

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 11 May 2017 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Review Working Group Meeting on the Thursday, 11 May 2017 at 12:00 UTC. 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.

Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/pbbRAw>

Audio may be found at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-11may17-en.mp3> AND
<https://participate.icann.org/p7dupk3w9pj/>

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all.

Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 11th of May at 12:00 UTC. On the call today we have Vicky Scheckler, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Rafik Dammak, Lori Schulman. We have apologies from Sara Bockey, Janelle McAllister and Jen Wolfe. And from ICANN staff we have Marika Konings, Amr Elsadr, Berry Cobb, Julie Hedlund and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and I'll turn the call back over to Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Michelle. So it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Hi, everybody. And we are a small group in the afternoon, or in my time it's

afternoon here. So but nevertheless, let's start and talk – go through our agenda and then let's start with the work to be done.

Are there any amendments, any declarations on the SOIs? I see nothing. So let's move forward.

Next item point is with regard to the result of the consensus call for the recommendations we have been talking last times, Recommendation Number 8 and 14 and 15. You may recall that this has been – have been decided upon and they were on the list for consensus calls. And may I hand over just to Julie, well, to tell us what is the status of that please, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from ICANN staff. So the consensus call did close on the 4th of May. And no comments or objections were received at that point. So staff has since sent to the list that the results of the consensus call and noting that for Recommendations 8 and the combined charter for Recommendations 14 and 15 as there were no objections or comments both were agreed to by full consensus. So those two items are completed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So that is – we can dive in directly into the next one. If you look to the agenda, the other topics we have, we have now to discuss the new charter for Recommendation Number 16, which used to be a combination of 16 and 18 I think in former times. So it was split up and staff drafted a new charter for that recommendation. Afterwards if we have time so we can start discussion on Recommendation 33. And these are the two items we have to deal with today.

So, Julie, I see you put up to the Adobe screen the new recommendation. Before I hand over to you that you can maybe just guide us through that, I was

just reading that recommendation. I think there is something just from the editorial point of view, if you look to the goal, I understand that this was taken from the strategic plan which you have made reference in the headlines here. But, you know, the very last item under this Board stuff and stakeholder use is not complete, something missing but you should take care about that.

So anyway I would like to hand over to you and you may guide us through that recommendation please, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from ICANN staff. And thank you, staff will note – excuse me – for the goal on Recommendation 16, staff will check the strategic plan wording and see if there's something missing. It actually looks like that might be a duplicate, but we'll go ahead and check that and make that correction. Thank you for that. And we've noted that in the notes as well.

So as Wolf-Ulrich has said, this was originally combined charter with Recommendation 18, but it was decided at the last meeting that after some discussion that Recommendation 18 could be pushed back and priority into Phase 2 recommendations and that Recommendation 16 could be considered on its own.

And so this is just a final walk through of Recommendation 16 prior to sending it out for a consensus call. The sense at the last meeting was that 16 could ready for a consensus call, but this would have been the first time we would have seen it as a standalone charter, so staff thought it would be useful just to walk through it relatively briefly.

So again, this is the recommendation on evaluating post-implementation policy impact. And as far as the strategic alignment, it relates to promoting the

role of clarity, promote role clarity and establishing mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem with a goal for shared understanding by Board, staff and stakeholders of the allocation of responsibilities for design development implementation of policy and operational processes and the shared understanding of roles, responsibilities and accountability to Board, staff and stakeholders.

And as noted, staff will look at the rest of the wording in that goal and see if there is something missing from the language in the strategic plan. And just to reiterate, this is actual language taken out of the current ICANN Strategic Plan that runs through 2020.

So the Recommendation 16 states that a policy impact assessment be included as a standard part of any policy process. And when the GNSO Review Working Group was looking at this recommendation, they noted that it seemed to be related to the implementation of the DMPM recommendations and then to assess whether or not the policy impact assessment is part of those recommendations, and then just to determine if indeed the DM – I’m sorry – the DMPM actually fulfills the policy impact assessment and whether or not appropriate changes have been made, if any, to the PDP manual that’s part of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

And then upon evaluation of these stats, then this GNSO Review Working Group would determine this recommendation has been implemented. Staff suggested the scope is sufficiently clear. The assumption is that recommendations will require changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures. The deliverable, I’m noting here, actually as staff, the deliverable is the revised GNSO Operating Procedures so staff will insert that as a deliverable. And as the option analysis was deemed that it was not necessary to look at other options for implementing this recommendation.

So moving on to the solution. And this is where it would have been different from the previous charter where the solution had notes for implementing both Recommendation 16 and 18, in this case it's just for Recommendation 16 implementation. So staff evaluation notes that Recommendation 16 appears to be addressed in the final report of the Data and Metrics for Policymaking – that's DMPM – Working Group final report.

I see there's a duplication in there. We'll make that correction as well. DMPM probably does not need to be repeated there.

So further to that, on the 21st of October, 2015, the Council passed a motion to improve this final report and the recommendations coming out of it. And some of these recommendations did result in revisions to the GNSO Operating Procedures published in February 2016 and in particular changes to the PDP manual.

So Recommendation 3, which relates to Recommendation 16, that's Recommendation 3 of the DMPM report, directs staff to create and publish new templates in the issue report, charter and final report templates in Annex 1 of the GNSO Operating Procedures Working Group Guidelines Section 5, Products and Outputs. And that has been done also.

But also, as part of that, there is a new charter template that has been added to the deliverables timeframe section of the – sorry, the Working Group Guidelines. And specifically, stated within that section is if the – as it states, sorry, if the working group concludes with any recommendations, the working group must include a policy impact analysis and a set of metrics to measure the effectiveness of the policy change including sources of baseline data for that purpose.

So this is indeed then the directive that a policy impact analysis as recommended in 16 must be included as part of the working group's deliberations when they conclude with any recommendations. And then as far as measurements, there needs to be an identification of policy goals, identifications of metrics used to measure whether policy goals are achieved, identification of potential problems in attaining the data or developing the metrics, a suggested timeframe in which the measure should be performed, define the current state baselines of the policy and define initial benchmarks that define success or failure.

And then there's some tips for metrics and these may include ICANN Compliance data, industry metric sources, community input via public comment, surveys or studies. Furthermore, Recommendation 6 of the DMPM report directs staff to update Annex 2 of the Policy Development Process Manual adding a new section, 4.5.2, Metrics Decision – Metrics Request Decision Tree, and form. And that feeds into then the Working Group Guidelines above.

And then furthermore, Recommendation 7 directs staff to import the Metrics Request Decision Tree found in Annex B and Metrics Request Form found in Annex C, these are in the final report of the DMPM and move those into the Working Group Guidelines. This also has been completed in the GNSO Operating Procedures that were published in February of 2016.

And so the staff recommendation is that this Recommendation 16 here has been implemented. However, I do see that Lori Schulman has her hand up. Lori, please go ahead.

Lori, if you're speaking I'm afraid we can't hear you. Lori, we aren't hearing you...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...I don't know if you want to check your audio?

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me now?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we can hear you now. Thank you.

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me now?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we can hear you now, Lori.

Lori Schulman: The – thanks, okay. Unmuting took a minute for some reason. Anyway, I just wanted to say that I think the inclusion of the requirements for the metrics, the process lined out, makes complete sense to me. And I certainly support it. But I have a general question about metrics and these requirements throughout all of the reform documents and the concern about metrics.

My organization just went through an impact study in cooperation with the CCTRT. And we relied on the expertise of the CCRT as well as internal expertise that we have on trademarks to come up with what we thought were fairly determinative questions. And what we learned in the process is that the metrics we were asking for and the way we were asking for them really did not reflect actual practice in terms of – how data is kept, how expenses are recorded, how actions are memorialized in the real world.

So I'm just wondering as a matter of course, since there is and I think a very good push on the ICANN side for more metrics and more impact evaluations and studies, is what are we doing to ensure that the metrics that we're asking for are the right ones? And I, you know, that might go to some of the identification of potential problems. But I think it's even more than that. And, you know, is ICANN planning to expand its staff or increase its expertise? I know we have Margie's group and Karen Lentz's, there's a lot of work on the metrics side and they do good work. But I'm wondering if even more is required.

Julie Hedlund: I see Wolf-Ulrich Knoben has his hand up. Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks – thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. And thanks, Lori, for these questions. This is a very good question to that. And I was thinking when I went through the document I was coming from the other side, I was thinking, well, should we now start, well, to create our metrics, well where we come – which we are thinking about which maybe valuable to put on – to put to this list. So this is the question from the other side.

I'm not sure – I do not have an answer to your question. I'm also just saying my question here. And maybe it's valuable if we would have a discussion here and continuing on the items here on the list for metric items whether these are the ones who we are expecting from – could help us, well, who could help us to, let me say, being valuable for the impact analysis itself.

I understand from everybody may have different approaches to that depending on from which business you are coming from. And so it's just a question from me. I do not have an answer. I leave it for discussion here. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: I see Amr has his hand up. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: thanks, Julie. This is Amr. Apologies for the background noise. I just wanted to try to maybe address Lori's question and ask a very sort of correctly where I go astray on this because she was a lot close to the DMPM – the Working Group's work than I was.

But my understanding is that any data that is available for example for a policy impact assessment is always subject to critical appraisal by the people who are using it. So as an example, working group members who'd have access to data then they want to use that as a means to measure the impact – the effectiveness of the policy (unintelligible) so that is there.

Another thing is that if working groups ever feel the need to acquire data, the GNSO working group, they ever feel the need to acquire data that may be assistance in developing policies (unintelligible) requirements there is now, also as a result of the DMPM final recommendations, final report recommendations, there is a mechanism for GNSO working groups actually request data whether it is the internal or external to ICANN.

This might also be helpful in the event that, you know, data is available (unintelligible) helpful. And the GNSO working group identifies that might actually be (unintelligible) so the mechanism does exist. And I don't know if that addresses Lori's question or not or even parts of it but I thought I'd share that. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi, Amr. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, it was very hard to understand you, the quality was very poor. But so as far as I understood you, correctly, so you were saying that, you know, the one – the list here is maybe a kind of suggestion or frames of metrics which could be used but it's up to the specific working group itself, well, to discuss this point, these items, the policy

implementation – the impact analysis and the related metrics which should be used for that. So if that's the case I would agree to that because the working group itself knows the best, you know, where they are talking about, they are talking about.

In addition, I see also Berry was making a comment on the chat here, so that is that the DMPM's attempt was more of a cultural change and to develop a generic framework. They did not want to be too prescriptive as each of the GNSO deals with is different. Yes, that is related to that what I was saying as well.

And that should be clear to the working group who is going to deal with that they are the ones who have – who are guiding this and creating the metrics which should be used. Thanks.

So I see Rafik next please. Rafik, we can't hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. Yes, I'm speaking, can you hear me? So okay, with regards to the metrics I see a reference that there will be a strawman to be used here I guess. Are we expecting to provide kind of guidelines for the working group to develop their metrics, because maybe it takes some time and maybe not that straightforward exercise. And do we have even if it may be dependent to the context or the background of each working group.

But do we think that we may have some kind of – a set of metrics that they will be applicable to all working group? So just to see how we can give more guidance to working group. To be honest, we are putting more and more task and work to be done. And so we probably need to give more support somehow for the working group to achieve their task, otherwise we may undermine their effectiveness.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, thanks, Rafik, for this question or suggestion. So if I understand by – well it’s open for discussion, so if I understand you know, what is right now in the charter template, there are some bullet points which are written down here, so a lot of – handful or two handfuls, identification of policy goals, identification of metrics used, identification of potential problems, metrics whether policy goals are achieved.

Okay, well if you understand the second bullet point is the one which should be subdivided in general metrics with regards to that, then let’s talk about. So how is that to be understood is my question here, to be understood these kind of bullet points? Is it more in general view or if it’s something which could be used by every working group or should we do more in this respect? Lori, please.

Lori Schulman: Yes, hi. I’m responding to those thoughts and I know my colleague, Vicky (unintelligible) audio, and I’m going to repeat what Amr typed into the chat just so Vicky can hear as well.

Amr was saying, “I was trying to say that in response to Lori’s concern if metrics data are available, are found to be practically and helpful in terms of the PIA, they are always subject to critical appraisal. Additionally and also as a result of the DMPM Working Group’s final report and recommendations, there is a mechanism for GNSO working groups to request data metrics that may be helpful to them in achieving their charter objective. This is true for data both internal and/or external to ICANN.”

And I appreciate Amr’s comment. And I believe that it’s supplemented what I was saying rather than actually answered it. I think my concern more – and this also goes to Rafik’s point about more and more tasks on working groups,

is that how do we as a volunteer community that have certain expertise in some areas but may not have expertise in others, and I will tell you, you know, my expertise is nonprofit governments and trademark law, but I am not a statistician or metrics person.

So even though with all due diligence in the world, I could be asked to review questions and those questions may seem logical to me because I understand what my workgroup is trying to get at, but if those questions from a statistical viewpoint or an analytical viewpoint aren't the right questions, who, you know, where's the expertise to help guide us? I think reviewing questions after the fact is certainly a step in the right direction, but I would think reviewing questions before the fact.

And again, I'm speaking from the experience of a recently-completed impact study where the questions were very detailed, we worked very closely with the workgroup, we believed that we understood exactly what the workgroup – rather the review team was trying to get at. We explained this to the people who took the survey, we had very willing participants. So all the forces should have coalesced into a pretty high response rate, and that's not what happened.

And the reality of it – what we were looking for as ICANN – was not necessarily how the real world works, how someone sitting somewhere analyzing how many domain names they're buying, whether or not they're defensive, whether or not they're more for marketing purposes, you know, all the questions about, you know, choice, competition and trust that we were trying to get at, the wording. And, you know, we used an expert, we used Nielsen, and you know, there's some input as to questions.

The feeling was that while the questions were certainly complex and might get the answers that we would want for the CCRT review, at the same time, they

were so complex it made it difficult for people not involved in ICANN to answer those questions. So that's my concern, sort of the inside culture about trying to get a detailed and granular as possible and an outside culture that may not operate that way. And understanding the impact of the questions beforehand might have been a little more useful.

And I think because we're talking about data in the long term and really being more careful about how the study impacts, I think these are important questions to answer up front. Now sometimes, of course, you can formulate metrics, you can ask your questions and you may not know how the public is going to respond until the public responds, I get that. I mean, you can't really predict the future.

However, in the world of quantitative analysis, you should be able to predict the future, at least better than we're probably doing it now. That's my concern and all this money. Marika asked me how that can be addressed here? Marika, I'm not sure, but I feel like in terms of review and implementation, if we don't start asking the questions here, where do we ask the questions? Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thanks very much, Lori. Well, this question came also up to me, well, by Marika, so how we can address it. So usually, as say, the working group is working, well, on the basis of a charter as a beginning, well, and the charter shall be fixed at a policy impact analysis should be done afterwards. I think at this stage, it may be too early to differentiate or to subdivide what kind of metrics to, well, to have these questions all available which shall come throughout the working process of the working group itself.

So I would say this is my answer to that, well, just take it in a practical way so don't forget that there may be questions which have an impact on the result of all of this, but do it step by step. And if it comes up then if you need some

more assistance, more expertise to that then raise this throughout the work you are doing within the working group. That's how we can deal with it. So otherwise, I don't have also a solution to that.

So maybe but I leave it open. So if there are other ideas, well, how to deal with it, how to address this here, so please raise your hands. Julie, please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from ICANN staff. So I'll note, as Wolf-Ulrich did, that the recommendation we're looking at deciding whether or not this has been implemented is Recommendation 16 which simply says that a policy impact assessment be included as a standard part of any policy process. We do see, from the staff point of view at least, that there now is a mechanism to ensure that a policy impact analysis is included as part of the working group's processes and there's some detail concerning that.

And we do understand that there's an overarching concern about how, you know, about the tasks that working groups have to do with respect to metrics collection, whether or not they know to ask the right questions, whether or not there's guidance for them. And staff would suggest respectfully that that overarching question is not in scope for the implementation of Recommendation 16, but part of the charter for this working group – there's really two aspects to this working group. One is to ensure that these GNSO Review recommendations are indeed implemented, and so that is the task we're addressing today.

But, the other thing – the other task in the charter for this working group is to address requests for changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures. And that could be also a request that may arise from this working group. So if, as Wolf-Ulrich suggests, after this group has continued with its work and looking at the various recommendations, perhaps there are other improvements that the

working group identifies that have come out of, you know, their work on the implementation of these recommendations that the working group would like to have set aside such as this one.

And that perhaps could be dealt with then separately as a request, you know, to consider possible changes to the Operating Procedures. So that is one suggested way that this group could go. But I'll just note we have 20 minutes left in today's meeting and at this point, staff suggests that they make the few editorial changes to this Recommendation 16 implementation charter and that then that this charter should be put out for a consensus call. And I'll just ask if there are any objections to that approach.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie, for the explanation. I think that is a good approach to do. I have a very last question, well, to this Number 16. I was also – I was following the links you put in here with regards to the charter – to the template, and this template includes all the comments still. So I wasn't fully sure whether the template is the one and has been implemented, is it just with the original comments in that or is that implemented already, that template? Or is it a draft? That was my question because when you go to the link there is some comments inserted in the template.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'll check on that. My understanding was that that is meant to be the final template but it's possible that there is an error in the – in that particular link. So thank you, I'm glad that you did follow that. And we'll check on that and make sure it's correct.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So you do that and we put that to the minutes as well. So I would like also to follow Julie's suggestion that we ask here whether we could put it so after the (unintelligible), I would suggest that Julie is sending that around to

us asking for consensus call – for a consensus call within the timeframe – which is the timeframe we have usually for that, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And that timeframe is two weeks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Two weeks, yes, two weeks from now or from the time when you are going to circulate that and then you will get time, well, to go back to your constituencies and finalize that. Any objection to that? No. Thanks very much.

We have, as the next item on the agenda, I think the beginning of discussion of Recommendation 33. So I have to – oh, Lori, before we go for that, Lori please.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I want to clarify a couple of points. One is I didn't object to what was suggested because it's certainly not my intention to slow the work down. But at the same time, I would like there to be some sort of commitment by staff and by the group generally that when questions like this arise, which go to sort of fundamental functionings of working groups and to Rafik's point and to my own point, that we create some sort of running list and if not and maybe perhaps even produce an ancillary report that identifies questions.

But what I would hate to see happen is that these questions are talked about in these small groups and to the staff's point, perhaps it's out of scope of this particular charter question, but that does not mean that it's not a worthy question and shouldn't be considered by the community. So I want to have an understanding here between – all right, to the letter, we stick to the scope, we get as much work out as we can because we need to, but at the same time, if there are good questions that need thoughtful analysis, that we raise these

questions and that there is some meaningful outcome to these discussions.

Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Lori. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. That's a fair question. And I was wondering how to deal with that. So I understand throughout our discussion here there will come – coming more and more questions related to maybe the GNSO procedures or other existing guidelines or procedures we have here. So the suggestion was to not to forget these questions, but to keep it as for a further work for this group to be dealt with if it comes up, for example, if it is related for the – with the GNSO procedures.

And so if it's not related to the GNSO procedures, we should put, as you say, it on a list, we should take care about that is going to be dealt with in the right – in the right environment. So as we do not have any specific let me say, target or deadline at the time being when we are going – when this group is going to deal with the GNSO procedures, the only thing we could do that is we create a list with some side items here, which you suggested, and then we take this list later on up and review that and then we look how we can deal with that work. Is that a way to go or how to deal with that. Lori, is your hand still up? Please.

Lori Schulman: Yes, well, I can raise it again. But I would support that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Julie, can you take care about that, that we will have a list where these open questions – there was Rafik's one and Lori's one – is put on that and that we can – well, we put that to our documents of our group and we take this list when we come to different items after this review items. Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And, yes, I will definitely – staff will definitely start and maintain a list. And just noting again, as previously

mentioned, that very definitely this working group, you know, has the authority under its charter to look at questions relating to the GNSO Operating Procedures and possibly questions not relating to Operating Procedures but to GNSO operations in general. And so we can collect these questions for possible future work.

I'm just noting that Berry has said in the chat displaying the PIA listed in the initial report template, as we are now actually going to send the charter out for a consensus call, perhaps what staff can do is also display that initial report template and anyway I'll take this offline with Berry and find out what would be the best ancillary information to include along with the charter in case there are, you know, people want to see and reference documents relating, you know, the documents that are referenced in the charter. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay great. Thanks very much, Julie. So and then you, as we said, well, you send out the Recommendation 16 now for consensus call – the revised version of that. So thanks very much.

So we have still well 12 minutes to go. Why shouldn't we start with the Recommendation 33? I hand over to Julie again.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from ICANN staff. So I'm just going to do a high level introduction to this recommendation. I don't think we'll have time to get into an in depth discussion on it. But so this is a recommendation that addresses the increasing – increasing the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its – that is GNSO's – participants.

And specifically, Recommendation 33 states that stakeholder groups, 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 staff thought that this related to the further globalizing and regionalizing of ICANN's functions from the Strategic Plan and the goal to bring ICANN to the world by creating a balanced and proactive approach to regional engagement with stakeholders.

So as identified in the GNSO Review Working Party, that working party suggested that staff should review the stakeholder groups and constituency procedures to determine how these aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its participants in selecting candidates for the appointment to the GNSO Council. So that would be the processes relating to selecting Council candidates.

And then the GNSO Review Working Group, after this review is complete, would determine whether or not the existing stakeholder group and constituency procedures are sufficient to complete the implementation of this recommendation or whether further steps need to be taken to meet the intent of the recommendation.

Staff felt that the scope was sufficiently clear. That the recommendations will require changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures. I would say actually staff should probably say "may" require changes. And actually probably not GNSO Operating Procedures but now that I'm reviewing this, probably that they may require changes to stakeholder group and constituency procedures, so we'll make that change. And again here as a deliverable possible recommendations for changes to the stakeholder group and constituency procedures. Option analysis, staff did not identify alternative options.

So for the solution here, what staff did was staff did a review, an initial review, of the procedures and the stakeholder groups and constituencies for selecting their GNSO Council candidates. And, you know, Marika notes in the chat that Work Stream 2 is looking at the issue of diversity. Pascal Bekono says, “How can we match activities to the CCWG diversity in this one?”

And maybe – and Rafik said, “Yes, working on the report. And we sent a questionnaire to SO ACs.” Maybe Rafik can help us with this. And I see Rafik has his hand up. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Julie. So for the diversity subgroup, we are working on first draft of the report and, I mean, we spent time discuss about elements of diversity and start deliberating recommendation. But in mean time we issued the questionnaire to the different SO and ACs to ask them about their opinion about elements of diversity and also asking them about their current practices and procedure. And it’s not just the SO but also stakeholder group and constituency within GNSO.

So I assume by – when we get the response we can share that here – with the working group. But this is kind of what the current status we have for now. So I’m wondering is how we can liaison this matter.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rafik. Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund, may I respond also?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please. And then me okay. You first please.

Julie Hedlund: That’s extremely helpful, Rafik. And I think it would be very important to – for this working group to see the response from the – responses from the GNSO to the diversity questions, but in particular from the SGs and Cs. This is – I’m noting this because at least with the initial brief review that staff

conducted of the procedures, there seemed to not be a lot of language in the SG and C procedures relating to diversity. There was some language relating to geographic region diversity.

There was not as far as staff could initially discover, language relating to cultural or gender diversity. So in some cases, in many cases, the language or procedures seemed to be incomplete in this regard. But the next step staff was going to undertake was going to be to engage more directly with at least the staff supporting the SGs and Cs to determine if there are further resources relating to diversity in each of these groups.

But I think that we may want to set aside this particular charter until we have the responses back on the diversity questionnaire and in particular from the SGs and Cs, just a possible suggestion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. This is very helpful to hear from Rafik was saying and you as well, Julie, from your checking the different constituencies charters and so on. So as – so I'm going to start as now the chair of the constituency, well, to review or to – not to revise but to review the – our charter as well to go through this. I saw also that there is some lack of this.

So my question would be very helpful to me personally and to our group, well, for example, to get some more guidance with regards to the cultural diversity question. I know there has been started some time ago, well, to be discussed, but I've never seen an agreed paper about that. So that would be helpful, well, also. I wonder whether this is the basis of this recommendation whether we have some paper for that, for example.

So and I think that other constituencies may have the same problem as well since we have ongoing discussions on some of these points, well, to get a, how to say, a solid basis for giving answers to these questions. So that's my comment.

Is it still your hand up, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich. Rafik speaking. Okay, so I mean, taking the opportunity and just asking the – those who are participating in the – or attending the call to ask their constituency and stakeholder group to respond to the questionnaire because I understand that – still on the call? Okay. I understand that the staff went through the procedure which is meant the written. But in our questionnaire we tried to really ask the different group about what they have a formal and informal practices in turn to encourage diversity.

So I think that we really complement the work here because if there are some practices we – I mean, or if what we can also use that as not just basing – to base our work on the – what we have in the bylaws or charter.

So we are expecting to get the response by early June. But again taking opportunity please address your constituencies and stakeholder group to respond to the questionnaire. It's not that long. And when we get the results I'm happy to share it with the working group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. We are almost done, well, we are but so that is helpful. I understand the questionnaire is open until 1st of June, should be answered to that. So well I would like to ask all participants here as well to refer back to their constituencies, well, to deal with that, that would be helpful.

So I think we have started this discussion right now which – what type of questions we might have here in addition. I would suggest, I have seen just the very draft of the Number 18, do we have a draft on that available to circulate to us and then we can check and continue the discussion on the list and continuing next time to the list?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund. So staff did produce a charter. I'm actually working with Amr to see if there's anything that we need to add to that for 18. And in addition, staff was going to go ahead and develop a charter for the next recommendation on the list which is Recommendations 24 and 25 which are combined. They relate to procedures for new constituency applications. And that's also part of ongoing work. So we'll try to have 18 and 24/25 ready for review for the next call.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry, thanks. I meant Recommendation 33, we are discussing about that. So that's – I understand that we will get a draft of that as well?

Julie Hedlund: This is Recommendation 33 is the one we've just discussed. It was staff's understanding that we might want to get the response to the questionnaire on diversity and then that could be included in this charter. Because, as Rafik noted, there – that questionnaire also asks about informal practices, which may then complement the procedures that the constituencies and stakeholder groups already have in place. And staff also is going to continue with contacting the SGs and Cs and at least the support staff there to ensure that there's not material that we missed in compiling the material in this charter.

So we'll work on a revision to Recommendation 33. We can revise as much as we can but we won't have the responses to the diversity questionnaire by the next call.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, no, well why not waiting for this, as you said, well for the – for the input from the questionnaire. And then let's move on further, as you suggested, with the other recommendations, so that would be good. I understand that we have a – the next call is in two weeks from now, the same time, is that the case?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Are there any more questions at the time being for today's call? Otherwise I would say thank you very much, it was a lively discussion. Thank you so much. And so we'll see you then.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much, Wolf-Ulrich. Thanks, everybody, for joining. Very much appreciate it. Sorry to go a little bit after. But thanks for a great discussion. Bye-bye.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Bye-bye.

END