

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
30 March 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/gnso/gnso-review-wg-30mar17-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Members:

Heath Dixon (RrSG Primary)
Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)
Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP Primary)
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)

Participants:

Pascal Bekono (NCUC)

Apologies: Lawrence Owalale-Roberts, Renata Aquino Ribeiro

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Julie Hedlund
Amr Elsadr
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings are now started. You may now begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Geno). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group meeting on the 30th of March, 2017.

On the call today we have Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Jennifer Wolfe and Sara Bockey. From staff we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Amr Elsadr and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for the purposes of the transcript. Thank you ever so much, and over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you so much, and thank you for those of you who are participating, for those of you who couldn't make the call and may be listening to the recording, we just had a discussion prior to the start of the recording that we will send out another Doodle poll just to see if this time maybe isn't best for everybody and really try to find a time for those who are regularly participating that's going to work well so we can try to increase our participation.

For our agenda today, we'll start with a review of the statements of interest and then Julie Hedlund is going to take us through the revised draft charters based upon the meeting that was held at ICANN 58. Then we'll move on and talk about the recommendation implementation tracking tool that is proposed to be used, and then we'll look at our meeting schedule and any other business.

So I'll start with just a brief ask of our – the few people who are on the call if there are any revisions to your statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, Julie, I'll hand it over to you to take us through the revised draft charters.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. And this is Julie Hedlund for the transcript and the recording. And thank you, everyone, for joining also. I will bring up the charters in the order in which they appear in the implementation plan, they are ordered by priority. And then note the revisions made based on the discussion at the working group meeting at ICANN 58 in Copenhagen.

I'm going to – I'll go ahead and I'll leave these documents synced so that I can scroll through them and I'll just talk to where we are in the documents. Let me just make them a little bit larger so that they're easier to see. They're still a little bit hard to see but hopefully, you know, somewhat legible for you.

The first of the recommendations in Phase 1 of the implementation plan is the Recommendation 8 which is the subject is the working group role in implementation. This was one that we'd found that a significant amount of work had already been accomplished in meeting this recommendation based on previous work.

And essentially that work relates to the final report of the Policy and Implementation Working Group and those recommendations and then based on those recommendations the implementation of those in staff view appeared to address this particular recommendation, just to remind you of this recommendation, it is that working groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to the policy that they have developed.

And in the implementation – Policy and Implementation Working Group Recommendation 4 recommended that the PDP Manual be modified to require the creation of an implementation review team following the adoption of the PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board.

This change, as staff found, was made in the PDP Manual and was implemented in the latest – in version 3.0 of the PDP manual in June of 2015. And specifically the wording was that the GNSO Council must direct the creation of an implementation review team.

And I won't read all of this language here, but in our discussion at the last meeting just skipping ahead, we had no changes to this charter but staff went ahead and did make a change actually sort of a global change that I'd like to highlight for you, something that was raised in the discussion of one of the

other charters, but I think needs to be addressed in each of the charters and that has to do with the key performance indicators, or KPIs.

Now these are generally measurable things, that is that, you know, is there something measurable that we need to look at to – in order to decide this recommendation has been implemented. Now, you know, that also can relate to, you know, if there are any deliverables, in this case the deliverable would be the revised PDP Manual.

In looking at the recommendations and this one in particular also, you know, it wasn't clear to staff what would be an appropriate KPI. I mean, if the outcome of the – pardon me – if the implementation of the recommendation is that language is included in the PDP Manual that sets up the requirement for an implementation review team to be established, as part of the implementation of the policy and that that review team would then have participation by the working group, then it's not clear to staff what a KPI would be. I mean, we have the manual, we have the changes to the manual, it doesn't appear that there would be any metrics or measurement that would need to occur.

And I'd just like to raise this point for discussion because it's really going to be – as staff looked through the various charters it seemed to be an issue recurring with other recommendations as well where recommendation, you know, might be just that there's now a requirement for X, Y or Z, you know, in the – the GNSO Operating Procedures and, you know, not obviously something that it would be a metric or, you know, some other kind of measurable indicator.

So anyway, Jen, I'd like to raise that as a point of discussion since this will be a recurring question. What staff has put in here now is that it's not clear to staff that a KPI applies in the implementation of this recommendation. And I think this kind of gets back to a discussion we had at our kick off meeting in that perhaps not all of the sections that are in the – this template, the charter

template necessarily apply in every case since, in every case in the implementation of each of these recommendations. So anyway, let me just put that out there as a question and I see that Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, Julie. Well just two quick comments to this recommendation. The first is which you mentioned is that there was the requirement or the wish from the group that working group members should be preferably, let me say, this way, also joining the IRP, the implementation review team. So the question was for me then, how that is – how that is incorporated here in the solution.

If you go just back this charter and the – on the solutions to my knowledge there is just one point here, and the two – the very last bracket, you know, e.g. composition, that is might be a hint you know, here that if this discussion comes up within the working group, that there should be mention that working group members themselves could be part of the implementation review team. So my question here is just whether we should be a little bit more precise with regards to that wish, under 2, that's the question.

And then to your question with regard to the KPIs, I think, you know, this is different from charter and recommendation to recommendation. Here in this case, I would easily say, okay, there's nothing then the question of whether – this recommendation has been covered by the related procedures, if that is in the PDP Manual or in the procedures covered then afterwards then it's only up to the – to the future establishment of working group to make them aware of this fact, but if it's in the procedure and the Working Group Guidelines, or where else, in that that must be enough for a fulfillment of a KPI in this regard.

So that's it for me, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And I'll note I think with respect to your first question and whether or not we need some additional specific or more precise

language in Number 2, I'm noting and capturing in the notes what Marika has pointed out that we also have as a point of reference the IRT Principles. And those principles say that the call for IRT volunteers should, at a minimum, be sent to all members of the PDP working group that was responsible for developing the policy recommendations. The call for volunteers may need to reach beyond the working group members to ensure broad participation by parties directly impacted by the implementation and parties with specialized expertise needed for implementation, in some cases additional outreach at the start of the later stage of the IRT may be necessary to ensure that appropriate expertise is available, and that directly affected parties are involved in the IRT.

And Amr reading from the chat says the bracketed portion of Number 2, e.g. composition, is an extract of one of the recommendations coming out of the P&I Working Group regarding IRT formation/composition.

So then I guess I would go over to you, Wolf-Ulrich, oh, and then I see that you have – Wolf-Ulrich has noted in the chat that should be enough from my point of view, so in that respect staff can go ahead and incorporate this reference into the – into the charter as well.

And then, thank you very much, also for your comment, Wolf-Ulrich, about the KPIs that, you know, that making the working group aware with – for future establishments – future working groups aware that – of their, you know, option to participate in an IRT should be enough. So I'll just ask if anybody else has any other comments they'd like to add.

Anything else at all on this particular charter? Staff has the action to go ahead and make these changes. And, Jen, I think I'll go ahead and move to the next charter if that's ok?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, yes, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. All right, so and this is Julie Hedlund again. The next recommendation charter is Recommendation 15, this has to do with the timeliness of the policy development process. A little bigger. And the actual recommendation reads that the GNSO continues current PDP improvements project initiatives to address the timeliness of the PDP.

And we'll note that – that this relates to discussions that I know that Amr had noted previously on the – on how to speed up PDPs. To a certain extent, you know, there have been actions taken to improve the PDP and these are noted actually here, again, related to the Policy and Implementation Working Group. But the – one of the items that was raised or really a question that was raised in the discussion at ICANN 58 – excuse me – related to whether there needs to be a more formal process undertaken for speeding up PDPs and for instance, periodically PDPs to share ideas on how they could be speeded up.

And so staff just noted this, and, you know, for further discussion here today, you know, if it's desirable to have something, you know, more specific than, you know, should a specific language be included, you know, in say the Working Group Guidelines for example.

And I'll just note a couple of things from the chat that Marika has noted. Marika asks, "Could that be part of the working group assessment, ask a question on if how the PDP could have moved faster? And then those ideas could be shared and discussed." And let me go ahead and capture that from the chat.

So I'll just open that question up for discussion. We, you know, it was raised in Copenhagen but we didn't really come to a conclusion on it. So anybody have any suggestions? What about Marika's suggestion there as a possible way to address this issue.

This is Julie again. I'm not hearing other comments. I guess my question would be to Marika, because I'm just trying to remember where – I have to pull up the working group assessment. Is all the language of the questions in the assessment is that actually language that's in the Working Group Guidelines? Or is that a link to a questionnaire that's outside of the Working Group Guidelines? That is that could be modified without necessarily changing the Working Group Guidelines?

And I should know this off the top of my head but I'm afraid I don't at this moment. And I see both Amr and Marika are typing. That was what I thought I remembered. Marika is saying in the chat, "Julie, I think it is a link. The GNSO Operating Procedures refer to it but do not dictate the questions as far as I'm aware." That is my memory as well. And I see Amr is typing.

Just waiting while some of the people are typing in the chat on this particular item.

Jennifer Wolfe: Hey, Julie, and I raised my hand and Lori had hers raised too. I mean, I think it definitely makes sense that part of the assessment process is what could have been done to make it faster. I know every PDP has its own unique idiosyncrasies, some are more complicated than others, some are just inherently going to take longer than others. But I certainly think having some sort of formal process to assess what could have been done to make this go faster and then, you know, in terms of a KPI is how is that cycled back into future PDPs.

I don't have the answer to that, I'm just raising that as – perhaps that's one of the pieces we could look at implementing. And then I know Lori had her hand raised too, yes.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I did.

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Oh okay. I saw Jen's hand too, I wasn't sure. Mine's – yes, I was going to echo a lot of what Marika said in terms of every PDP seems to be a bit idiosyncratic. But I also think part of the reason that the PDPs are slowed down are the size of the PDPs. You know, when you have 45, 50 people on a call for controversial issues, what's happening is you hear the same argument over and over and over again.

So part of being bottom up and democratic is that we allow every voice to be heard but every voice gets heard over and over and over again. And I see that as slowing down a lot of the work that I've been doing for the last – particularly the last six months, I would say. There seems to be no way or no reasonable way to corral people without stifling their voices, which we don't want to do. I think it's an – something to look at.

I mean, one idea might be do we want to continue to have completely open PDPs? Do we want to have some limitations on size? And do we think that a size limitation could, you know, help efficiency or hurt efficiency?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. And this is Julie again for the transcript. And noting from the chat also that Amr says, "One previous measure taken during a staff exercise for improving PDPs was including PDP working group charters in preliminary issue reports meant to (unintelligible) used to form charter drafting teams, draft the charter, submitting for public comments and having Council adopt them. This is now included in the process to accept issue reports."

That's actually a really good point and something else I think that we could point to in – could reference in the charter here. With respect to Lori's question about sort of the size and perhaps composition of PDPs slowing things down and the question about size limitations, I'm wondering what others think about whether or not there should be something explicit, you know, there's certainly language in the PDP about ensuring, you know,

participation, you know, and broad participation. There's nothing in there currently that I'm aware of that talks about size limitations.

Is that something that people think should actually be called out? Or is it enough that PDPs, you know, if they can currently be, you know, are, you know, can be somewhat flexible as far as their composition. And I'll go ahead and recognize Jen. Go ahead, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. This is Jen Wolfe. And I wholeheartedly agree with Lori. The size is absolutely what starts to take the process and just expand it because when there's so many people and everyone is trying to make sure their voice is heard, and she's exactly right, people say the same thing over and over because they want to be on the record for saying those things for the folks they represent, which is totally understandable. But I think she's absolutely right, that if you want to speed it up you've got to have some control mechanisms over that.

Now I don't know if that belongs in this charter but I think it's certainly something, you know, and I, you know, look to you all from staff to help us in the scope of all this, is there somewhere where that concept fits? Maybe it's here, maybe it's somewhere else, but I think she's absolutely right. And that's something that should be brought to the proper, you know, attention somewhere in this process.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. This is Julie. And I'll note a couple of comments in the chat relating to this. Marika says, "The PDP only outlines minimum requirements. There's a lot of flexibility in how work can be conducted. There would be nothing, for instance, to prevent groups from meeting everyday for four hours." Which we would hope they would not want to.

But, and she also notes that, "The model used to be a task force, in which used to be a task force in which each stakeholder group and constituency would appoint one or two people max, not an open working group model.

Maybe a middle way could be not open participation, but neither the very limited participation of the past.” So something in between, you know, the task force model and the current open working group model.

I take your point, Jen, though, as to whether or not this particular issue is in scope for this charter. I’m just looking back to the recommendation. And it just says that the, “GNSO continues current PDP improvements project initiatives to address the timeliness of the PDP.”

So to me it would seem that if the working group feels that the size of a PDP is a limiting factor in the timeliness of the PDP, it would seem to be that that point – on the size of the, you know, of the group would fall into the scope here.

So that leads then from staff point of view as to whether or not language needs to be included and staff could draft some language included in the PDP Manual that would suggest perhaps a middle path or some way that the size could be mitigated.

It is a balance because I mean, you know, generally want to have broad participation in a PDP to ensure that, you know, all the parties who might be directly affected have an opportunity to participate. And some PDPs are by their nature extremely broad, I’m thinking of for example, the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP which has an extremely large group of members and observers. And yet, the work itself and this is actually a subject of a later charter, is phased and split into work tracks, and each of those work tracks is a much smaller group. And then these are all proceeding simultaneously.

So I’m wondering if phasing is not also a way to address the issue of having a PDP that has very broad participation but that still is nimble enough to get some work done. I’m just throwing that out as part of the discussion.

Lori Schulman: It's Lori, if you don't mind my not raising my hand since there's only like five of us? I agree. Maybe if we phase things and people could come in and out. One of my issues, like with my members, my organization has over 1000 actual brand owner portfolio members versus I think totally we're 7000 so 6000 are service providers, which would be like law firms, they could be people with an interest to IP, which could actually be registrars and registries or academics. We have a cross section of the multistakeholder model ourselves within our own organization.

But one of the vexing issues particularly for our corporates, and I know there are many working groups who actually want to hear from the brand owners themselves, the true corporates, that are managing and holding portfolios. They're the ones with the least amount of time to start and then completely finish a PDP. And they have asked me a number of times, and I've not been able to give them a good answer, how can we get involved when we need to be involved? Like can we come in and come out?

My general counsel or my CEO will never allow me to spend hundreds of hours or maybe thousands of hours required of a PDP over the course of time, but if I could come in and out that would justify – that could justify my participation. So this idea of phasing I think could actually encourage people that wouldn't normally participate if there was an understanding they're active in a phase. And then they could choose whether or not they wanted to continue in a different phase and still feel like they've contributed.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Lori. And I'll just note a few things from the chat. Lori notes, does broad participation necessarily mean high numbers versus having many interests represented? Each PDP could be sized according to needs. I think that idea of phasing. Marika says, "Good point, Lori. I guess the question is though how and who do you assess whether different interests are represented? Would it be feasible to have each SG, C, to appoint three to four reps representing those different interests?"

And Amr says, "Lori, public comment periods is one way to participate, also during early PDP outreach to SOs, ACs." And I see Lori is typing. And I guess – and this is Julie again – I'll note that the issue of phasing is a topic of one of the other charters. And I wonder then, and we can switch to that one, and I'm wondering then whether or not this item relating to size would better fall into that charter. And Lori is noting the chat, "Public comments are too late for many not well versed in the subject."

And I see Marika is typing. "Thinking out loud," Marika says, "What about a plenary style model of participation? The plenary would meet once a month to get updated on the progress/status of work while the legwork weekly calls, is undertaken by a number of reps?" And Marika is still typing. "Sorry, probably getting way ahead of what you're trying to achieve today."

This is Julie again. That's an interesting point, Marika. And I have to say actually that that's the way – that's essentially the way the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group is proceeding in that the work is being undertaken by four work track sub teams, and then those groups provide updates to the full working group every two weeks. So the work then is split up, you know, it's happening simultaneously but the groups that are undertaking the work are much smaller than the full working group.

And go ahead, Lori, I see your hand is up. Lori, if you're speaking you might be on mute.

Lori Schulman: Oh sorry, yes. I think the plenary might be a good way to go for a variety of reasons. I know the RPMs is discussing that too in the sense that we're thinking about breaking down into work teams and then meeting every other week and then having the work teams meeting every other week. So depending on how involved you want to be, it might be, you know, two less calls a month than normal. So I think others are thinking of that too. I wanted to point that out.

In terms of getting ahead of what we're trying to achieve, I know we're only at the preliminary stages of it but I think these ideas are good to be talking about now that it can frame as we go into the actual work what really – what we really need to focused on. So I don't – my thought is, Marika, I welcome them as part of the team. And what I've noticed is, I mean, I've missed a lot of the initial calls although I was on some of the initial calls of this group where nobody showed up and the calls were canceled.

So if this group is to remain this small, which I don't necessarily I think I have a problem with, I think it's a great time to talk about these new ideas and things and different kinds of thinking as we go through the questions.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. And this is Julie again. I'll note that just sort of a process note about these charters, just because not everybody has, as Lori noted, you know, been on all calls. But each charter is meant to be an implementation plan for a particular recommendation or recommendations.

So in this case, for example, if the working group were to decide that what has already occurred, that is the expedited policy development process that's referenced here, you know, the Policy and Implementation Working Group recommendations, and their implementations, and then the fact that there is flexibility already in the PDP, you know, for phasing or other methods to speed up the work, if the working group were to decide that these steps were sufficient to implement this recommendation, then the working group could simply declare that Recommendation 15 is implemented.

So that means we'd be done with this one. It would – and same with 8. If the working group on Recommendation 8 that we just discussed and it appears that the work that has already been done has actually resulted in an implementation of Recommendation 8, then the working group would say, okay, Recommendation 8 is implemented.

So, you know, in this case, we are having discussions about some possible perhaps changes to the PDP Manual, perhaps something that encourages working groups to find efficiencies. Now phasing is something that is talked about in one of the other charters and staff notes in that charter that phasing is actually already occurring in several different PDPs while it is not specifically encouraged.

So perhaps this charter and that charter on phasing could be combined into one and the working group might decide yes, staff, suggest some language that could go in the PDP Manual that would encourage a plenary type of model and also encourage phasing where appropriate.

So that's my question. And that with that language, once that language is implemented in the PDP Manual, then these recommendations the working group could deem them to be completed. So my question is, would the working group like staff to – we can take the charter on phasing – this charter – combine them and suggest some language for the PDP Manual that the working group could look at that would address the issue of timeliness and also encourage phasing, so those being two separate recommendations that seem to be related.

Jennifer Wolfe: Julie, this is Jen. I think that makes a lot of sense to look at doing that. And I think, you know, if you go back – for Lori just some history to – the way that we've structured all of our work in this working group is to take these recommendations that were already underway so that we could say, you know, if there's any changes or if we think that it's on track, that then we say, okay, this is the completed charter, this is underway, and then we are sort of checking the box on those recommendations.

So I think that sounds like a really efficient way for us to combine some of these and to the extent that we feel like there's anything new that needs to be addressed that the recommendation is that – is added to the PDP Manual. So I think that makes a lot of sense, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. And I'm just taking an action item here. And I just brought up – I just brought up the charter for Recommendation 14 and that one is the feasibility for breaking PDPs into discrete stages so the chunking recommendation. And on this one, that, you know, again, you know, staff had asked the question of whether or not there, excuse me, should be specific language to encourage working groups to look at the option of phasing.

And, you know, so in this case too, you know, like I said, we could come up with language that would address both sort of the speeding up of PDPs as well as, you know, phasing and also perhaps, you know, a plenary type of model as well. I'll just note from the chat Marika has said there may also be other models that may be worth exploring similar organizations to see how they conduct similar activities. Thank you, I'll put that also in here.

And I note also that Wolf-Ulrich says, "I agree to your suggestion, Julie." So I've taken that as an action and that would also then address Recommendation 14 as well so we'll put those two together. And again I'll just note that with the key performance indicators, this is also one where it wasn't exactly clear what we would measure, I mean, one possible measurement of whether or not, you know, whether or not the, you know, phasing is something that we want to encourage would be to perhaps look at PDPs that were phased and those that weren't and look at, you know, their timeliness.

But given the disparity between PDPs I think you know, that might not really be that useful of an indicator. But in any case, staff will take the action to combine these two and come up with some suggested draft language.

So that actually addressed Recommendation 14 and 15 so will move ahead to the next recommendations. And this is – these actually were recommendations that had already been combined. They're Recommendation 16 and 18. And this has to do with evaluating the post-

implementation policy impact and effectiveness. And on this – on these recommendations, actually it was very helpful that we had Berry Cobb who had joined the meeting in Copenhagen actually remotely.

But he had noted that there was, with respect to the policy impact assessment, and I'll point here to some new language, quite a bit of work resulted from the final report of the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group. And then Berry had suggested a number of changes pointing to that work and how that work actually addressed aspects of these recommendations.

So I'm moving to the second page where that, you know, staff had noted that Recommendation 16 and 18 appear to be addressed in the DMPM final report. The Item A is stricken, that was relating to Recommendation 2 to update Annex 2 of the Operating Procedures for early outreach on scope and quantitative input. That actually doesn't fall in the scope of these recommendations, Berry noted.

But Recommendation 3 directs staff to create and publish new templates of the issue report, charter and final report templates. And this has been completed. Work product templates were created and deployed in the GNSO Operating Procedures and also included in the GNSO site.

And in this charter template it has a new section that directs the drafting team in the deliverables and timeframe section and states, "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." And then it lists a number of things that need to be there, identification of policy goals, identification of metrics to measure whether policy goals are achieved, identification of potential problems.

“In attaining the data or developing the metrics, should suggest a timeline in which the measure should be performed, current state baselines of the policy and initial benchmarks that define success or failure. Metrics may include but not limited to,” and then there’s a link to a hints and tips page. “ICANN Compliance data, industry metric sources, community input via public comment and surveys or studies.”

So then where Recommendation 6 directs staff to update Annex 2 of the Policy Development Process Manual with the new Section 4, 5, 2, Metrics, that is noted as completed. And same as Recommendation 7, noted as completed. And while staff noted that the current policy development process does not document the policy impact analysis, I mean, it has the charter template, including that working groups must have a policy impact analysis, staff notes that ICANN has documented the review process and there’s several links here relating – related links here.

So what staff found was that quite a bit of work actually has been done. And just looking back up to the original recommendations, 16 was that a policy impact analysis to be included as a standard part of the process that is now included. And then that the Council evaluate post-implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis rather than periodically, and that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting of scope of future PDP charters.

So the question I think staff has here is while 16 seems definitely to be completed; 18 has further evaluation aspects. And I guess the question would be then, does the requirement of the working group having a policy impact analysis and taking all these measurements is that sufficient to address 18 or does there need to be additional language in the Working Group Guidelines or elsewhere in the – somewhere else in the Operating Procedures where the Council is tasked with evaluating these, you know, these policy impact assessments and the policy effectiveness? So I’ll put that out there as a question.

And I'll note we have 7 minutes left so we may end up having to carry on this discussion on the list as well and staff can frame questions there also. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Yes, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, Julie. By reading this charter and the, you know, the suggestions, for the new charter template, working group charter right now so under deliverables and timeframes, so my question here is so when we – and we are going to compare, you know, the – what is envisaged as an outcome here, which is detailed on the – this charter template, and when we compare it with the Recommendation Number 18 itself, so we should be clear because 18 is pointing to the policy effectiveness.

So this is, to my understanding, a detail of the policy impact analysis which could be – could have a wider frame, you know. So we shouldn't forget that is just about the policy effectiveness with regard to that recommendation. And the question what it means, does it mean here that the goals of this policy development process have been achieved? Or does it mean that this achieving these goals there is, well, something, well, the policy implementation could be done in a better, in a more effective way or what does it mean?

So this is a little bit too me we should be clear about that. I understand that, so I've – I'm still reading and I have all that to read so more in detail to be clear about whether this is in line to each other. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I think that is really the key question here is what do we mean by post implementation policy effectiveness and evaluating that. And perhaps what staff needs to do, happy to do this, is look back a little bit more at how this recommendation arose, some of the discussion within the

GNSO Review Working Party as to the, you know, the genesis of this recommendation to get a clear sense of what, you know, what their expectations were.

And I think there is – I know there is some additional discussion around this that staff would be able to pull and pull out and present to the working group which staff can do on the list as well to tee this up for further discussion. And here I see Amr in the chat is saying, “Does the working group also wish to address the distinction between periodic versus ongoing post implementation policy effectiveness evaluation?” That’s a very good question.

Right now it says, you know, ongoing is the recommendation as opposed to periodic, which is what is in the GNSO Operating Procedures. So the question would be do we want – does the working group want something – what is currently stated in the Operating Procedures would then be changed to ongoing and perhaps with specific language concerning the evaluation of the post-implementation policy effectiveness. I see Amr is still typing.

I’m just noting for the time we just have, Jen, two minutes left.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, I was just looking at that as well.

Julie Hedlund: So perhaps we can wrap this up and staff can take the action to frame these – these questions a little bit more, provide some more background. Amr also said, “Implementation of ongoing evaluations also needs to be considered.” So we have a couple more pieces here to kind of flesh out in this recommendation and staff can take the action on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Julie. And just to recap, I know a couple of you came in late, and we thank you for participating. I know we have a small group. We did get through most of the revised charters in follow up to the ICANN 58 meeting so thank you all for working through that. If staff can address the issues that we

discussed and circulate that on list so we can certainly encourage any further discussion for those who weren't able to attend the meeting.

We did discuss at the very beginning sending out the Doodle poll just one more to check in with everybody. I know a few of you who are regular participants, this is a very early morning call so if you would like to see us shift that call, you know, we certainly hope you'll note that in the Doodle poll. And, you know, we'll try to get a little more attendance or at least participation on list.

And our next meeting, we are on an every other week cycle, which we thought was appropriate for this working group, so our next meeting would be scheduled on Thursday, April 13. If there is a shift in the time due to the Doodle poll then that will be noted, but otherwise, we will plan on picking up where we left off here on April 13.

Is there any other comments or business before we conclude the meeting? I see Amr is typing. Anyone else – just jump in since it's a small group if you'd like to speak up. Okay, I see Amr is still typing. I haven't quite seen that come up yet so we'll just wait a moment and then we'll bring the meeting to a close.

Amr is saying, oh at Wolf-Ulrich, "I don't believe it has. This would be dependent on how the DMPM recs are implemented." Wolf-Ulrich, any other response to that in terms of your question?

Wolf-Ulrich Knob: Well, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Just, well, then we have to think about in more detail. So in the – may I ask, well, to staff to look at this data metrics recommendations where the definitions are with regard to that. Maybe that is helpful. If we don't have any common basis for that with regards to effectiveness, so we have there is a – we have a really weak ground well, to find a solution for this. So just if there is something available and could be brought up next time that would be helpful or on the list.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. If staff could look into that that would be helpful to just regroup on that particular point. Okay, well we are at the top of the hour. I thank all of you for participating. We will get that Doodle poll out to see if we need to shift the time of this meeting, but we'll look forward to picking this up again either on list or in our next call in two weeks. Thanks, everybody, and have a great day.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks, bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, all. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. This concludes today's call. You may now stop the recordings. Have a good day.

END