

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 27 July 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-27jul17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p7uv8jlcxcu/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/BXrwAw>

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

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Review meeting held on the 27th of July 2017. On the call today we have Sara Bockey, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Rafik Dammak and Heath Dixon. We have listed apologies from Jen Wolfe and Marika Konings. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Amr Elsadr, Berry Cobb and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to you Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. Please begin.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Terri. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Hello to all. We are not complete as I can see from the list here, but maybe there will – some people joining later. I think we should hold the meeting and start immediately.

The agenda is on the screen. And if there are comments with regard to the agenda? No, I see none. So let me just briefly ask for any amendments or modifications to the present – to your present SOI, statement of interest? Is there anything to disclose? No, thank you.

So then let's move to the third item, it's an update on the consensus call on charter for Recommendation 13 which should end today. And I would like to hand over to Julie, well, to give an update of the status. Please, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And with respect to Recommendation 13, that charter has been out for two weeks for consensus call ending close of business today, the 27th of July. As of today, there have been no comments, questions, objections or concerns. So we'll see where we stand at the end of the day. If there are no objections or no comments at all, then we'll consider this to be agreed to by full consensus and staff will make the announcement tomorrow. So that's where we stand. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Julie. So that's my take as well. So from this group there is no objection and it will go the way as you described. Unless there is any further comment to this topic, so is there any comment, any further comment? No, I see none. So then let's do it how you described and then we'll move over to the next recommendation.

Recommendation 19, to be continued to discussion. As I recall from the last meeting, so we had some I think there were some indications to making some amendments to the charter itself. And you sent the revised charter or recirculated that, Julie. I would like just to hand over to you immediately. I think our goal is today to determine whether this is then enough and whether the group itself sees that as a fulfillment of the recommendation itself. And after that, then there shall be a consensus call for two weeks, so that's what I took. But Julie, I would like to hand over to you and to step into.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, we did discuss this charter on the last call. And staff offered to add some additional references and information to the charter which staff did do. And we thought it would be useful to go over those changes on today's call and then if there are

no further changes those additions would be incorporated into a final version. And as you say, Wolf-Ulrich, then they would be sent out for consensus call.

So just a reminder of this particular charter recommendation, it is that as strategic manager, rather than a policy body, the GNSO Council should continue to focus on ensuring that a working group has been properly constituted, has thoroughly fulfilled the terms of its charter and has followed due process.

And so the scope was that for staff to provide applicable guidance from the Working Group Guidelines and then to determine if there was indeed a function for periodic review of the working group constitution membership and activity. And then the working group will determine whether or not the current procedures require any changes and just – and if so would direct staff to do so or would then determine whether or not this recommendation has been implemented or whether further steps are needed.

The assumption is that applicable guidance exists in the Working Group Guidelines with respect to working group constitution, membership and activity. And then the deliverable would be further guidance if the working group deems that it is required.

So further then to this analysis. Staff found initially, just to move down, initially to what we had found initially – excuse me – staff found that there is indeed a review of the working group that is built into the Working Group Guidelines Section 7 and that's the working group self-assessment. And further to that, staff has added further links to in particular, to the questionnaire. and because the questionnaire actually has questions very specific questions related to the functioning of the working group, that particular PDP working group, on completion of its work, its membership, its diversity, its constitution and basically covers the workings of the working group and is a review of how that work proceeded.

And furthermore, staff research found additional guidance relating to the performance of a working group. So in particular we call out Section 2.1.1, which is the announcement of a working group noting that – and this is from the Working Group Guidelines – that after a decision has been taken to form a working group, there is the call for volunteers to ensure broad representation and participation. So there are guidelines to ensure that there is – that there is broad participation and membership in the working group.

In addition, the guidelines address the representational balance in Section 2.1.1, the Chair. And I'm not going to read through all this, you have the documents also. But it talks about how the sub teams need to be open to all and encouraging representational balance, and that although there would not always be volunteers from every interest group, it is often acceptable to have a small sub team that's not totally representational, but there should be an outreach effort to those groups not represented. So there is a definite emphasis when working groups are formed that they be balanced and representational.

And then from Section 8 of the GNSO PDP manual, there is the development and approval of the charter of the PDP. And here this is actually something relatively new that when the PDP is initiated, then immediately a group is formed at the direction of the Council to draft the charter for the team. And for the PDP working group, that is. And noted in specific in bold here the elements of the charter should include at a minimum, the following elements, working group identification, mission, purpose, deliverables, formation, staffing and organization and rules of engagement.

So again, the PDP manual also ensures that there are mechanisms in the charter to ensure that there is a clear purpose, mission and deliverables, organization and rules for a PDP working group when it is formed.

And further then, in Section 9 of the PDP manual, once the charter is approved, we note here, the preferred model is the working group model. And

we note here in bold, just to call out for emphasis, that the working group Council should not select another model for conducting PDPs unless the Council first identifies specific rules and procedures to guide the deliberations. And that would include at a minimum set forth in the bylaws and PDP manual. So again, there are very specific guidelines for how a PDP working group should operate.

And then finally, Section 12 of the PDP manual covers Council deliberation and consideration of a GNSO PDP working group final report and recommendation. So as the manager of the policy process, when the working group finishes its report and makes its recommendations, the Council deliberates on whether to adopt these and Council takes into account whether the PDP team has indicated any recommendations that are interdependent, just not going to read all of this, but just that the Council has the opportunity to pass along any concerns back to the PDP team for input and follow up.

So again, there is a mechanism for the Council to deliberate on not only on the report and recommendations but on the work and the performance of the working group and to pass back any concerns that might need to be addressed.

So in conclusion, staff notes here that – excuse me – during the research that was conducted, staff found that there is sufficient existing guidance in the GNSO PDP manual and Working Group Guidelines mandating the GNSO Council as the strategic manager of the GNSO PDP to ensure that a working group has been properly constituted to the extent possible, has thoroughly fulfilled the terms of its charter and has followed due process.

The PDP manual also provides the GNSO Council with guidance on its deliberations of the outputs of a PDP working group while the PDP Working Group Guidelines provide an opportunity for working group members involved

in a PDP to provide their own assessment of the efficacy of the process with the goal for further improvement in future work.

So at least as far as the staff could determine, there seems to be, if we go back up to the recommendation, sufficient current guidance that allows the Council to focus on ensuring that a working group has been properly constituted and has fulfilled the terms of its charter and followed due process.

And so now it is for the PDP working group to determine whether or not this recommendation has been implemented or whether further steps are necessary. So let me turn things over to you, Wolf-Ulrich, and we'll be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Julie. I think there is a lot of stuff available with regards to the process itself as well as to the, how to say, how to supervise the policy process itself so as you mentioned here and you have written down. So I really would like to point to that matter, the question, you know, the distinction between the policy itself and the way how it is – how it is organized and managed by the Council that is where the recommendation and the recommendation is about here so it's the management of the policy.

So I would like, well, just to put that question to the audience here, to the other members, well, is there – from your point of view is that your feeling that this stuff, which Julie mentioned, well is enough for the management of the policy specifically with respect to the supervision or the establishment and follow up of working groups, who are the – the core of the policy development. Is there any comment from participants here? And if you have any comments with regards to that either saying well, to the recommendations from your point of view, that is – that seems to be enough, it's okay, there is no objection to that, well, I'm just hearing if there are comments.

Lori, please yes.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I just – I think I'd like clarity but I can't seem to roll the screen back up. But there was a section here that talked about we recommend the working group model but there may be other models, and that confused me because I'm not aware of any other model but the working group model except to the extent that a working group might have sub teams to divvy up a huge project like is being done in the Subsequent Procedures and the RPM. But I don't – I don't think I understand what the other options are or why that language was there. I don't see it now.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Let me just – well ask, well, to understand, Lori, so you are referring to a sentence or phrase with regards to the working group model itself and the question...

Lori Schulman: Yes. Not the outcomes piece but further up. There's a section on – God, why don't I see it now?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, maybe Julie, Julie please.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I'm looking. I just heard it in the explanation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Section 9 of GNSO PDP manual, PDP outcomes...

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Yes, let me look. I just read it and – I mean, not just read it, I listened to and then followed it...

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me, this is Julie Hedlund. If I might point us to it? I also have the text on the screen right now.

Lori Schulman: Oh great, okay.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry, it was unsynced, let me sync it again so – hang on, there it should be in the center of the screen right now. So let me read it again. And to my knowledge, there has not been another model that has been used. I don't remember the origin of this language. I think actually the language is there as a caution that there should – that another model should not be used. It reads specifically, and it was called out here to point out that the manual cautions against using any other model.

So what I think as staff we wanted to do was point out that this, you know, that the guidance is that the model should be the working group model. So it states specifically, "The GNSO Council should not select another model for conducting PDPs unless the Council – GNSO Council first identifies the specific rules and procedures to guide the PDP team's deliberations which should, at a minimum, include those set forth in the ICANN bylaws and the PDP manual."

So I think the point here is that the preferred model is as set forth both in the PDP manual and the Working Group Guidelines, it's the working group model, and that anything that would be used otherwise should also have specific rules that are already set forth so that you would not have a PDP team that's operating without clear rules and without rules that aren't bound by the bylaws and by the manual.

And I see Amr is typing so I think he may have here some other guidance. Yes, he says – Amr says, "Other models have been used for different projects but not to develop consensus policies so not to replace PDP working groups."

Lori Schulman: Well I think that's my point. I'm sorry to barge in but I mean, we are talking about PDP outcomes and I'm wondering if this language should actually be stronger. Yes, I don't think we can prohibit it under the rules, but maybe say something like the GNSO Council should not select another model for conducting PDPs without a written rationale that's agreed to by the Council or

something like that that it couldn't just arbitrarily say oh we'll use another model.

I mean, to Amr's point, you know, yes, a working party is not a PDP. A PDP is a PDP. So I don't know...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...I can ask you a question, Lori. So looking at the recommendation, how would changes to this section relate to this particular recommendation? So how are they in scope? Because what we're being asked to do is, you know, is whether there is enough guidance for the Council to focus on ensuring that a working group has been properly constituted, has thoroughly fulfilled the terms of its charter and has followed due process. So we're trying to determine whether or not there's sufficient guidelines that already exist to ensure that the Council can do this job as a strategic manager.

And I also see that Amr has his hand up so maybe he has something further to say that relates to our question as well.

Lori Schulman: Okay, I'm going to put my hand down.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, sorry, well it's Wolf-Ulrich again. Before I hand over to Amr, well, it's also – I think my impression, Lori, so with regard to that recommendation and our mandate here is not about thinking about whether or not in future or under which conditions a different model could be used or not or shouldn't be used. So it's, well, it's the assumption here that we are relying on the working group model and under these assumptions, you know, is the question here how these questions – the recommendation is fulfilled or not. So that's my comment to that. But, Amr, please.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And thank you, Lori, and Julie as well. When I raised my hand I was going to start off by pretty much pointing out what Julie did in

terms of the scope of this recommendation and charter. But to sort of address some of the questions Lori brought up, there are other models that exist in the PDP manual now that – or actually as annexes to the operating procedures that sort of outline different sort of structures that may be used in policy work such as the expedited PDP and in some cases where guidance is required on existing policy to form a GNSO guidance group.

And so those do exist and there are reasons why the GNSO Council may request such a group to be formed and to conduct some work related to policy. But these were not included in this charter because again, the scope is rather limited to this recommendation. The recommendation here is not focused on the function of the GNSO Council per se but more so on the GNSO's Council's role in ensuring that GNSO working groups are properly constituted and that they themselves thoroughly fulfill the terms of their own charter and that they have followed due process.

So the focus here has been on GNSO working groups and not sort of like expedited – the expedited PDP process or GNSO guidance process where other groups may exist. So I hope that does provide some context to why the focus was on the GNSO working groups in this charter. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks, Amr, for this. Are there any other comments? So if not, the – then I may ask, well, if we are prepared, well, to do the next steps of means from our point of view to say, well, this recommendation and the charter, well, fulfills what is in the recommendation itself. And we put it out for a consensus call for the next two weeks where you have the chance, well, still to go out to your constituencies and stakeholder groups and comment on that if there is a comment. So that would be my suggestion. Is there any objection to that? So seeing none, so then Julie, we'll do that as usual.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And I have noted that as the action item for staff to take.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thanks very much. So we can close discussion on Recommendation Number 19, and would move to the next, Recommendation 30. Thirty is about the – what is it about? I have read it but I'm just a little bit maybe confused with other recommendations. Is the – 30 here, yes. The GNSO develop a policy so the recommendation is that the GNSO develop and implement the policy or the provision of administrative support for stakeholder groups and constituencies and that stakeholder groups and constituencies annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of administrative support they receive.

And Julie has – had circulated the charter here and has pointed to all the projects or the pilot programs which have been done so far and which are ongoing. And for this I would like to hand over to Julie to guide us through.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So yes, as noted, this is a recommendation that relates to – to the provision of administrative support for the stakeholder groups and constituencies. And then also relates to the review and evaluation of the effectiveness of that support.

So the scope was for staff to provide a report to this working group on the results of an evaluation of the GNSO toolkit, quote unquote, and the pilot program, quote unquote. These are two programs for providing administrative support to the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And then on the provision of this information and the status of where these – this administrative support stands, then the working group would determine whether or not this recommendation has been completed. In particular the second piece of the recommendation we'll call out to you and that is that there is a review and evaluation of the effectiveness of the support.

So assumptions are that these initial programs, the toolkit, and the pilot program have been completed and then the report deliverable is a report that staff will provide on the evaluation of the toolkit and pilot program.

So to go through what staff found, and a little bit of background, in 2010, there was a formal GNSO toolkit developed by ICANN staff to clearly and specifically identify the administrative support that ICANN would provide to GNSO stakeholder groups and constituency communities. And over the next few years, in collaboration with the community, staff developed a specific set of items that would be provided under a pilot program by ICANN to provide additional level of admin support service to the community under staff management.

In 2014, ICANN introduced a pilot contact secretariat program to determine if those services could be effectively and efficiently offered to the ICANN community under ICANN management. So staff notes that considerable work has been completed and is ongoing, that is no longer in pilot mode.

So the information pertaining to the various administrative and managerial support functions associated with SO/AC engagement and here are several links. So there are several pages – there is an overall page that is about the SO/AC support function. And then within that, we have several ancillary pages. There is an inventory of current services that are being provided and also a work effort inventory.

There's a secretary services matrix, so these are all the secretariat services being provided. There is the – also as part of this there's the community member recognition program, there are input and feedback mechanisms, there are content delivery mechanisms, and there's also now coming up in FY'18 the community regional outreach program, the CROP, that will be starting up.

And then future efforts that are part of the ongoing work is a group team support and facilitation, and then also training, education and collaboration mechanisms. Now, I'm looking at – and looking into this research, there's quite a bit of information. And what I realize now that might be helpful, Wolf-Ulrich, is if staff were to do screen captures or to display these various pages.

It's not – I don't think that's something that's easy to do while we're sitting on this call.

But I'm just wondering if there's a way that we can show you what actually exists at these pages or perhaps to amend the charter to include some of these as attachments. I'm just trying to think of a way that we can further describe what's out there or make it easier for this group to understand what's out there.

I can talk through some of these things specifically that there are quite a – there's quite a comprehensive list of services now that are provided to the stakeholder groups and constituencies, each of those groups have their own secretariat or administrative functions, you know, there is, you know, there's phone support, meeting support, you know, secretariat support and there's mechanisms for feedback on all of these current programs.

I would say, you know, that it's clear that this is still an ongoing effort. And the one piece I think that is perhaps not formalized that I could see anyway is that there was – whether there was an annual review mechanism. There's a mechanism for feedback, as we see here, and input, but I don't know that there is a formalized annual review mechanism.

So I'm going to stop here just now and happy to take questions. And then also let me just see if there's something that I could quickly bring up just to show you as an example. I apologize for not thinking of this until just at this moment but realized that just showing a list of links is perhaps not as useful as being able to show a shot of something.

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Thanks very much, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, it is – I had a chance, well, to click some of these websites. And, well, it's really good in shape. And there is a lot of effort has been done since as you outlined, since 2010 or 2015, with the pilot – '14 with the pilot program. The first question I have is there may be – if you look to the recommendation and what is the

intention of that, there may be something have been developed in parallel over this time so that the recommendation is, well, let me say looking from a point of view where no so many things have been developed as they are at the time being.

So the question is, well, if you look to 2014, I think 2014 was starting just this review when I recall that correctly and the recommendations have been developed. And so there's maybe, you know, something have been done, you know, later on or was just in a stage of the beginning to be done when this recommendation was established.

The second point I do have whether we can come to that later, is for me the question – if you look to the recommendation which says there should – it's – if you could scroll up to the recommendation itself, yes, the GNSO develop and implement a policy for the provision of this administrative support. So then is the question so for that is that well covered here? I understand here is covered all the activities, all the projects which have been done. A policy maybe of a different level that means it's just a kind of binding agreement also between several sides, well to do something. Or well a policy how to do that in this way as well.

So that is a question which I would like to discuss and would like to see from the participants how they see that here. Is there really a policy to be developed which means, well, shall the GNSO follow its policy development process in developing a policy for these activities? Is there a necessity to do that? Is that – can we draw this from this recommendation? Or how shall we do that? So these are questions to me right now. And I would like to open for comments and discussions. Julie, is that your old hand or...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, that's an old hand. I'll put that down. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So if there are any comments or any questions from others, I would like to encourage you, well, to put that here. It seems to be not at the time being. Amr, you have a comment, please.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Amr from staff. And, in the absence of any other raised hands I just thought I'd offer a thought that, you know, as you all know of course GNSO policy recommendations are developed via PDP working groups which normally result in recommendations that will – that when adopted by the ICANN Board and implemented, will lead to changes in contractual obligations with contracted parties.

Other recommendations developed by the GNSO are normally developed by non-PDP working groups. An example would be this one perhaps, and another example would be the Policy and Implementation Working Group. But those don't develop policy, as we all know, of course. So personally my reading of this recommendation is that, you know, there's nothing that would prevent the GNSO Review Working Group from providing a recommendation that may result in amendments to the GNSO Operating Procedures to the effect or the intent of this recommendation. But those would not actually result in new policies being developed.

And I just wonder if there was a bit of a mismatch in the phrasing used in this recommendation in terms of how to get the intent of the recommendation through but not necessarily via a policy development process. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Amr, this is very helpful. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Because I was also thinking, well, it couldn't be the case, you know, at that time. You know, I really don't recall, you know, also I was a member of the Review Working Group as well how it came to that phrasing because there are much – should have been a discussion about the consequences if that was the intention, well, to really to start a PDP here on this matter.

So that is – on the other hand, I understand it's helpful to see if a kind of – let's not call it policy, a kind of, let me say, rules also or kind of agreements should be developed between ICANN and the community, the GNSO community, about the provision of the administrative support here. That may be a different thing.

And I wonder whether that was the intention of that time, well, to just to – whether the intention well just to move ahead, well, that program is going to be started but to provide this support or was the intention, well, to settle some rules, well, to be sure that it will be provided continuously rather than that ICANN just says okay, we have maybe a budget problem and we cut the support program here. Or, you know, that is – they are different thing.

So is there any thought about that, about how you see that from the point of our group here? Amr, is that still your old hand or...?

Amr Elsadr: Hi, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Amr. Yes, that is an old hand but I'm afraid it's stuck. I may need to drop out of the Adobe Connect room and log back in, apologies.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, no problem. Well let me phrase the question the other way around. People here, participants here satisfied with the content of this charter right now or do we have any other questions with regard to that? How shall we move on here is that – Julie, do you have any comment on that?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So, yes, thinking about this again, and the use of the word "policy" is maybe not quite appropriate. I know Amr has said guidelines or operating procedures might be more fitting than a policy. I think – let me put it this way – I think it is in the remit of this GNSO Review Working Group to interpret as part of the implementation – interpret the recommendation in the appropriate way. Because, you know, the working group has noted it's not really appropriate to use the word "policy" in this sense in that policy has a very specific meaning within the GNSO and the community.

Perhaps what it is is that the working group could consider recommending if something is not already in place, a procedure or guideline or an agreement as to how this administrative support is provided. As you know, Wolf-Ulrich, you know, what would happen if, you know, ICANN said oh okay, for fiscal year '19, we don't have the budget to provide half of these services.

You know, there doesn't appear to be anything binding that would prevent that from happening, although frankly as staff, I would like to look back again at the formation of this and also consult with the group that manages this engagement and to determine whether or not there is something more formal in place that may not – may not be apparent but that may provide some underpinning or guidelines for how this, you know, these services are provided.

So I'm wondering if to assist us in this evaluation if there – if first staff could consult with our colleagues who are managing the support to have a better understanding of whether or not there is some underpinning guideline agreement or procedure in place governing this work and then also this PDP working group could decide if there – in the absence of something more formal if perhaps the recommendation might be that a procedure could be developed or something could be integrated into the GNSO Operating Procedures that speaks to this because as far as I know, there's nothing in the Operating Procedures that talks to the provision of administrative support.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well let me make a suggestion here. As you say, it is in the remit of our group here to interpret what it is about the recommendation, how we understand that. And we should do that so we should here – if there are no objections, no further comments on the content of this charter. We should agree to that. And we should – we should point out, well, in agreeing to that, how we interpret this question about the develop and implement the policy here – that we don't see that as a policy development process as usual on the one hand.

Rather than we see the development of the programs over the last years during the process of the GNSO review and the ongoing program development here as – we acknowledge that. And we accept that as the – as the best way, well, to work or to provide the support at the time being.

In addition there may be that we have to discuss well, one point open which you mentioned already, that was the question of continuous – how to say that – review or – of some of these points here which is maybe not fulfilled or we should point that out. On the other hand, and we should because we hand that over at the end as a group so we hand this over to the GNSO Council, I understand that. So if – so we should also outline or tell the GNSO Council that we are – that it's up to him to decide to the Council whether measures should be taken in order to – how to say that – to make the support more – let me say – not an obligation but in a form which is in more binding, you know, both sides.

So you may have the better words, well, to put that together. So if that is a way to do that and to move this ahead so I – just a suggestion from my side. Any comments, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So, yes, I think that is definitely a way forward, and staff can go ahead and incorporate language into this charter with the points that you've just made. And staff also noting Rafik's question that he thought that the admin support has moved from the pilot phase, it has indeed moved beyond the pilot program. And I think staff would like to just to confirm internally with ICANN what is the understanding you know, what is ICANN's understanding with respect to the provision of this support. You know, as Rafik noted, you know, if it's depending on getting budget approved every year, is this something that you know, is, you know, is set now or is it something that is subject to the whims of the budget?

So I think that it'd be helpful for staff to get some internal guidance on that and bring it back to the working group so that if there is something that we can incorporate here in the charter that says, you know, yes, you know, ICANN is committed to providing, you know, this support and then, you know, then there's also the question of whether or not the Council you know, would like to institute some kind of annual review of this as well as this working group notes, there is not currently a review although there is an input mechanism.

Although I must say that that's something that I think staff could also confirm interplay with ICANN.org just to, you know, ICANN Org to just – to, you know, determine whether or not from an ICANN point of view there is, you know, a mechanism for reviewing the support that may not be immediately apparent in, you know, in the, you know, the various support information that's been provided online.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. That is a good way to do. So let's move that forward. And please may I also ask you, well, to think or, you know, there was the second half of the recommendation that the stakeholder groups and constituencies annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of administrative support they receive. So as I understand, well, you mentioned that it is not yet fully covered by the various websites or, well, office here, so we should think about how we can also cover this point. Is that the correctly understood, Julie, from my side?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, that's understood. And part of what staff would like to do is determine whether or not there currently is a mechanism for or review of the effectiveness beyond simply that there's an input mechanism but is there also an annual review mechanism? And if not, then that could be a recommendation coming out of this working group to the Council.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Good, Julie. You will update the – this charter accordingly. So we have now two minutes to the hour. Let's talk about the next – the meeting schedule. Because I think there is about a meeting in – is it in August there was one meeting scheduled which overlaps with another – with the Council meeting, I think so the next meeting is scheduled for 10th August, that is our regular meeting and there is no – there shall be no problem, I understand, yes? But there is a meeting then for the – on the 24th of August, I think, so and this is overlapping with the Council, isn't it, 24th, yes.

That is overlapping with the Council call. So I would like to ask, well, to think about, you know, how to move that meeting. We could do a meeting the week before even, maybe the - is looking to our schedule it would be helpful if we would have a meeting on 17th of August instead of 24th, and then from the 17th start after that in every two weeks. Is that the way to do or what is your preference?

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff if I might?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes please.

Julie Hedlund: Make a suggestion, I think perhaps we could suggest to the list that we would reschedule to the 17th from the 24th and as you say, go every two weeks if there are no objections, then we could go ahead and do that just asking if there are any objections and if none then the secretariat would go ahead and change the schedule.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is that acceptable or does it...

Julie Hedlund: I see Lori Schulman's typing. She's on vacation 19th through the 28th. Well then that would be good, I mean, if, you know, you know, we can go ahead and bring this on the list but I would suggest that we just go ahead and do this. We have fairly light attendance on these calls as it is, and August is a time of you know, people being on vacation so, you know, we'd probably be

hard pressed to find a time where, you know, every single person is available in any case.

So staff could take the action, Rafik says, "People taking vacation?" Staff will take the action to go ahead and cancel the call on the 24th, set up a call on the 17th and then do the two week rotation beginning from the call on the 17th so that the next call would be the 31st.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Great, thanks very much, Julie, well. So thank you very much, all, for this call. It's top of the hour. Wish you all nice vacations if you go. And have a nice time. Thank you very much.

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

END