

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 16 November 2017 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/gnsognsoreview-16nov17-en.mp3>[\[audio.icann.org\]](http://audio.icann.org)

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p97fhnxdixi/>

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

Attendance

Members:

Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP Primary)
Lawrence Owalale-Roberts (BC Primary)

Participants:

Kris Seeburn (NCUC)
Pascal Bekono (NCUC)

On Audio Only: none

Apologies: Jen Wolfe

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Emily Barabas
Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Maryam Bakoshi
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much for that, (Jamie). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. And welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 16th of November 2017. On the call, today we have Sara Bockey, Krishan Seeburn and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. We received apologies

from Jen Wolfe. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Emily Barabas, Maryam Bakoshi, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind all to please remember state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to mute yourself when not talking to avoid background noise. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Nathalie. This is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. Hi, everybody. So we have a agenda – let me just ask first for the – for any amendments to SOIs or change of SOIs. Yes, nothing, thank you.

Let's review the agenda and just have a common understanding on how we proceed today. So since we have – we are three – no right now we have four of the members, yes. Okay, which is not too bad. So I would suggest that we go through the status as we have at the time being and try, well, to move it forward, but maybe with that status of four so that we have not – we are not in a position, well, to finalize any recommendation at the time being.

But I see as well Rafik – Rafik, nice to see you. Hello. We just started. So with that introduction, let me just briefly go through the agenda. An update from ICANN 60 for those who haven't been attending the ICANN 60 meeting, so I have given a short presentation to the GNSO Council during the Council meeting there. And well there was no discussion about that so we – the understanding was okay that we are in line what our plans we had at the time being that we can come back in case we are faced with any problems with regard to timing or budgeting or what else. So that was just accepted the report.

I would – well okay, with regards to Number 3 of the agenda, Julie has sent out I think last week the consensus call on charter for Recommendations 10, 11 and 18, oh that was – no, that was ended on 9th of November, the consensus call. I understand that there was no – not any objection, any

further comment on that. But I would leave it to Julie when she's going to join us, well, just to make it clear that that is finalized and that we can proceed as usual with consensus – recommendations that have been accepted by consensus calls.

Is there any question or any comment to this point, Number 3? No, I don't see that. Then I was suggesting with my email one hour before that we swap the next two items and start with a discussion at first of the revised charter, but as Julie is not here at the time being, Nathalie, would like to ask well really to come back to the old plan, well start at first with the work plan and then step into the discussion about the recommendation maybe Julie is then available for that.

So this is – this paper is new for me. I didn't realize it. I thought it was – we were talking about it, yes. Is there anything in, well, because I did not read that in advance from others who put comment on that. So what is the – whether there are issues with it, whether there are things we should discuss about and what to do with it. I see Emily. Emily, please.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Emily from staff. I can just give a little bit of context for this document if it's helpful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh great, yes.

Emily Barabas: So this is – Julie pulled this document together and it's quite helpful and something that everyone might want to take a look at if they haven't yet already. But it's basically a proposal for next steps regarding a number of the charters. So you can see at the top of the document here – oh let me sync, there we go – that we have Recommendations 26-29. And I think the intention was to discuss those today but just as a proposal for some of the edits, for those and some action items primarily for staff on some of those revisions. And then as you can see I'm sort of scrolling through here...

Julie Hedlund: Hi, this is Julie Hedlund. I'm so sorry, I'm very, very sorry. I got messed up by the time change and Emily, it sounds like you're trying desperately to figure out what I was supposed to be doing.

Emily Barabas: That's okay. Do you need a second? I can – I was just giving a very brief overview of what the work plan document contains...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Oh that's actually what I would be doing. Thanks very much. I do need to get into the Adobe Connect room so if you...

Emily Barabas: Okay, so give yourself a minute, I will just give a brief overview and then you can dive in. And we just covered 1, 2 and 3 briefly although we might go back to 3 for a minute if you want to talk at all about the next steps on Recommendations 10, 11 and 18. But I'll let you log in. I'll give this overview and then we can pop back to 3 if it's helpful.

So as you can see here there's Recommendations 4, 22, 34 and so forth. And the idea here is just that this is laying out the – an idea of the next recommendations that we might be able to address based on the quote unquote low hanging fruit for some of these items. So that's basically what the document – and you can see that there's months here listed which gives a general sense of the timeframe for some of these recommendations.

So I think the task here is to – for everyone to go through, look and see if this seems like a reasonable plan, if there's any red flags or any issues that seem like they should be addressed earlier or, you know, should be lower priority flagging those as well. So if people already have comments that's great. And if not, that's sort of something or the to-do list to serve you and either share our feedback on the mailing list or in the following meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thanks very much...

((Crosstalk))

Emily Barabas: Julie, do you want to – sure thing. Julie, do – are you in a position now to take over either to pop back to discussion of consensus call on 10, 11 and 18 or if you want to dive deeper into the work plan you can do that as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Just thanks very much. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking, Emily. Thank you very much. Well let's just stay at first with that here with the work plan and then come back to the consensus call recommendation.

Well just my question is here, well, thanks very much so that's very clear. By establishing this time plan so when you went through the details, Julie and Emily, did it affect our ideas before so with regards to the timing or is it in line with that, what we have also put in our presentation and the report from last month?

Julie Hedlund: Oh, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie. I can answer that. So, yes, this actually is in line with our timing with the timeline that we presented to the GNSO Council on November 1. And in fact is maybe a little bit aggressive, so that's why I think as Emily mentioned, you know, these are, you know, these are, you know, goals for when staff would have a draft implementation charter for the working group to review.

But, you know, things may take a little bit longer. But for instance the items that are on hold because of the CCWG Accountability sub team on diversity, we have those out through June, completion in June because of course of that dependency and we don't know how long it will take for those recommendations to be approved. But the timeline actually has everything completed by next September. And so far we're envisioning that we'll be ahead of that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Great. Thanks very much. So that is good, we should have targets at least and that is good that we have this in line with our plan. So are there any other comments from the group? Did anybody have a chance, well, to go through in advance? I didn't – I did not do that so I would like to suggest that we all have the chance further on, well, to go this – with this over the next one or two weeks and if we have comments so we can come back on the list also with our comments.

But anyway if there is right now any comment from the group please go ahead. There is not yet a comment. So doesn't matter. So let's take this, well, and carefully, well, study it after this and if you have comments then come back to it – to the list. Thanks, Julie, for this and Emily as well.

So now let's come back to the agenda Item 3 consensus calls on charter, I would like just officially well ask you, Julie, about the status about that.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So the consensus call that we had out for the combined charter on Recommendations 10 and 11 and on Recommendation 18 ended the 9th of November. There were no objections received. This is to remind people also that we extended that – extended that consensus call to three weeks before – because it did fall over the ICANN 60 meeting, so it was open before ICANN 60 and open after ICANN 60 and during. And there were no objections. So these recommendations are then accepted by full consensus.

And in fact, the – the charters were then reflected as being accepted by full consensus. And we sent an update with a link to those charters to the staff who are supporting the OEC so the OEC would see that because we had to send the implementation plan to Council and OEC really while the consensus call was ongoing, we had sort of preliminary charters, you know, and the expectation of those being approved in that plan. We did send an update to the OEC to the staff for the OEC reflecting the approved charters.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thanks very much so that's very clear. Yes, then let's move directly to Item Number 5, discussion of the revised charter for Recommendations 26 and 29. I wonder how we go through that. Julie, would you like just to introduce that? Because so we had some time in between so I also had to keep up with the content of that where we are with it and I made some comments about that. Could you just guide us a little bit through? Please.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. So this is the combined recommendations for 26, 27, 28 and 29 relating to stakeholder group and constituency membership and statements of interest. And this is a charter that we had previously discussed and we then had planned to come back to. And so just to note what we have done here. And I had thought that I was going to bring up the – I thought I had the version that had the – yes, okay I'm sorry, here are the redlines, good. That's very helpful.

So just to go directly to the changes staff have suggested, what we did overall was we tried to see whether or not these recommendations had indeed been actually already addressed by procedures that were in place. Previously we had suggested that maybe there could be changes to wording in the GNSO Operating Procedures but we decided to see if there was a way that we could find out whether or not these recommendations could be addressed by procedures that were already in place. So that's what we've tried to suggest here and just then to highlight the changes.

So first for Recommendation 26, and this deals with Chapter 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures and the statements of interest. And what the recommendation says is just going back to that, is that Council members, Executive Committee members of stakeholder groups and constituencies and members of working groups complete and maintain a current comprehensive statement of interest on a Website. And then where individuals represent bodies or clients, this information is to be posted. If not posted because of client confidentiality the participants' interest or position must be disclosed. Failing either of these the individual is not permitted to participate.

So staff took a closer look at what the Chapter 5 actually says. First of all, while the phrase “Executive Committee” is not specifically called out as a relevant party, the word “committee” is. And staff was suggesting that “committee” could also include Executive Committee members just because the word “executive” isn’t there, doesn’t mean that it still couldn’t be considered committee members. Committee members are indeed called out as relevant bodies.

And I see Marika, there’s a few comments in the chat too. Seems that one of the main issues at the moment that people forget to check their SOIs. Similarly with GDPR, additional consideration may be given with regards to how consent is requested and access to this information. So – and then Rafik is saying, “I’m feeling that the current platform is not optimal for SOI management.”

So staff does note that in addition to committee perhaps encompassing Executive Committee as a relevant party, with respect to calling out relationships, it’s already a requirement that relationship need to be called out. I mean, there’s a specific question, are there any arrangements, agreements between you and any other group, constituency or persons regarding your participation as a work team member. So that must be disclosed.

And in the event of confidentiality, there are also two other questions that address your positions. So if you cannot disclose a client you do still have to indicate whether or not you are representing someone else. You also do have to indicate whether or not you have any relevant arrangements, interests or benefits. So even if you had – if you could not call out a client because of confidentiality, you still could indicate what your interests are. And so you could disclose, I think that the requirement in the recommendation is that you could – you still do have to indicate your interests or position.

So it seemed to staff that the current procedures encompassed the Recommendation 26. I'll pause there for any questions on that suggestion or comments.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Are there any comments from the floor?

Julie Hedlund: I'll just note in the chat, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund again from staff, that Marika Konings is saying, "Rafik, yes, I think you're absolutely right. Staff has been pushing for a working group sign up tool which would also manage SOIs as the wiki is definitely not ideal." And staff should also note – oh I see Rafik has his hand up. Let me pause there. Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: Hello? Can you hear me?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. No just a question about Recommendation Number 27 and having centralized lists. So currently the constituency and stakeholder group they have membership system, some of them were kind of supported by ICANN but managed by the constituency themselves. So the question here, we are not asking to have some access to the membership list but it's regarding managing list of SOI just only the SOI that should be updated on a regular basis so not membership information, just want to maybe clarify the language here.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Wolf-Ulrich, if I might address that? So Recommendation 27 actually is a little bit different than just SOIs. The recommendation actually states that, "The GNSO establish and maintain a centralized publicly available list of members and individual participants of

every constituency, stakeholder group with a link to the individual statement of interest if one is required and posted.”

So it is both a list of the members as well as links to SOIs. Now what staff had found, and now placed in Appendix – or I’m sorry, Attachment – sorry – Attachment 2 which doesn’t seem to be showing up quite right here, Attachment B, pardon me. Is that there is – there are lists of members and these are all accessible on the GNSO – let me see where that link is – that the – they are available at – it’s not – they’re not all one list but they are centrally located at GNSO.icann.org. And on that series of pages you can access the list.

So staff was thinking that yes, there are lists that do exist and they are – and they are centrally located. And Rafik, I see you have your hand up so I don't know if that answered your question.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, this is Wolf-Ulrich speaking.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. So I understand that you are going to use – oh sorry. So I understand that you are going to use the public – how to say – the public members’ list and to aggregate them. So here we are assuming it’s only that member are from stakeholder group and constituency but I think we are getting more people involved in working group, they are not part of any constituency. And for NCSG and NCUC we find an issue that several people when they fill the SOI when they don't belong to any constituency or stakeholder group they – some of them they select NCUC or NCSG.

And so I think maybe this can help to keep – I mean, to check such information. But the question here is how it will be done because we arrive – the list is growing so just (unintelligible) I mean, I’m not suggesting here specific technical solution but something maybe should be investigated in how we can keep consistent data in the different places so to avoid such discrepancy. Yes, sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich, if I might address that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Please, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. So that I think may be sort of the issue of maintaining sort of the integrity of the list, if I understand your concern, and that you have people who are identifying themselves with, you know, particular constituency or stakeholder group, not actually part of that group. That's perhaps out of scope for this particular recommendation since the recommendation is talking about the list that the constituency and stakeholder groups maintain.

And I guess the expectation would be that someone is not being placed on that list or those lists if they hadn't already been vetted by the stakeholder group or constituency as opposed to someone, say, stating in an SOI that they are, you know, part of a constituency or stakeholder group. And I don't think there's anything really in these recommendations that speaks to that except that staff has noted that the statement of interest platform is going to migrate from the current wiki solutions to that of the Global Enrollment Platform and notes that this will allow for proper connection to individuals' profiles when they enroll in working groups and better alignment of the statement of interest to the working group entry in the system. So – and the unofficial target date for this launch is fiscal year '19.

And I see Marika Konings is saying, "Rafik, we have noticed the same issue. Maybe we could add a clarification to the SOI basically explain for each field what info is expected to be filled out though that is also clear that affiliation refers to membership, whether or not you feel affiliated with a certain perspective.

That sounds like a great suggestion from Marika. Rafik, would that address your concern? I don't – we could actually put that language in here even though that's not something that the recommendation is saying that we have to do but we could note that, you know, the – you know, we could add

explanatory language to the form of the SOI without actually having to change the Operating Procedures because we're not changing the underlying questions.

And I see Rafik has a plus one.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie, this is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I also – I'm in line with what Marika was saying here, you know, an explanation could help I think so. Also that brings me to my comment, you know, which I've sent – circulated shortly before the meeting. So that is something, you know, which is formulated in the solution of recommendation – in the question form. Do you believe you are participating in, yes, so I think that's the same thing, you know, it's not, you know, do you feel, you know, you are participating in that or you are here – I think it would be better, well, to go directly that way to ask people are you participating in this or that group, yes, otherwise.

And they are then forced, let me say, in a way well to think about, you know, what is – maybe we can explain this question a little bit more in detail. But I think that would be more helpful rather than to give them the chance, well, just okay, I believe it is really but maybe the other way around so I don't know. So that was one of my comments with regard to that part.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. That's very helpful and I think that – I think that's something that we should highlight here and we certainly can make that change.

And I think it might be helpful to emphasize also how, you know, if we can migrate to a platform that allows a stronger connection to the working groups you know, this Global Enrollment Platform, that that's something that perhaps we don't even – maybe we don't note it so much as we say how it would be very important to have an enhanced SOI whereby there is more of a direct clear connection with the groups in which the individuals actually participating

and, you know, and a stronger link to that individual's profile. So that is something we could – we could emphasize here as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I think that's good. Thanks very much. I wonder whether we could follow all the chat, well. I saw a note from Marika making reference to the GDPR and the potential impact. That's what I also circulated with regards to I think Recommendation 27. I wonder whether we could go into more detail right now with regards to the impact on that or whether we shouldn't just make a reference to a potential impact which may come and then, you know, pay attention to that point that it could lead then to the fact that SOIs have to be thought about again, you know, with regards to the GDPR requirements on that.

I wonder whether we could do that right now in our group here or whether it – there is a dependency on the overall implementation of the GDPR here from ICANN side. This is just a question from my side. I'm not certain about that but so I would just to put it here as a question.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Not seeing others with their hands up, just from a staff point of view, I think it would be helpful to call out the possible impact that could be – the impact from GDPR on – and I think maybe this would need to be perhaps an overarching statement. I mean, because I think it applies in, you know, possible ways to each of the recommendations. And that it's – that the way that, you know, that SOIs and lists are administered could be impacted by the requirements of GDPR in ways that we can't necessarily anticipate at this point.

But noting that you know, while we may not make any changes to the SOI structure at this point they may be necessitated by the impact of GDPR in the future. So something like that I'm wondering if that might be useful to call out really at the – before we even get into the details on each recommendation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, thanks – thanks, Julie. Well I agree to that. I wonder how we are going to do that. Should we make a note at a – related note which could be drafted from staff side in the, let me say, on the determination of – for the recommendations or in whatever part of the charter we feel it's necessary well to incorporate that. So that would be my suggestion that you may – maybe in cooperation with Marika draft just a part for this part with making reference to that, and that makes it very clear so that there is something, well, which could have an effect in future here.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. I think that there are two places we might want to call it out. I think we want to call it out in sort of the research that staff has done as part of the solution section, and then I think we also should call it out under the working group determination perhaps again before we get into the detail on each recommendation but really at the – as a – something that, you know, say again as an overarching issue at the beginning of the determination section.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes. Well thanks very much, Julie. Well saw also in the chat from Kris here and in relation to the limitation of and the willingness of persons well to release their private information. I think that is the core of these things, you know, as well. That is an assumption. It's necessary, well, in any case if somebody is going to release the information so it must be justified, it must be asked, it must be confirmed by the person itself, well, that ICANN will – shall be entitled, well, to public – to make public this information. This is an assumption we have here.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. And I'm just replying to – also to Rafik in the chat. Rafik had asked, "Julie, is it possible to get an update from Chris Gift about the new platform? He made a presentation to the diversity subgroup a while ago." We certainly can include in here also a link to the latest information on the platform, noting however that, you know, I mean, it's subject to, you know, possible changes.

But, you know, in that, you know, I'm not sure for example whether or not the notional you know, date of fiscal year '19 – 2019 is – I'm not even sure if that's an accurate date to include there. But, yes, we can get an update on the platform – and I think it would be useful to include a link to that as well in the charter.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thanks, Julie.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: And Wolf-Ulrich, again, would it be useful then to walk through – walk through 26 and 27 just to briefly talk about the changes we made in 28 and 29?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. So with respect to 28, so this is an interesting one that staff did a little bit of research on. And Wolf-Ulrich, you may recall this also because I know you were involved at the time. So Section – Chapter 6.0 of the GNSO Operating Procedures is on stakeholder groups and constituencies but the – and Section 6.1.2 is on membership. It's a fairly lengthy section. And it has to do with all the various requirements for, you know, for having membership lists and transparency and how members are accepted and so on.

And so this recommendation says that key clauses in there should be made mandatory. So staff went back and looked again and how these procedures were developed under the Operation Steering Committee as part of the GNSO Improvements Program. And actually I was supporting that group at the time that these were developed. And I remember that there was a discussion about the terminology and in particular that the key clauses use the phrase – and here the recommendation is not very specific so I think it's somewhat open to interpretation.

But the key clauses use the word – the terminology “should” instead of say, the word “must.” But I know and I recall that the intent and this is also reflected in the history in the notes in particular that the intent was that that these were supposed to be mandatory, that these are procedures that are supposed to be followed, that there isn't anything that's not – there isn't a change to the clauses that would change the intent, let me put it that way.

So it's unclear at least to staff what would need to be changed in the Operating Procedures that would change the way they are, you know, they are followed given that they are already – the intent is already that they should be procedures that the stakeholder groups and constituency follows. And I'm wondering if you have any comments here as well and from your recollection, Wolf-Ulrich, as far as what you think the intent was in this section where, you know, the operative word in each clause is “should” and whether or not that is something that is meant then to be the – that these should be indeed followed in the same intent as if you use the word “must” instead of “should.”

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I would have that, you know, this is old discussion, every time if you try to come to consensus about what is going to be done, yes, so international level, is not just in ICANN, is in other institutions as well. It's every time it comes up, not with the question of about it must be, it's about it shall be, yes. So shall or should, so this is what is the question every time because shall and must even – even must, well, is more directly and focused on that.

But should maybe in international environment also for others in other cultural environments is a kind of obligation, yes, already and is a binding one which is not written in this way. So at that time so what I understood from that is so that we understand it is something which shall be done but so in the context as I have tried to explain that, so we left it as should. So we can keep it as

given and common understanding that those who are – who have been working on that and are also, you know, have decided upon if the Council – at the GNSO as a whole understand it's a kind of obligation, is a binding rule, a binding rule.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. And, yes, that is – that you have explained that better, and I think that staff will add some of the language – some of the explanation that you just provided as well. And that does – that is consistent with what I recall the discussion being in the OSC as well. So thank you for that.

And then the other aspect of the recommendation is that there should be meaningful sanctions for non compliance. And again, staff found that there are indeed, you know, to a degree already sanctions that exist and that are also built into – into Chapter 5 on the SOIs as well. You know, first of all it's incumbent upon staff – and this is written in Chapter 5 – to be checking that statements of interest are completed and posted. And not only are SOIs – and I think this is something that's worth adding here as well, you know, not only are staff checking and we do indeed check; it is a standard procedure but, you know, there is a statement at the beginning of every single work party meeting – working group meeting, pardon me, whereby the chair always asks whether or not statement of interests are up to date.

And this is followed – I'm not seeing where this has ever not been done, it is a standard part of the Working Group Guidelines. And, you know, if there are – if there is not an SOI the sanction as it stands now, and it is indeed followed I know the secretariat, the GNSO secretariat would confirm this, that if an SOI does not exist for somebody who is in a working group, that person is not allowed to participate until that SOI is posted. So that person will be taken off the member list and that person will not get notifications of meetings until the SOI is posted.

So it seems at least to staff from our research that there is indeed already an existing sanction in place and that it is – it is a working sanction, it's being applied. And I notice that Marika Konings says, "Staff can only check for completeness, not for accuracy." And that is also made clear in the Chapter 5 as well, we were careful not to say that staff is not vetting an SOI but staff is making sure that the SOI is complete.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, thanks, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I fully agree to that what Marika was writing here with regards to completeness rather than accuracy. So my question would be here, do we have already – since there are rules already in place with regards to sanctions, did we have any – was there any case in the past when those rules have been – have been taken, well, and we had some sanctions about that? Is there anything – I can't remember.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Well, I do know that we you know, I can find out from the secretariat but, you know, in cases where say somebody is new and they signed up for a working group and they don't yet have a SOI posted they are prevented from participating until one is posted. I don't think that happens real frequently but I think it does happen. And so, you know, the rules that are in place have been applied. It's not – I don't think it's something that happens very frequently at all. I mean, it's really a matter of you maybe somebody is not being responsive when we're asking them and then they'll come back later and post an SOI so not somebody who is willfully not say abiding by the rules.

And I see Nathalie is typing. Yes, she says...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry so Nathalie has said in the chat, "Staff insists heavily on SOIs completeness but we do not necessarily bar members," oh I see, "without SOIs from attending calls."

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead. Somebody is trying to speak.

Lawrence Olawale Roberts: Yes, it's me. (Unintelligible). I was thinking about the word "meaningful sanctions," can we – because I think it's too hard to use that word, can we find something else better than "meaningful sanctions" because it used to be like (unintelligible) to respect for the word "meaningful sanctions" means to – kind of is too hard I think for me (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. That was Lawrence, I think? The terminology of meaningful sanction is actually what was used in the Recommendation 28, the original recommendation. It states, "To institute meaningful sanctions for noncompliance where appropriate." I too think perhaps that's not ideal language. I mean, I think what it means is sanctions that can truly be applied and are applied. I think that's that is meant by meaningful, but we can't change that word per se because it is part of the original recommendation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: So thanks, Julie. So we have to understand with regard to the sanction so as Nathalie was writing that only (unintelligible) have been barred so far. In case, say, they do not provide or didn't provide an SOI. Do we have a procedure about that? That means, you know, is staff going, well, to remind people once or twice – once or twice, well, for that to come up with that or is there a limit in weeks, well, in providing an SOI or is it just your feeling at the time being since there are no rules how to deal with that. Do we need some more specific rules regarding this? I see Nathalie is raising a hand. Nathalie, please.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Wolf. This is Nathalie Peregrine from staff. Yes, regarding the specific rules, we haven't – well an internal rule that upon sign up a member

with no SOI receives an email – explanation as to how to complete it and (unintelligible). From then on they receive three reminders from staff spaced out within reason, or say four or five business days each time. With – from a second reminder a warning that their status will change from member to observer should their SOI not be completed on time. If after three reminders they haven't completed the SOI, they also (unintelligible) to observer so they lose their subscription to the notifier list and to conference calls and get their posting rights for the discussion mailing list removed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much for the explanation. I think that's fair so but well if there are other comments on that I think well you help yourself, you know, in this regard and that is – it seems to be fair as well. So – and if there are problems with it from the person who is affected by that, so he or she they can refer to the constituency or ever well to claim, you know. But I think that is helpful, yes, thanks very much.

So by the way, Julie, are we through with that? Because we have left just two minutes, well, and can we finalize this recommendation just for going through and then talk about we are doing next?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. I think we are. I think staff has some actions to make some – to make some further changes to the charter which we will do. And so we'll accept these changes and we'll redline some new changes. We'll send them around to the list for review and say a final discussion at the meeting on the 30th.

And then the final item on the – on the agenda today was just that staff suggests that given that we do generally have pretty light attendance that perhaps we could at these meetings do a couple of things. We could ask the SGs and Cs to confirm their primary and alternate members because there's always the possibility that these have changed perhaps.

And then also to ask whether or not this is still a time that works for everyone particularly if it's, as it's now shifted earlier with the time change, or whether or not the original time was better or if staff should do a Doodle to find a more suitable time so that we can have better participation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Great suggestion. Thanks very much, Julie. So that means you would like to send out – let's just send out on the list to the constituencies the full membership list and all their members as we have at the time being and then they could feedback well, that it's the status or there are changes with that. And also with regard to timing I think it's a good useful suggestion you make to ask, well this is the time we should follow in future as well or we have better times, well, to find. Great suggestion. Thanks very much.

With that I think, well, we are at the top of the hour or one minute behind. So are there any further questions at the time being? I see none. So thanks very much and so we will have the next meeting in two weeks from now, same time, is that okay, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, unless we are going to decide differently, yes. Thanks very much. And good-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone. Thanks so much for joining. Have a great day. Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for joining...

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: ...today's conference call. This adjourns today's meeting. Operator, you may now stop the recordings. Thank you.

Lawrence Olawale Roberts: Thank you.

END