, thank you. And is that the and Wolf-Ulrich would you agree that's the target timeline your group's trying to hit? Okay. And what - did you receive any guidance from the board when they establish that timeline on what level of detail they wanted to see in this implementation plan because I know you - one of the slides indicated that that it would be an outline first with a lower level of detail to come during implementation. And we are - reasonably believe that would be acceptable, that would be an acceptable work output.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well asking me but you can really chime in as well. So I don't see a very detailed, you know, request from the board with two - (unintelligible) this. But I would say, you know, as we are going to work, you know, we would like to avoid that the board is let me say mis-pointed in his perception of the timing for example. So therefore we need to a certain level of diligence we need the investigation of that what does it mean really, what is the implication of the recommendations to the timing and maybe to the if there is some budget request, you know, that and we would like to come up with some budget figures so this should be carefully designed in advance before we bring that up to the board. Thanks. Julie is that…

Julie Hedlund: If I might add this is Julie Hedlund. We will of course endeavor to get as much detail into this plan as possible. There is quite a bit that we can provide because for the first batch of what we're suggesting is the

first batch of items of recommendations it's work that's already underway. So that means there's quite a bit that we can identify and point to and we can be very close to saying well if these three things happen say for instance, you know, then this will be, you know, this is how we can implement it.

Some of the budgetary figures may have to wait just because it, you know, it might have to fall into the budgetary process which is, you know, is underway but would extend past the deadline. But what we are endeavoring to do is to provide as robust a plan as we can recognizing that some of these details really cannot really be provided until the plan is being executed.

James Bladel: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich and Julie. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes a real quick question this is Chuck Gomes. Are - and I don't recall from my review of the current budget but are there any funds available for GNSO improvement implementation in fiscal year '17 budget or if there are any additional funds needed that will have to wait until fiscal year '18? Anybody know?

Julie Hedlund: We can certainly find that out. And I would say too that again for the first the top priority item the work that's already underway many of those are staff implementations, things that, you know, are nearly complete if not complete really just needs the judgment from the working group, you know, to say yes check that box, you know, based on what's been provided that it's complete. So those would not have budgetary implications.

Some of the items that might be in the second batch oh - and certainly this lowest items in the third batch could certainly wait and, you know, in a more detailed, you know, budget could be developed. But from a first pass through in the implementation plan many of these items would appear not to have budgetary implications.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. The other questions for Wolf-Ulrich or Julie? We are a couple of minutes ahead of schedule on our GNSO review implementation session. No? Then thank you for that update. We will look forward to the first draft of that outline of the plan.

                 END