

TRANSCRIPT

GNSO Review Working Party Wednesday 18 November 2015 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance:

Avri Doria
Chuck Gomes
Jen Wolfe
Klaus Stoll
Rudi Vansnick
Amr Elsadr
Osvaldo Novoa

Apologies: none

Staff:

Larisa Gurnick,
Charla Shambley
Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Bruce). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Call on the 18th of November 2015.

On the call today we have Osvaldo Novoa, Klaus Stoll, Rudi Vansnick, Chuck Gomes, Avri Doria and Jen Wolfe. We received no apologies today's call.

And from staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Glen DeSaintgery, Charla Shambley and myself Nathalie Peregrine. (Almay Alsadi) has just joined us in the Adobe Connect room.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much. And over to you Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks so much. And thanks everybody for making time again to continue our work in reviewing the recommendations. As many of you may recall during our in person meeting in Dublin, we used - utilized this format that I think was very effective in allowing us to work our way through each of the recommendations provided by the independent examiners and tally the survey results that we had provided as a group and be able to then discuss them to determine do we think that these should go forward.

Do we think they should go forward with comments? Do we think work is already being done in a certain way within the ICANN community? Do we think there should be some modifications or do we just believe it should not be implemented?

And just as a reminder to everybody, our goal here is to use this as a tool to get us through all of the recommendations and then we will formulate that into a written recommendation to - I was about to say SIC but the Organizational Effectiveness Committee so that they could then determine how to go forward. They did give us an extension of time in order to do this work. So we're appreciative of that extension of time.

You know, our hope today is that we get through the remaining - I think we have 13 more recommendations. That we can get through those recommendations and then if needed we can schedule one more meeting just to recap and review and determine our final communication to the OEC to keep us on track.

So any comments or just questions before we dig into the recommendations on the screen? Okay. Great. Then we'll go ahead and get started.

So this first recommendation on the screen, and again, these are just in the order that we were working them through; Recommendation Number 3, excuse me; that the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups.

So I'll just open it up now for comments, questions. You can see here we said on the side at the - in terms of ease of implementation, (if it seems hard). And we had a 50% number in terms of where people responded. So comments on this particular point? Yes. Amr, please.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jen. This is Amr. Yes. That there's a bit of an overlap between this recommendation and one of the responses we gave to another where when we discussed incentives to people participating in the working groups who - I think we put in language in our recommendation as a review team that the incentives should not be financial.

So I would be a little concerned on how the implementation of this recommendation would take place. I would be concerned on who determines how the finances are allocated to working group members.

I'm not saying that it can't be worked out but there are still a lot of questions around how this could be done. I certainly wouldn't want this recommendation to go through and the GNSO Council being faced with a position where it has to decide who should get funded to participate in working group meetings.

I think - well from recent experience, which is rather limited on my time on Council, it just seems a little problematic that a GNSO Council is making these sorts of decisions. It's easier when the stakeholder groups and constituencies (doing so).

I'm just saying there's a lot of context behind a recommendation like this and there's more work that needs to be done before we consider recommending that it be implemented. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thanks Amr. And you're exactly right. We did talk about that in Dublin that, you know, there shouldn't be financial, you know, if that's an incentive. And I agree this is a fairly broad statement. Klaus, please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Yes. For me first of all the language is a little bit imprecise because what does it mean remove cost barriers. What are cost barriers? And for example I think - I'm sorry that I'm coming back to the financial part. I understand Amr and I completely agree with him. But it's like squaring the circle.

For example, one of the cost barrier is quite simply time and people are - can't do their day job with which they earn their bread if they really properly participate in the working groups.

So I'm really not happy with that word cost barrier because normally the travel and the participation in working groups face-to-face meetings and so on is often covered. But the other barriers, the real barriers of participating in the working group, i.e., time and - is - and the cost related to that is not included in here. And so for me it's absolutely not clear this recommendation. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thanks. And I'll just note Marika noted in the chat that for most of this its conference calls. It's not necessarily a cost to participate. I just wanted to reference that. Chuck, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Thanks Jen. And following up on what Amr and Klaus said, just a little history in terms of another area where the GNSO has tried to remove some cost barriers. And that's with regard to travel to ICANN in person meetings.

And initially it started out on kind of an as needed basis. And then over time it basically became a default that Councilors and officers and so forth would take the slots and if there were any left over for those who had need, they could apply those. And then of course you have the fellowship program as well with very strict guidelines for how to participate.

So Amr's points are really well taken that who decides and how do you decide it. It's not an easy thing. And it's real easy for example if we're talking about a working group and there's any cost that might occur like for example to an in person meeting, chances are although maybe this could be controlled is that we might start out on an as need basis if we can define what - how to evaluate need.

But if it's like the past has shown, it'll go to the working group Chairs and so forth. So it is a complicated issue. At least half of us said this is a hard one. And 2/3 of us said it was going to be an expensive one. And I think those are very true characterizations of this particular recommendation.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. And I see Rudi you have your hand up so please go ahead and then perhaps we can agree on what our response is on this comment. Rudi, please go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Jen. Rudi for the transcript. While it - I agree with what was said by the three previous speakers. Although the trouble is one of the issues that are not enabling people to participate in face-to-face meetings. But I think that there is also something else that could help in bringing in new blood and more participants in the working groups.

Although the community Wiki of the working groups has already, to me my experience still today is that there's a bit more effort to be done on the Wiki than (unintelligible).

When you're used to work in working group, you find quite often more or less easily your way in the Wiki of the working group. But for newcomers it takes time to get through and to find the status of the working group for instance already is one of the issues that - it's probably not when you go to the working group.

So I think some efforts could be done on having a better overview and summary of the status of the working group so that the newcomer can easily find a way of okay, this is something I could jump in (yes or no). That's at least what I find.

Jen Wolfe: Great. That's Rudi. That's a great comment. So it sounds like, you know, where we are is that the idea of removing, you know, barriers to participation is - would be helpful with things like Rudi just mentioned, maybe some training or making it easier to use the Wiki.

But anything regarding cost would need to be better defined in order to proceed. Would that be a good way to summarize that we agree with the intent of removing barriers but that cost needs to be defined and that we look at maybe other ways to remove barriers? That work? Anybody opposed to that comment? Okay. Great. We see checks. All right.

Chuck Gomes: And...

Jen Wolfe: Yes. Sure Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Jen, this is Chuck. Let me follow up with that. The - I think an action item for implementing this particular one would be to do what you just said and what Klaus said and others as well.

First of - a first step on this one is to identify what the cost barriers are for different groups. I think that's an action item that needs to precede going too far with this. And several people have hit on that. We really need to define

what the cost barriers are before we can attempt to remove them or even reduce them.

Jen Wolfe: That's an excellent point. Thank you very much. Okay. So moving on to Recommendation 7, the stakeholder groups and constituencies engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English as a means to overcoming language barriers.

And I think we talked a little bit about this in Dublin but, you know, again, I notice this is a very broad statement. But comments on this particular recommendation. Klaus, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: To be absolutely honest, I feel a little bit insulted by this recommendation because as somebody who is working the constituency with all the limited language skills I've got in Spanish and other languages and really trying to engage with people in their mother tongues or however all the way. And I think to put the workload away from ICANN as a whole into the stakeholder and to the constituencies I find a little bit - very limited. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. And Charla and Larisa, I saw your hands both went up there. Do you have a point of clarification for us on this issue?

Larisa Gurnick: Actually this is Larisa. And Jen, I was hoping to go back to Rec 3 real quickly...

Jen Wolfe: Sure. Sure. No problem.

Larisa Gurnick: ...and get consensus so that we can appropriately tag it with the color scheme that has been developed. So it...

Jen Wolfe: I think it was a yellow that we agree with the intent but suggested modification.

Larisa Gurnick: Right. Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Was that - Charla, was that yours as well?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. Charla had the same question.

Jen Wolfe: Sorry about that. I'll make sure I use the color code. I'm sorry.

Larisa Gurnick: No problem. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Thanks guys. Okay. So other comments on Recommendation 7? Rudi, please go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Jen. Rudi for the transcript. I think it goes together with my previous comment. If there is any possibility of having some reason different languages on the working groups work that is done, that could definitely (unintelligible) people to join the working group and be of help and especially having the ability to communicate what is in another language into the community. I think it's going close to what I mentioned for the Recommendation 3.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Rudi. And a question to staff. Is this already being done? I feel like this is perhaps being done in some instances. Is it being done in all instances where there are transcriptions available? Does anybody from staff know?

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, this is Larisa. I don't know that it's being done on a consistent basis.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: ...Mary might be able to provide more substantive answer.

Jen Wolfe: That would be great. Marika, please if you can provide any enlightenment on this issue.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I'm sorry. I just got disconnected (between this point) but I understand the question is in relation to what is provided with regard to translation of documents.

Jen Wolfe: Correct.

Marika Konings: The PDP manual does describe some guidance in that regard. And I think there's a standard package at least from a policy development process perspective, all Executive Summaries of documents are translated. And in addition to that, final reports are fully translated. So that is I think what the current guidance is that it's provided, you know, as a result as well of the community conversations on the PDP.

And as well I know for example, the GNSO Web site we do have, you know, made it easier for people to like use Google translate or Bing translate to translate pages as well as the Web site, which I know is of course not a perfect translation but at least we've tried as well to make it easier for people to do that at their own account.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thank you very much. So what - is the consensus that this is work that's being done or do we think that more needs to be done towards this recommendation? Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. It seems to me that this is a recommendation that probably should - in terms of implementation should be combined with several others because they're - I think they're - and I haven't identified all of them.

But it seems to me there are several recommendations that all kind of tie into this one. And it might be good if we identified similar or related recommendations and suggest that they be looked at together even Number

3 that we just looked at with regard to cost barriers could be somewhat related to this.

So I think there's interdependencies of several of the recommendations that might be good if they were combined in terms of implementation.

Jen Wolfe: Great point. Thank you. And Amr, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Jen. This is Amr. Yes. Chuck makes a really good point. I was actually going to ask - it feels to me that I'm reading this recommendation a little differently than others are because to me this doesn't seem like a recommendation barrier towards increasing participation in working groups or sort of providing access in different languages for things like the final reports of PDP working groups, which is already being done.

But it seems more like a recommendation that's being made to stakeholder groups and constituencies with the GNSO regarding how they function internally. At least that was my understanding of the recommendation.

And so when I first read this and I submitted the comments on that, I thought it was a pretty good recommendation actually. In terms of implementing, it might be considerably difficult to do this. That is if the recommendation is actually geared more towards the stakeholder groups and constituencies sort of reaching out to their membership - those members who do not use languages other than English for example.

So yes, I just wanted to just say that I actually do like this recommendation. I think it's a good idea. As far as the NCUC is concerned for example, we do have Executive Committee members from different regions who are - whose - they're meant to actually do this to sort of reach out to the members of the constituency who are from the regions and try to help them to the extent possible. But it hasn't been implemented too well.

And I would say that it might be challenging to implement it in the aftermath of this review as well. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks. And Chuck, I see your hand's up again. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I just wanted to give a illustration with regard to the Registry Stakeholder Group because this came up recently. We haven't done anything on it yet. But it relates to this recommendation.

One of the things that constituencies and stakeholder groups could possibly do in the special budget request that we do every year - those have for the most part been related to travel. But it's possible that some of us could put in requests for funding of some translation services for other similar language support that would help us in our individual groups in that regard.

So I'd just give that as an example as maybe one way in which some of us maybe could respond to a recommendation like this.

Jen Wolfe: So is the consensus that we agree with the intent but we want some clarification or refinement of this? Or do you think that it's a general idea that we should accept and say move forward with this recommendation? Is there a consensus that we flag it as green? Yes, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I think that it's correct to say we support the intent. I think this is one that's hard to say too much without involving the individual stakeholder groups and constituencies because Amr's right. It is directed at stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So this may be one where we want to get some representatives together in a small group and see what their particular needs are on this before going too far down the path of making recommendations because it may be different for different stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So I guess what I'm saying is yes, we support the intent but it may be a good idea to involve some representatives from SGs and Cs to further discuss how this might happen.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. So, no, I think that's great Chuck. Thank you. So I think that would flag this as a yellow that we agree with the intent. And the modification that we would suggest is that further discussion be held with the SGs and Cs to, you know, refine how this would move into implementation. Does that work?

Chuck Gomes: Works for me. This is Chuck.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Anybody opposed to that? Okay. (Seen) Chuck. That's good. Okay. Then let's move on to Recommendation Number 9, which states that a formal working group leadership assessment program be developed as part of the overall training and development program.

So again, that's a fairly broad statement. So I guess we could start with is this something that we think is important and should perhaps be refined a bit or is there opposition to this idea? Klaus, please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: I just would like to know what is meant by working group leadership assessment program. Is it to assess the leadership of working groups or is it to train working group leaders? What is meant by that?

Jen Wolfe: I think that's a great question. We can try to pull up some of the context and the details. If I recall and Larisa, you may have more to add to it but I think it was an idea of assessing and trying to help working group leaders have training and become more developed. Larisa, do you have more context to add to that?

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, Jen. Yes, this is Larisa. My recollection was that this had to do with assessing the needs of the leadership for training and development. So it wasn't an assessment of their performance as much - at all, I think it was

really the assessment of where they feel they needed additional training and development to be better more effective leaders.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you. Rudi, please go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Jen. Rudi for the transcript. Indeed I think it's important that if we want to have working groups that are successful and leading into good policy it is important to have good leadership, chairs and co-chairs, having the experience with one PDP working group where I was a co-chair, we both were new in doing this kind of work. It would be good if there was a possibility to have some kind of group training that allows people to raise their hand and become a leader of a group and avoid that the group is going down when the leader is not available or is just dropping off.

I think in the context of the academy that we have in ICANN now perhaps there could be a slot specifically for the working group leads.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. It seems to me that this is a green and that the action item for the GNSO in this one is to develop a needs assessment for working group leaders. And that to me is a way to -- that's really what this is calling for. And I don't hear anybody disagreeing with the requirement to assess the needs for working group leaders.

Jennifer Wolfe: No. That's great. I think you're right. So I'm seeing checkmarks so let's mark that is green with the notation for the GNSO to develop a needs assessment so let's mark that as green.

Klaus Stoll: Sorry, this is Klaus.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure.

Klaus Stoll: Can't we just reframe the - reframe the thing so that it's a little bit clearer, the recommendation, just reword it in such a sense that it's clear what it was actually meant.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, you mean the needs assessment?

Klaus Stoll: Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. So hopefully Charla has that. And like I said, we'll circulate these again so everybody can look at them so if we think any more refinements need to be made or comments we can have one more round and making those comments.

Okay so moving on in our discussion we will move on to Recommendation Number 10, which states that the GNSO Council develop criteria for working groups to engage a professional facilitator or moderator in certain situations. Klaus, I see your hand up, please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Sorry that I'm talking so much that I'm very passionate about it. Out of my professional experience I'm basically very much against the use of professional facilitators and moderators because quite simply there, into groups and into things are specific dynamics going on and from outsiders who are basically not subject experts often they do more good than harm. But that is just a personal opinion which shouldn't scupper this recommendation.

But what I find really wooly is the whole, again the wording of the presentation. What does it mean in certain situations, what does it mean engage? What is a professional facilitator/moderator? I think the intent is to get some more professionalism into the working groups but I think this is exactly the wrong way and also it's very costly. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thanks. And Marika, I saw your hand go up. Please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. It may be worth pointing out here as well that of course we currently do have a pilot program that's ongoing in relation to facilitated face-to-face working group meetings. So as part of that we also anticipate that we will be providing the feedback that we've received as a result from that experience which also may help inform and, you know, maybe to Klaus's point indeed as well whether that was actually deemed helpful or not.

And I can only speak from my personal experience but I think indeed for some of the meetings I share the perspective that Klaus has then it may not always work as the person doesn't necessarily have, you know, the understanding of both, you know, the subject matter nor the dynamics that exist in the community. But of course there may be situations in which it could be very useful.

But again I think the review of that pilots may help inform, you know, further conversations around this whether indeed it's deemed, you know, worthwhile to pursue or whether, you know, the benefits don't outweigh the cost that of course a professional facilitator or moderator would bring with them.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. And Chuck please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And Avri had a good comment in the chat too an example of where a facilitator could be helpful. Now as Marika I think hinted that there, we've had some success using facilitators. And in some cases they haven't been external facilitators who don't know anything but people who are familiar. So that - Klaus, I think that your concerns could be addressed based on the development of - by developing criteria that deal with that. In some cases it might be better to use somebody that's internal, in others it might not. Maybe in a case like Avri mentioned there where the - where a group is that loggerheads there.

So that note that this recommendation is just developing criteria for when facilitators or moderators might be used. So again I think this is a green. And

I think that the criteria themselves that are developed could deal with the concerns that - the legitimate concerns that Klaus mentioned and also of course in Avri's chat comment that, I mean, that's probably one criteria where a facilitator or moderator might be useful.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. So I guess my only question on that would just be orange since there is a pilot program and we want to see the outcome of that pilot program for this to proceed? Or do some of you feel like this is a red, that it's not...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I don't - is that pilot program developing criteria? Or is it just experimenting with the concept? If it's developing criteria, orange would be okay. If it's not then I'm not sure it's already underway.

Jennifer Wolfe: Marika, can you provide some clarity on that?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. The pilot itself is not specifically focused on criteria although we've tried and as part of, you know, how would you identify someone and how do you identify which project. I think that has some criteria. But I do anticipate that when we review it we may come back with certain criteria for which, you know, facilitate at face to face meetings maybe useful on what the Council should consider. So not a real black white answer but I suspect that some guidance or suggestions may be included as part of that review.

Jennifer Wolfe: Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Maybe our suggestion should be that we encourage the pilot that's going on to also take at least the first step in developing criteria and then if necessary further work can be done on that after the pilot.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that would be a good way to proceed. Do you all think orange? I see maybe checks for orange or prefer green?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I can live with orange if we make a comment like I just said.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's okay.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Seeing some checkmarks there. So Charla, let's mark that one orange with a comment that we want to see the outcome of the existing pilot program and that if it is positive that more criteria be developed.

Okay moving on to Recommendation 13, which states that the GNSO Council evaluate and if appropriate pilot a technology solution such as Lumio, or similar, to facilitate wider participation in working group consensus-based decision making. And I think we're starting to get into the ones where there was more discrepancy on that everyone thought so what is your feelings? Do we need more technology solutions? Do what we have work? Or is there already work being done to evaluate technology solutions?

Any comments on this recommendation? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, sorry to talk so much. But I think that work is going on. I think staff's been looking at technology solutions for years probably.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And - but I don't think this is something that's a done deal. I think you're always - you always should be looking for solutions that help us do our collaboration better. So it's not as if I don't think we ever reach - so I think one of our comments should be this should be a continuous improvement type

thing where we always try within cost constraints to have the most effective technology solutions to help us do what we do.

Jennifer Wolfe: No that's a great point. Marika, can you - do you know if this work is currently being done?

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So, yes, Chuck is correct that there are various things staff is looking at and we actually explored recently I think another tool. And again I'm not familiar with Lumio so I don't know if it was, you know, a similar kind of approach. But again it was a tool on facilitating working group participation, sign up, you know, working on documents. And I know we're looking at other tools as well for example to facilitate working group sign ups.

So I agree with Chuck, I think this is probably something of, you know, continuous improvement. And, you know, probably helpful as well to involve staff in the conversation to see what has already been evaluated and reviewed and see, indeed, are there other tools such as Lumio that may need to be further considered as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jen. This is Amr. Well this is a personal opinion. I'm not familiar with Lumio either. But I have done a lot of work on implementation of information systems for collaborative work especially for the healthcare field. And I've done a lot of reading on academic papers that have been dealing with this both in and outside of healthcare for a decade now.

And it seems to me that the - well the rough consensus on this from an academic perspective is that introduction of a system does not necessarily mean improvements inserted like the work that is being done. I think there is a general flaw in the principal or the assumption that introducing a system will help increase working group participation or engagement with the wider

public in that sense. I think this is something that needs to be studied very carefully.

I think in a lot of situations introducing new systems actually complicates the work for the people who are already doing it, people who are already kind of used to doing the work and the way they have been doing it and introducing new technologies may complicate it. It could be very problematic. And I would recommend a more cautious approach before doing anything too drastic in terms of implementing this recommendation. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. So since there is some work being done would be coded this as an orange with a comment that we believe in continuous improvement but that no specific tool is being recommended and that we should not, to your point, Amr, just add tools for the sake of adding tools that ensure they're really needing some specific need that's currently unmet? And I saw - I think Rudi said yellow. Do we think orange since there is some work being done?

So it was checks or stop signs, whatever you have for no. Orange - is orange okay since there is some work being done with those comments? Okay I see one check. Three checks. Anyone opposed to flagging as orange? Okay so we've got to those comments that will be added to that recommendation.

Okay so Recommendation 14 that the GNSO further explore PDP chunking and examines each potential PDP - okay you guys are moving it on me and making it hard. So the GNSO further explores PDP chunking and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.

And I guess maybe at the outside if we can just ask Marika again, is there any update on what's being done in the PDP working group? Please, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think this is basically something that is already being done. I think that the GNSO Council examines, you know, each PDP at its

merit and determines what is the best approach for dealing with them. And then I think, you know, the three PDPs that are currently under consideration, you know, all specifically discussed as part of the preliminary issue report as well as, you know, Council conversations on what is the best way of dealing with it, should it be, you know, sequential in phases, should it be broken up?

And then of course this as well for the working group to determine themselves what is the best way of working. So at least from my perspective I don't think there's anything that is preventing the GNSO as well as PDP working groups from doing so. And I think they're actually doing that already. Although of course at the same time it needs to be recognized that, you know, at the end of the day everything will need to be - will need to come together to, you know, get submitted to the Council and subsequently the board.

So it's unlikely, although I don't think the PDP as such prevents it that, you know, certain recommendations could already start - being start passed through while others are still being worked on, although I guess in theory that is an option too.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Marika. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Jen, this is Amr. I certainly agree with Marika here. I think it is important to allow the GNSO some level of flexibility to determine when and if chunking is necessary or helpful. The way this recommendation is worded I don't think it's harmful in any way, it's just saying that - asking the GNSO explores PDP chunking which is kind of in a way already happening.

And so I don't think there's a problem with the GNSO exploring this concept and seeing when and how it could be useful or helpful. I will note that there were some I think legitimate concerns to this recommendation raised by Westlake themselves in the report and they mentioned this. So these are I

guess things like, for example, continuity of volunteers across different chunks in a single PDP for example.

So could be problems with this. But like I said kind of doing this on an ad hoc basis where the GNSO itself determines when this could be helpful or not would be fine but in principle I don't see anything - I don't think the recommendation itself is problematic, it's just asking the GNSO to explore this. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I think I'm in agreement with everything that's been said. I think the word "further" kind of throws us off a little bit. This is another I think continuous improvement type thing that for any PDP ideas such as chunking should be considered if it works. And of course one of the most successful examples of chunking is the inter registrar transfer policy the way it was broken down. And that process is finally coming to a head in implementation right now.

But even with the PDP that's under consideration for registration data that's going to be a huge and very long PDP. In essence there's some chunking in the issues report not in the same way that happened with the inter registrar transfer policy but some phases. So I think that's an example where, again, it's been considered and probably should - in each PDP of any significant size or complication this is something that should be explored.

So I think it's not so much further exploring as it is in each case evaluating whether some form of chunking, and there's not one size fits all as the two examples I cited are very different, but it should be examined where appropriate and decided like Amr said, with the discretion to the Council to - and the whole GNSO to decide whether it's useful.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thanks, Chuck. So do we feel like this is - because work is being done on this that we would code it orange with some refinements? Chuck is saying yes. So maybe better defining chunk and how that is determined. Okay I'm seeing checks. Chuck, is that a new hand? Go ahead, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: It is, it is because I don't know that chunk needs to be defined. In fact we don't want to be restrictive or like I gave two examples where two very different types of chunking occurred. So I'm not sure it's necessary to define chunking because we need - I think it's better to be flexible there.

What's being proposed in the report for the registration data PDP is very different than the chunking that occurred for the inter registrar transfer policy. But they're both very I think can be very useful and helpful in the PDP process. So I don't think that we need to define chunking but I'm open to discussion on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: So do you think, Chuck, in terms of a comment if we say this is orange the work is already being done and is underway but if we're going to add something to it that it's not necessarily defining chunking but defining when it's appropriate or giving - defining when it could be used?

Chuck Gomes: Well yeah - this is Chuck again. And, yes, I mean, obviously the usefulness of chunking really comes into play in more complex and long PDPs. So in that sense, you know, that's what happened with the inter registrar transfer policy. And that's what's being proposed using phases in their registration data PDP that the Council is going to probably vote on tomorrow. So, yeah, I think you're got the gist of what is appropriate here.

But it is - it's already being done. And I don't know if we want to cite two examples, one that's happened successfully and one that's proposed, that are two separate examples. It's probably not necessary to cite the examples because certainly the Council will be very familiar with those.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay so are we in consensus this can be coded orange - work's already being done. I think I've seen a little bit on the chat. Everybody okay with that? Anyone opposed?

Okay, then we'll move on to Recommendation 21 which states that the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well represented in the policy making process.

Thoughts and comments. I don't believe any work is being done on this right now but Marika or Mary please correct me if I'm wrong about that. I think this is a relatively new recommendation. Marika, do you have some more context on that?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I'm not aware that this is anything that the GNSO Council would be doing. And I'm not really sure that the Council is set up or even authorized or, you know, as part of its mission to undertake or commission trends.

But I did see actually an announcement passing by yesterday that I think was looking for input on the health of the gTLD sector. I don't remember exactly what it was called. But I think there is probably work going on maybe within the GDD team that I think looks more at this kind of information so maybe it's more appropriate to say that the Council should check whether such information is available and get briefed on it so it can factor into, you know, requirements for policy.

So again it may be worth checking what is already going on but I'm not really sure if it's really for the Council at least in its current role to undertake that kind of work.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. Rudi, please go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Jen. Rudi for the transcript. Well indeed I don't think it's the duty of the Council but it's rather than constituencies and stakeholder groups that could see -- request for policy future. And sometimes it pops up also during working groups that something needs to be done out of that working and that should be triggered in a certain way. I don't know how this is done today but that seems to me quite important that you can trigger upcoming new policy based on work that is done in a working group.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Klaus, please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I think I'm not quite sure what an analysis of trends in gTLD means. I would also agree with this is not a GNSO Council problem and would Rudi what Rudi said it's more in the constituency for it. But I would, for example, be very much interested to know with the consumer satisfaction of the new gTLDs how our end users take these things and that should influence the policy that happens further. So I think this is a recommendation again which is fairly (weak) and needs a lot of refinement.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Klaus. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I had a lot of trouble with this recommendation. I'm with Klaus on the fact, how do you analyze trends in gTLDs? What do they mean by that? It's one thing to look for possible policy issues that may be coming up based on what's happening with gTLDs but I'm not sure how you analyze trends in gTLDs. That doesn't mean anything.

And then the second part of the recommendation is very different and something that I think should be happening all the time for the Council and that is to ensure those affected are well represented. That should be an ongoing practice of the Council to make sure that those who are impacted are well represented. So that's a very different thing than analyzing trends.

So I think first of all this should be looked at -- and I'm not sure we can color code it one way because I'm not even sure I agree with analyzing trends of gTLDs even if I could figure out what it meant. If we're talking about forecasting likely policy requirements that's one thing but analyzing trends in gTLDs to do that I don't understand that. So let me stop there. This is I think the problematic recommendation. Not that the intent is it's probably okay but the first part doesn't -- I don't understand the second part should be ongoing practice of the GNSO Council.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. And I do want to add I agree, I mean, I feel like to a certain extent that that is what the stakeholder groups and constituencies do is bring to the forefront policy issues that need to be considered. And so probably my biggest concern with this recommendation is that what does "undertake a commission or commission an analysis" does that mean hire somebody to go do that? You know, isn't that what the GDD is already doing? So I agree there's some may be confusion on the wording.

And, you know, we might want to look at do we flag this as a red, as they do not implement with an explanation of that so that it's not construed that we don't, you know, believe in the importance of, you know, looking at policy issues? Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jen. This is Amr. Yeah, I agree that the term I guess "analysis of trends in gTLDs" may be a bit confusing. I'm not exactly sure what that means either. But I - in general when reading this recommendation what I was thinking was something more in line of having actual empirical data to base policy discussions on or at least - not based that but at least to help move the discussions along in a certain way. Yeah so I was thinking when I read this recommendation I was thinking about the few Whois studies that were done like privacy proxy abuse and that sort of thing.

And I was also thinking about the Data Metrics for Policy Making Working Group so I was just thinking about all of these efforts to sort of - where

someone is actually commissioned to collect information and analyze it either quantitatively or not and just make it useful. But again I can't be sure that that's exactly what the recommendation is saying.

So what I believe maybe we might want to do is if possible reach out to Westlake and trying to engage their ideas on what they were thinking in terms of this recommendation. We might also want to go back to the report. I admit I haven't read it in quite a while so I want to just go back there and just seek clarification on the context of what was meant by this recommendation. But like I said in terms of the developing - getting someone to help develop empirical data that would assist in policy development I think is a good thing. I think we should take advantage of that whenever we can. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Larisa, I see your hand is up. Do you have some clarification for us?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. Actually I just wanted to propose a thought. With the Consumer Choice, Consumer Trust and Competition review underway, as you all know, to compile, analyze and review the outcomes of a lot of activity having to do with the new gTLDs. Might it be useful to rephrase this recommendation in such a way that broadly and suggests that as analyses and data points and reviews - as that work progresses and there is outcomes from that that that be something that is considered by the GNSO Council as part of their regular efforts to plan policy or coordinate policy development. More of a strategic sort of activity to consider all the information that emerges and it might be useful in their considerations. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. And Chuck, I note in the chat you suggested that perhaps we break that sentence into two pieces. And I'm just going to guess here maybe what you were thinking that we would take the first piece about undertaking or commissioning an analysis of trends in order to forecast policy and then maybe a second piece ensuring those affected are well represented in policy making.

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Maybe if we bifurcate in that way so we would have 21A and 21B. and then are we thinking that perhaps 21A we would mark as orange that it's being done in the consumer trust work that Larisa just mentioned and the B piece, would that be something that we just ate green, of course we recommend that people are well represented or does that need to have some clarification?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I would say that the 21B is being done or at least it should be being done all the time. That's one of the primary functions of the GNSO Council and its management role of policy development is to ensure as much as possible that all stakeholders are well represented.

Jennifer Wolfe: So would you say that's orange too, but that's already...

Chuck Gomes: I would say that's orange. I'm not sure I would say the first one is orange. I think that the things we're talking about in terms of competition and consumer trust are about to take place.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think that they've happened yet or even officially been started. The CCT review from the AOC is scheduled to kick off in January, right?

Jennifer Wolfe: Right, right. So would we say that that's a green, we recommend it and maybe just make a notation that we think that that work is going to be done?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Sorry, Amr. This is Chuck. I don't think I would call it a green because it's so poorly worded. Well we don't know what analysis of trends really means or at least I don't and a couple of other people seem to be in the

same boat. So I think this is one that needs some - 21A I think needs some modification.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. I would actually advise against dividing or separating this recommendation into two just yet. Like Chuck said, 21B is already happening and it will continue to happen; we don't need Westlake's recommendation too, is going to keep happening in the GNSO one way or another through the Council. And the Council is supposed to do this to make sure that everyone who needs to be represented is represented in working groups. And I'm sure the stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO are all over this as well.

But until we do actually understand what they meant -- what Westlake meant by an analysis of trends in gTLDs I think we would want to sort of just cancel out the association between what 21A is trying to say and what 21B is trying to say because we might -- I'm just saying if we do take a closer look at this we might discover that there is some kind of point they're trying to make that we're missing. And it may be something specific to the analysis and its association with representation in the PDP.

So I would just -- I would advise that we just try to figure out what exactly was meant by this before we decide to divide it. I think whether we divided or not, 21B is going to keep on happening anyway. And if we don't understand what 21A is then it's very unlikely we'll be able to implement it. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Any other points - Larisa, is it possible to get clarification from Westlake or is there assignment completed at this point and that's not possible?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. I think it's absolutely possible to reach out to Westlake. What I would suggest is perhaps that we look into that section of the report...

Jennifer Wolfe: The report, right.

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: ...and the narrative that supports that first and then perhaps as an outcome of that. I'm happy to reach out to Westlake and see if they might be available to have a conversation with the working party to help clarify this. I don't think that they would be opposed to that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well perhaps we start with pulling the report first and maybe circulating that unless and just getting any comments and we will just put this particular one on hold. And we can either resolve it on the list or if we need to have another call specifically for that issue we can come back to that. So why don't we just flag that one for right now that we're going to go back and look at the report in more detail on that particular issue and then we can discuss it on list and determine where we think it needs to be coded. Is that okay with everyone? Anybody opposed to taking back off-line? Okay.

All right so moving on we have two more recommendations to get through on our call today. So hopefully that (unintelligible) for everybody. I think we had a 90 minute call slated so hopefully this timing works for everybody.

So Number 22 here on the list was that the GNSO Council develop a competency-based framework which its members should utilize to identify development needs and opportunities. Comments on this recommendation. Yes, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: I wonder if this is just like 21.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right, right.

Chuck Gomes: Where we need to -- because I don't know...

Jennifer Wolfe: What does that mean.

Chuck Gomes: And I haven't, like others, I haven't looked at the detailed write up in the report for quite a while. So my own personal feeling is to treat 22 just like 21, let's go back to the report, see if we can get some clarity there. And if not get some clarity from Westlake on this. But that's my opinion. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. Any others? I know reading that and I know we probably need to go back and I'll look at the report on that one in particular but that seems like a pretty broad statement that would need clarification for us to move forward with. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jen. This is Amr. I do remember that I had a thought on this when I was going through the report and I think it had to do with there were several bullets under this recommendation that I think with sort of like items - items that should sort of be - to sort of determined that competency of GNSO councilors.

I also remembered that I had a bit of a problem with this in principle because it seemed to me that the competency of GNSO counselors should be determined by the constituencies and stakeholder groups who elect them or select them and send them to the GNSO Council. So it's more of a - again I think there is an element of this that is more of a stakeholder group/constituency issue and not so much of the GNSO-wide issue.

But I think I would need to go back to the report and just figure out again what it was they were recommending be measured and how counselors may be assessed and for what purpose. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. And I'll just note too, I am going back to my summaries and this was one that they had changed were clarified in their final, the previous way it was worded was to say that the GNSO should review and implement a

revised training and development program - oh shoot, my print off cut off - but that they refined it to then say that the GNSO develop a competency-based framework which its members should utilize. So I'm thinking it has to do with the training and development.

Avri, I see your hand is up, please ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Avri speaking. First of all I think in some sense this is already done. It's the kind of thing that gets reevaluated every year when the GNSO Council and GNSO at large speak of what do we need a new NomComm appointees, what competencies are missing?

I think it's also something that comes up when, you know, the planning is going on in terms of these yearly sessions that new Council members have with all Council members of how do we need to improve, what do we need to work on and such. So I think it is actually something that is ongoing and that perhaps, you know, it needs a thread of greater attention to tie it together so that people could see its being done and maybe fill in any gaps. But I don't see this as anything new and a great onus.

And while I agree with Amr in terms of appointing people obviously except for the NomComm appointees that is up to the stakeholder groups. But in terms of looking at a sitting Council and saying, you know, we really need to get better at or learn how to do at or in the next Council we should concentrate on, so I think it's being done. So at the most it's orange or closer to a done color but thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Avri. So that's important clarification. What do you all think? Do we still want to go back and look at the context in a bit more detail or do we feel like we can market this as orange? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, well Avri could be right. I didn't read this in the context of something like NomComm appointees and stuff like that. And if that's what it refers to

that's good. So why don't we just go back and confirm that that's what this is saying?

And if it is, Avri's right that this kind of thing already happens in a variety of ways within constituencies and stakeholder groups and with consultation between the GNSO and the NomComm and so forth. So I'll just throw that out, in other words let's take a look at their more detailed language in the report, consult with them if we need to. And just to confirm what Avri is saying and if that's correct then it may very well be and oranges probably the right thing.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. And I know I was trying - I've got the report, a printout of it and I was trying to look at it but I think it's not something to do on the fly, I think it's something we could pull and certainly do on list as well. And it looks like Avri is supporting that. We could go back and look at the report online.

Larisa, did you have some points of clarification there too?

Larisa Gurnick: Jen yes, thanks. It's Larisa. I did take a quick glance at the report and I agree, this shouldn't be done on the fly. But in reading through the several pages quickly there may be a distinction between the documentation and clarity about what's already being done versus whether it's being done so I will just leave it at that. And as staff we will take an action item to extract relevant portions of the reports pertaining to several of these recommendations and make sure that it's circulated on the list and give everybody a chance to form your own opinions about what the intent is. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. So we have on Recommendation 21 and 22, we're going to get some context in the details from the actual report. We can all go take a look at that and make comments on list to arrive at some consensus on the color coding and any comments that might be needed as we move forward.

So moving on to the last recommendation for discussion, that is Number 36, and it states that when approving the formation of a PDP working group the GNSO Council require that its membership represent as far as reasonably applicable the geographic, cultural and gender diversity of the Internet as a whole. Additionally, that when approving GNSO policy, the ICANN Board explicitly satisfy itself that the GNSO Council undertook these actions when improving the formation of a PDP working group.

I'm sure - Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I have a problem right at the beginning when it says, "When approving the formation of a PDP working group." I should have caught this a long time ago before they finalized this recommendation.

But I don't think there's a point in time when the Council approves the formation of a PDP working group. There's a point in time when they initiate a PDP, and that's followed by forming a working group. But I don't think that the GNSO Council approves the membership of the PDP; they approve the Chair or Co-Chairs.

So this one starts off and it's probably just wording that needs to be fixed, but I'm not sure what they mean there. It sounds like they're recommending that the Council approve the membership of a PDP before it can take off. That could be translated from what they're saying here. Do we want to go down that path? I don't know.

But - and then one other comment on this, and I think I think relates to other parts of the report too. But, you know, we have a pretty good definition of geographic and I think a very clear definition -- at least to date -- on gender diversity. But I think there's still a lot of ambiguity with regard to cultural diversity, although they do talk about it in their report.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. And Amr, I see your note. Yes, we did talk about a related recommendation which was Recommendation 32, which we flagged as red -- do not implement -- where cultural diversity was defined. And we did recommend that that was not implemented.

And for me, one of the concerns here is exactly what Chuck is saying. That it requires a forming of PDP which it doesn't seem to make a lot of sense, but also that it states the diversity of the Internet as a whole, and in some components of the report, Westlake defines Internet as a whole in terms of Internet usage in a way that this would not be practical to implement at all.

So I - that was a really big chat in there. I'm sorry; I didn't quite see all of that.

Klaus, did you have a comment? Please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I would like to strongly object against the second part because look what happens if there is working group recommendation which goes to the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board doesn't like it but doesn't have a good argument against it, and then we are not satisfied that you implemented reasonable practical geographic and cultural and gender diversity. I think this is something which is just not on.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Klaus. Marika, did you have - I think you put that big post in the Chat. Did you have a clarification?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm sorry about that.

But what I posted there and actually there is specific language in the PDP manual that talks about the rule that the Chair of the PDP working group has in relation to ensuring participation and diversity. While at the same time, also recognizes that, you know, there will not always be volunteers from every interest group, and it's often acceptable to have a small sub-team that is not

totally representational to perform initial roles that will later be reviewed by a broader more representational group.

So, you know, I agree with Chuck here that basically it seems they haven't understood well the role of the councilors here that the PDP working group manual clearly perceives that this is actually the roll of the Chair. And, you know, I know as well from past experience and on occasions where the Chair has flagged that, you know, participation may not be as broad as it should be. But at the same time, there are obvious challenges with, you know, all these categories represented recognizing that certain topics may be very specific, and of course, you know, participation and influence is not only done through a PDP working group.

Of course information is spread through stakeholder groups, constituencies that, you know, provide input and hopefully have that, you know, diversity within their membership. You know, public comment is another mechanism by which input is achieved.

So - and all (unintelligible) shouldn't be, you know, looking just at the way the working group is constituted is that, of course, you know, a working group does require certain participation and commitment, and may as such not always reflect all the different factors that have been mentioned here.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Marika. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jen, this is Amr. Yes, I just wanted to point out something else here.

That ensuring diversity or at least allowing for the inclusion of diverse views in development of policies in the GNSO is not limited to working group representation. So even if there are geographic or cultural diversity issues or the lack of them in the constitution of working group, it doesn't mean that these views are not or cannot be represented.

For one thing, for example, there are multiple public comment periods along the course of every PDP beginning with the Issue Scoping Phase to when the ICANN Board is considering the adoption of GNSO policy recommendations.

So it may not necessarily be sort of - it may not necessarily be something that would really prevent the formation of a working group or the ICANN Board having to adopt working group recommendations because they're not satisfied with the composition of the membership.

So I just wanted to point that out and especially with the last part of the recommendation and the role of the ICANN Board. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Amr. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And in fairness to Westlake, they did put in here as reasonable practicable. So that's a good qualifier.

But each working group is different. You know, again, to use the Inter-Registrar Transfer Working Group that was a relatively small group and was mostly Registries and Registrars with a few others sprinkled in and some groups not represented at all.

But it worked. And like Amr pointed out and others, you know, at later stages then, the broader community -- the more geographic and cultural and gender diverse community -- was brought into it. And they weren't interested in the early stages and the nitty-gritty, and that was okay.

It's kind of like, you know, in a PDP working group itself, when we break down into small sub teams that aren't typically geographic, culturally and gender diverse, but they bring some key thoughts forward that the more diverse group can then consider through public comment periods, through other input and so forth.

So this one is kind of complicated and Amr brings up a good point. I mean do we want the Board - I mean if the Board looks at the IRTTP PDP working groups -- A, B, C and D -- they'd have to reject it if this wasn't worded very carefully because it was not geographic or probably not culturally -- however we define it -- diverse. It could have been gender diverse; I know they had both genders involved but I don't have the list in front of me right now.

So would we want the Board to reject that when in fact, it was a good progress. You have to really look at the policy process from beginning to end including end being final approval after comment periods and so forth.

So again, the wording - and I suppose Westlake probably meant that the Board would satisfy itself that it was all a good process, but that gets pretty complicated. They have to look at more than just the working group.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. And Larisa, I see your hand is up too. I'll just comment.

I think what we really want to make sure we're thinking about as we code this and provide our comments is, you know, as we're giving this to the OEC, what do we want them to do with this? Do we think this is a do-not-implement because it's just the way its written is too off, or do we think we agree with some of the intent and we want to clarify it.

I think that's what we have to decide here because they're going to take this and say, "Hey, this is the GNSO providing their comments on this recommendation." So I think we want to be really careful with one like this.

Larisa Gurnick: It seems that one of the components - this is Larisa for the record. It seems like one of the components of this would simply have the data available -- not just about the diversity or representation of the working group participants -- but as Chuck suggested, of the people that responded through the various public comment processes.

So perhaps a useful component or side component of this would simply be beginning to track that information and compare it over time to better understand the kind of diversity and participation that results in these various processes between working group and people that are engaged at a different level than just through public comment or other means. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Larisa.

So can I ask the group what are you leaning towards? Is this a yellow or is it a red? Do we have any comments on just kind of our general color-coding and then we can refine comments on either.

Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Jen. This is Amr. Yes, I just want to say that I'm leaning more towards red because the parts of this recommendation that I think are helpful and that sort of give the flexibility in how to implement it -- like Chuck said -- as far as reasonably practical or as practical as included in the language here.

I think the parts of this recommendation that may be helpful already actually exist in the PDP manual. So I guess adding to whatever has been added here may not be so helpful, so I would just be more towards red. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Amr. Any other - who else thinks red? If you can make a checkmark or make a note, or if you'd like to speak up? Chuck's for red. Anybody oppose? Anybody feel like yellow would be more appropriate?

Chuck Gomes: Note I said that in the Chat - this is Chuck.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, it didn't pose for me. Okay, sorry about that. Thanks Chuck.

Okay, I'm sorry. My Chat hadn't scrolled down. I'm seeing - so a couple are saying feeling more towards yellow.

So Amr, would you be comfortable with yellow if we had some real strong clarifying comments?

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr. Yes, I guess I would be depending on the comments.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, okay. So perhaps if we have yellow - and this is one too, I think, that we can circulate, you know, as (Sharla) captures the comments from today, we can circulate it and certainly refine it as we kind of look at these last three -- 21, 22 and 36 -- so that we can refine the comments.

So let's say we flag this as yellow. And (Sharla), if you could try to capture some of the comments that have been made with regard to, you know, concerns about the Board and its role with regard to approving, you know, the formation of a PDP working group recognizing what's already being done versus what's really practical, that we can capture all of this.

Is there anything else that I missed in sort of generally capturing what was discussed? Anybody wants to add for (Sharla) to capture in the comments? Okay, I'm not seeing anything else.

So as I said, particularly on these last three, we're going to get some context from the report so that we can look at those and then discuss on list, you know, what we think those should be coded, and any comments or clarification. And on 36, (Sharla) is going to take the comments that we had, we'll flag it as yellow, and we can take a look at all of those.

As with all of the comments, we'll get this circulated and everyone can take a look at, you know, how we have tagged these as either green, orange, yellow or red and with the comments that we have so that we have another round of

the ability to, you know, make refinements before this is formally delivered to the OEC.

So I think from a timing standpoint - and Larisa, please correct me if I'm wrong here on our timing. I don't think they were meeting on this again - they're not voting on this or looking at this again until February. Is that correct or am I wrong about that?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct Jen - this is Larisa. That's correct. The other component to consider is there are several other steps. I believe the prioritization overall, once you take a look at the color-coding and what gets moved forward and how, it would still be helpful, I think, to take another look at how these should be prioritized, and also what the next step would be for all of that outcome.

If that's something that needs to go then to the GNSO Council before it can be forwarded to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, so that should get factored into the timing.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, so we're trying to work to - so what do you think our timeframe needs to be for us to have our final recommendations? Are we trying to do this in the next month then?

Larisa Gurnick: I would say so. And perhaps Marika, again, could provide some clarity on the GNSO Council aspect, but I think that if this team finalized it within the next month that would ensure there's enough time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. And Marika, do you have anything you want to add to that that we should consider?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think it probably makes sense if this is going to be, you know, a GNSO response, that of course it passes through the Council your full review and maybe a formal approval.

At the next meeting - well the next meeting is tomorrow, but of course too short notice to provide them with anything. But the next council meeting in December is on the 17th of December, and the document deadline for that meeting is the 7th. So I don't know if that would be...

Jennifer Wolfe: December 7.

Marika Konings: Correct. So if you would want or would look for a formal Council approval, the document as well as a motion proposing approval of the assessment would need to be in by the 7th of December.

Jennifer Wolfe: And Marika, the next GNSO Council meeting would be in January then if we didn't make that timeframe?

Marika Konings: Correct. I think we're currently looking at a draft schedule for January, and we I think have tentatively two dates for January at the moment as we're trying to anticipate as well the CCWG Accountability Proposal. So it's not confirmed yet whether that would be a meeting on the 14th or the 21st or potentially even both.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Just general thoughts to - I mean to try to have something completely finalized by the 7th, that's just two weeks and there's the Thanksgiving Holiday in there as well. So I don't know if that is realistic given that we want to probably give everybody a really good chance to review this.

So does everybody feel comfortable if we target - we want to have our work done maybe before the holidays and then get this to the GNSO Council for their January meeting which would provide time for changes to get to the OEC in February?

Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: I think that realistically makes more sense than trying to hit the December...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, I don't think that's going to work.

Chuck Gomes: ...because I think Larisa made a really good point. It's one that I was thinking of and was glad she raised it is that I think we're going to have on a call some detailed discussion in terms of priorities. I know we have a high level prioritization based on the survey we filled out, but I think we need to take a look at the priorities kind of as a whole -- together -- and refine our priorities. And it may take the better part of a call to do that one exercise.

Jennifer Wolfe: Correct, right.

Chuck Gomes: But that's my thinking.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think you're right. I mean I think what we've done now is we've been able to organize it and frame it so that we could get through this in an efficient way.

But you're right. I think what we want to do is make sure we have really strong recommendations on the prioritization when we send it certainly to Council and then to the OEC. And I think the more we've done our leg work, the easier it will be for Council to review it and consider it.

So why don't we proceed with that timing in mind that our goal will be to get this circulated, have our comments on list and schedule another call to take a look at that, make any refinements and discuss prioritization so that we can complete our written report before, you know, before the holidays -- before the end of the year -- and then be prepared to submit that in early January for the Council to look at at its January meeting.

Does that work for everybody? Checks, okay.

So that's how we'll proceed. (Sharla), I know that's a lot of work on you in a short period of time. We really appreciate all of your help and all the hard

work in getting this organized so that we can work through this very efficiently. I appreciate everybody's time.

Larisa, please. I see your hand. Go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks Jen, this is Larisa. Another reminder is that at some point, after these important tasks are completed, there's one more activity which is to evaluate the performance of Westlake.

So to support that effort, Staff will prepare a survey type tool for the members of the working party to respond to as you wish, and it will be based on the criteria that was included in the request for proposal. And part of the process of how Westlake was selected.

So I just wanted to remind, Jen, you and the rest of the members that that's still a really important step to complete. And there's no particular deadline for that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you; I appreciate you reminding us of that. And is that something that we each can reply to our own survey, or is it something where we have to have consensus?

Larisa Gurnick: I think it's completely your call. My suggestion would be -- based on what seemed to be early success -- using the survey tool that seemed to help people formulate their own thoughts and ideas and then we discussed it as a group. If you would be happy with that format, we could do it the same way.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that would be very helpful. And I think since we've got some time sensitivity to finish our substantive work, let's get that done first and then we will certainly come back to getting our feedback. I know we all probably have a lot of comments for Westlake and we can address that at that point in time. So thank you for reminding of us of that.

Larisa Gurnick: Great.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, if there's nothing else, thank you everybody for your continued time and support of this process. And we will keep this moving forward and to our next phone call.

So I think we'll send out a (Duta) poll to get a call scheduled in the next few weeks so we keep this on track within the next month.

Thanks everybody so much for your time today. We really appreciate it. And everybody have a great rest of your week.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks.

Man: Thank you, bye.

Group: Thanks, bye.

END