

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
25 October 2016 at 13:00 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-25oct16-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)  
Donna Austin (RySG Alternate)  
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP)

**Participants:**

Pascal Bekono  
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts

**Apologies:**

**ICANN staff:**

Marika Konings  
Julie Hedlund  
Lars Hoffman  
Berry Cobb  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, the 25th of October, 2016. On the call today we have Jen Wolf, Donna Austin, Lawrence Olawale, Rafik Dammak, Sara Bockey and Bekono Pascal. Joining us a little later in the call will be Wolf-Ulrich Knohen. We have no listed apologies for today's meeting.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Berry Cobb and myself, Terri Agnew. Also just joining us is Heath Dixon. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this I will turn it back over to Jen Wolf. Please begin.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you and thank you to all of you have taken the time to participate in the call this morning, this afternoon where you may be. We certainly appreciate it. I know for many involved in this working group they may or may not be able to participate in the call but they do go and listen to the recordings, read the transcripts and respond on list so I want to go ahead and move us forward particularly with the timeframe that we have in which to complete our work.

So just to briefly follow our agenda items, are there any changes to the statements of interest for anyone on the phone call? Okay seeing none we'll move on.

So as you can see our agenda for today we want to start with just a call out again for anyone who might want to volunteer as vice chair. We'd like to then move on to talk about everyone's review of the strawman draft now that we've all had a week to read through it and provide some comments. We'd like to talk about the batching, which is an important piece of our work here is to take these recommendations, these 30 plus recommendations and group them into batches that we think are reasonable to tackle over the next 12-18 months. And then we'll talk about our next steps, timing and our next meeting.

So with that as our agenda I'd like to start again with just a call for a vice chair; if there's anyone on the call or if there is anyone on the list who would like to volunteer we are still looking for a vice chair to assist in the event that I'm not able to participate or just that we need additional assistance in moving the leadership forward. Is there anyone on the call who's interested in volunteering or any other comments about someone volunteering as vice chair?

Okay seeing none we'll just – oh, Lawrence, please go ahead. Thank you. Lawrence, I can't hear you. Are you on? No? Okay.

Terri Agnew: Jen, this is Terri. He's unmated – he's unmated now. You should be able to hear him. Lawrence, go ahead.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Can you hear me now?

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolf: Oh go ahead, sorry.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Great. Sorry, this is Lawrence for the record. My – I am proposing one of our area meetings or rather I have, yes, I've proposed that Wolf-Ulrich stand in as cochairs of one of our meetings. And I still want to put forward this position. I know we are looking at is a vice chair position but I feel that having a balance, so to say, for both houses is one of the reasons why I had put forward his person.

Based on the fact that having a – I mean, having our working group have cochairs the fact that one, there will also be – there will be a balance from both houses where have I'm certain about the commercial and the noncommercial which will suit us perfectly, in other words, if we were to adopt

the cochairs structure we will have a situation in our hand where we have very good – where we have a very good balance on both houses.

Gender-wise also we will have a great balance. And I think that if or rather my suggestion is if Wolf-Ulrich is not – if he's not – if he is not desirous of stepping in to this position then we might look further to see if there is anyone who might want to step in as a vice chair to our chair, who's already doing a great job. This is not to say that we are not good as we are but for the sake of balance from both houses and also I believe that having someone also share the (unintelligible) in case any of the two leaders are unavailable at a particular point in time, we could also have a balance in terms of leadership.

Aside from unavailability of any of the – I appreciate there is a (unintelligible) chair role and we might not be able to – our leaders might not be able to be at each and every call, there is also appreciable work that might need to be done behind the themes of aside from the calls. And so if we have cochairs from particularly from the different representing the diversity of the GNSO there's some work and some decisions that could go – that may be done in collaboration with the staff and, you know, where we now have a call such things - I mean, such decisions can then be looked in further by the entire team.

So my proposal in this light is just to see that, one, there is a balance; two, that, you know, both houses, I mean, the diversity that is GNSO is well represented in our leadership structure; and, three, the fact that there might be some decisions that, I mean, some work that might have to be done at least, you know, aside from the calls. And we have – if we have such a leadership structure in place this might help with making some of these decisions and, you know, getting some of this work done before we have our calls. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you, Lawrence. And Wolf-Ulrich is not here to accept that very kind and nice nomination but I think his name has been brought up before so

perhaps we can persuade him when he gets on the call. Any other comments or suggestions or volunteers for vice chair? Okay, seeing none we'll talk to Wolf-Ulrich when he joins the call about that.

Let's move on to discuss the strawman draft of the implementation plan for the GNSO review recommendations. I know in our last call it had just been presented and so many of you may not have had the opportunity to review the document in detail. So I'd like to start by just asking for any general feedback before we talk specifically about batching of the recommendations. I know that was one of my first comments was looking at the way it was structured I felt like we could take a basic approach to grouping the recommendations based upon - there was work that was already being done and then work that had been prioritized by the working party and then all of the other recommendations.

But I want to start by just asking for general feedback to the plan. Are there any general comments that anyone would like to make or provide to staff at this time? See none, okay why don't we move into talking about batching because I think that's a really important piece to how we organize the document.

What we have talked about, I don't know, Julie, if you're trying to pull up that section of the document that deals with batching. What we're looking to do is create essentially three segments that would occur over the next 12-18 months where we recommend that we take groupings of the recommendations and we batch them so that the workload is manageable for our volunteer base to be able to take those and then create the more detailed implementation plan.

And so as I had looked at these, we have a couple different ways that we could look at these. As you can see what's on screen right now there were three general categories of recommendations. You'll see the blue category are those that deal with PDP improvements, effectiveness, implementation

and so one. There are those coded brown which deal with the GNSO Council, stakeholder groups, membership and so on. And then those in the magenta color which deal with working group performance.

But we also have some other categorization that I think could be helpful as we look at just the batching piece of this, and that is we had some recommendations from the independent examiner for we identified previously that work was already being done somewhere in the GNSO. So in my mind that seems like a very logical place to start because if there's work that's already been done it may be a matter of simply identifying some mechanism to have some accountability for that work that's already being done, because we know it's already happening somewhere within the GNSO.

And then secondly, we could look at the recommendations that were prioritized as high, meaning everyone in the working party and then ultimately endorsed by Council and the OEC now like those recommendations are very important to the GNSO and so I think our second batch could be to really focus on those recommendations. And then finally our third batch would be the recommendations that came after that, those that were medium or low priority.

So I want to start with just this general concepts because how we organize this will be important in how we dig through each of these recommendations in creating the implementation plan. Are there any comments or feedback on that idea of an approach to batching? And Julie, I don't know if you have the - there was a slide or a piece where there was that batching, the timeline that was set up that had arrows going across it, if we could pull that up just so everyone can conceptualize what we're talking about. That was it.

So this is what we're talking about. First batch is January 2017 to December 2017; second batch starts June 2017 runs to May 2018; third batch starts October 2017, runs to 2018. So I'll pause and ask for thoughts, feedback on this approach to grouping our work.

And Marika in the chat is making a note that the work that's already underway, she uses the example of Recommendation 8, there is already a working group doing some of this so it may just require us to confirm that the implementation of those recommendations meet the objectives of the GNSO recommendation so that's when we talk about the first batch of being low hanging fruit. It may not take that much work for us to complete that first batch, which is why we're talking about putting that in the first batch.

Donna, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks Jen. Donna Austin. I guess it's just something that strikes me about the timeline, you know, September 2018 is pushing out but I understand it, you know, one of the challenges to this will probably be getting the volunteers necessary to do the work.

But I just wondered, you know, when Julie, I assume you put this timeline together, what was the consideration in identifying the timeframes? Thanks. And I support the batching comment, I think it makes a lot of sense. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Donna. And, Julie, did you want to respond on the timing proposal?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I should be more clear. And it does actually notice in the document here. It's a placeholder timeline. The timeline will definitely have to be refined once we scope out the batches. And at the point that staff put in this timeline, you know, we hadn't discussed batching, we hadn't discussed, you know, what to start with.

If the first batch is indeed the ones - were the work that's already underway then I would think that that overlap between first batch and second batch would be, you know, there would be much more overlap than that. The second batch could indeed start I would think perhaps even at the same time as the first batch. Or once we, you know, look at the dependencies, and that

would be another key indicator with the work that's underway and those in the second batch and those in the third batch, we might find that there might be some things that might have to be, you know, that we might have to ensure our completed in the work that's underway, you know, perhaps before we started some things in the second batch.

And so that's part of - I know what staff can help do is look at those dependencies and then, you know, come up with a more refined timeline where again, as I know, I think this one could be much more overlap between first and second batch, and will be a much more precise timeline. This is really just sort of a sample. I think we'd have more discrete dates and dates for deliverables identified, that sort of thing.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks Julie. And, Donna, was that a new hand up? I think it was. No? Okay. No, Julie, I think you're absolutely right. I think that if we batch these such that we are taking the low hanging fruit of work already underway we may be able to dispense with that within the first three months of 2017 and then immediately move into our second batch.

I would suspect that the second batch is probably the piece that would take the most amount of time because we would be dealing with high-priority items where the work is not being done and it would likely require some more time for us to really build out an effective implementation plan. So thank you for reminding us of that that this is just a placeholder.

I think that if everyone is in agreement with that approach, you know, perhaps we could look at this and say the first batch should be dispensed with by the end of Q1 2017, we would immediately move into the second batch and then that could address Donna's concern that we've pushed this out to September of 2018. That might allow us to move everything a bit faster.

Any other comments on the batching approach that we are discussing and taking this general approach to work already being done, high-priority work

and then the medium and low priority recommendations? If there's no objection to that then I would suggest we use our time to go ahead and start talking about preparing the details in our implementation plan looking at the work that's already being done.

And Julie, if you could pull that piece up when we move into the - there's another piece of that document where we move into - I think you already had some of it grouped in terms of work already being done. And we could start talking through that piece. Get that pulled up here in a minute. And I think we could start talking through the dependencies and any other information that we need to start completing the implementation plan for this Phase 1. I'm not seeing anything on the screen. Are we having a Adobe Connect issue? Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I have it up on screen so that is odd.

Jennifer Wolf: Oh, is it just me?

Julie Hedlund: And I seem to still be in Adobe Connect.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Is anybody else not seeing it?

Jennifer Wolf: Is anyone else seeing...

Terri Agnew: This is Terri. I confirm, I can see, Julie, the middle of the screen what you've put up.

Jennifer Wolf: So maybe I'm just having a problem.

Julie Hedlund: And Marika is also seeing it as well.

Jennifer Wolf: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: You may need to login again, Jen. It's possible that you lost your connection or there is an issue with your connection.

Jennifer Wolf: Okay. I will work on logging in again. I am assuming you have - I've got the hard copy document in front of me. Are we on the 5.1, work already underway, Recommendation 8?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct.

Jennifer Wolf: Okay. So why don't we start with that? And this recommendation is that working groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they've developed. There is work already being done. And they might ask if perhaps if Marika is on the phone if she could, while I re-login here, could you explain how the work is already being done? And then we could talk through dependencies and thoughts on implementation? Or Julie or whomever might be able to do that and I'll get re-logged in to try to get my screen fixed.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Apologies, it took me a second to get off mute. In relation to the specific one, so Recommendation 8 that noted that working groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.

And they are the GNSO Review Working Party already identified that the specific working group, at the time that the Policy and Implementation Working Group was already working on that issue. In the meantime that working group has actually completed its work. And one of the outcomes of that work was that it is now required to form an implementation review team that will work with ICANN staff on the implementation.

And in that way is in a position to address any implementation related issues that are flagged as part of the implementation process. And the

implementation review team is open in principle for anyone interested in but it specifically targets the working group that was involved in developing the original policy recommendations.

So on that basis, the working group would need to assess does that meet the intent of the original recommendation of the GNSO review working group? And if so, maybe one of those recommendations that can already be considered completed. And it may be sufficient just to point out what indeed the recommendations of the Policy and Implementation Working Group mean in practice and how the working group believes that fulfills the recommendation of the independent examiner.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Marika. So any comments. This will be interesting as we start to tackle where the work is already being done by another working group. Any comments from our working group on how we move that implementation plan forward if work is already being done? Is it simply a matter of saying the work is already being done?

Yes, Donna, please go ahead.

Donna Austin: I guess, Jen, the question for me is do we need to do any - sorry comment not we, just, you know, the working group that's put together to implement these recommendations, do they need to review this to make sure that what has been done is, you know, kind of like a tick the box exercise so that they can confirm that it's on the right track or, you know, implemented fully.

Jennifer Wolf: That's a great point. Right, so perhaps if we create a sub working group for each batch that for this particular batch that is dealing with work underway it is sort of a checks and balances to ensure as they complete their work doesn't match up to what was recommended and follow up on that in some way. Is that what you're saying?

Donna Austin: Yes, I think because of the recommendation from this review - from the GNSO review - that there is or there should be an obligation for the Implementation Working Group just to tick a box that it has been done.

Jennifer Wolf: Okay.

Donna Austin: And that they are okay with the way that it's being done.

Jennifer Wolf: Okay excellent. Any other comments on this particular recommendation? Okay, why don't we move on to the next recommendation in this batch which is Recommendation 15, which was the independent examiner's final recommendation was that the GNSO continues current PDP improvements, project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP. This was prioritized as high.

What we have noted was that this was work that was already being done. Again, Marika, do you want to just give us a quick update on how that work is being done?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So basically this is another project that was recently considered complete, and in this case it may be helpful if we share the kind of final status update that was provided to the Council which still has I think a couple of small recommendations linked to it which staff is in the process of implementing.

So, you know, some innovations were introduced there in relation to the timeliness of the PDP or basically providing the ability to the Council to speed up certain parts of the policy development process. So again I think it's something where this group may need to review whether you believe that is sufficiently meets the recommendation of the independent examiner or whether further work would need to be undertaken.

And in this case, as that specific project has already completed, you know, it would obviously require separate work in order to do so. Again I think some other things that, you know, maybe worth pointing out here is that as part of, also for example the Policy and Implementation Working Group, a number of new processes were created that again give the GNSO Council additional abilities to follow certain processes that may be quicker than a PDP if the circumstances warrant it.

So there are also other projects that may have influenced or addressed some of the objectives of this specific recommendation. So I think it's something where maybe staff can put some of that information together so well that allow the working group to review whether you believe indeed that is sufficient to meet the objective of this recommendation or whether there is still something that - additional that should be considered or undertaken.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks Marika. Any comments from the group on this particular recommendation? And I see, Wolf-Ulrich, you have now joined. Welcome. We are now working through the recommendations where work is already underway somewhere in the GNSO and just discussing how those recommendations might be implemented.

And I think just as a note to staff, I know they were going to be helping us in between our meetings to keep the documents moving forward. I think to the extent we can add some of those details to these recommendations as Batch 1, that would certainly be helpful. And I think what we've talked about here in our call is that these recommendations where work is already underway our primary initiative will be to, as Donna used the term, check the box, ensure that the work that has been done or is being done fulfills the recommendation.

Seeing no other comments, why don't we move on to Recommendation 16, which states that a policy impact assessment be included as a standard part of any policy process. It was prioritized as high. The working party, as we

worked through these recommendations, determined that this was already in the PDP manual, that we have no analytical framework to do this so what is being measured?

What we had talked about was perhaps we need to create a more analytical framework for assessing policy impacts and determine what should be measured and corresponding metrics.

So in terms of work that's already been done, the GNSO Council, as the manager of the policy development process oversees this ongoing effort. It also featured in the final report of the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group.

So if, Marika, if you want to add anything to that, you know, we certainly welcome your comments on that and then welcome comments from the group on how we implement this particular recommendation where there is work that's already done in some way.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. And I actually see Berry on the call. He may actually be in a better position to speak to the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group final report which is also a report that was already adopted by the GNSO Council and is in the process of being implemented.

It may address, oh Berry is saying he's not dialed in so hopefully he will type something. But again we can pull out some of the aspects of that report that may be relevant in this regard. And as already noted, you know, the mention of an impact assessment is already part of the policy development process manual.

But indeed there is no specific guidance around that, it's more a recommendation to the working group that as part of its work it also assesses the impact or expected impact of the recommendation. So again we may need to look closer at that DMPM final report to see how that meets the

requirement of this one so the working group can review indeed whether that sufficient or whether other work is needed.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Marika. And I note Berry Cobb in the chat has said he's not dialed in but that there is a placeholder for impact as part of the key performance indicators dashboard. Any other comments on this recommendation? And I think it will be helpful if we have some of this additional information put in by staff and we can look at it further.

Berry is also saying, can use assistance to develop what the analytical framework should look like. Any comments from this group on what the analytical framework would look like in terms of the impact of the policy if we are to measure that in some way?

Seeing none, that's an important question and perhaps, Julie, as we recirculate this document to perhaps highlight that in this particular recommendation to give everyone some time to think about it. But I think that is – that is probably where we can have, you know, the most influence on this particular recommendation is defining how is impact analyzed, how is it measured so that we can determine has the policy had the impact intended? I think that's where we probably have some work to do here on this recommendation.

Okay while in the interest of time let's keep moving on. And as this document continues to evolve we can certainly, you know, recirculate and rediscuss these issues. If we move onto Recommendation 18, this was the independent examiner's recommendation was that the GNSO Council evaluate post-implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis rather than periodically as stated in current Operating Procedures and that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time.

It was defined as high. Some of the comments that we had in the working party was that, you know, we need to define this at the start of implementation, what the assessment period would be and how it's established. And there were questions about how the GNSO Council would evaluate implemented policies. Again this relates to the last recommendation as well but questions about how does it align with the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group.

And I'll put – so Chuck Gomes also had the comments that we might change the PDP guidelines to make post-implementation policy effectiveness evaluation an ongoing rather than periodic process, and that we also develop guidelines for how implementation of policies should be evaluated.

So obviously you can see this is where the color coding of blue, these very much relate to one another. I don't know if, staff, if Marika you want to jump in on anything that you think is currently being done to address this so that as we look at these two recommendations in tandem we're fully aware of other work being done.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think you summed it up quite well what indeed is already in place because, I mean, there is a, you know, specific provision that deals with that in the PDP manual. Indeed there is no other standardized process that's currently being used. And, you know, what may be of interest here, we've had some recent experience that the different approach that has been taken, for example, to reviewing some of the policies after they've been implemented and some may be more successful than others.

And maybe there's an opportunity there to look at those and see if it is possible to have a kind of standardized approach as well as a timeline for when and how the policy, after implementation should be reviewed. And again, you know, in this case it may not be possible to have a one-size-fits-all

because it may depend on the nature or extensiveness of a policy recommendation that may be having some kind of framework similar to what was done for the implementation phase, which again is one that has already been undertaken, may serve as a model to facilitate discussion and work in relation to the specific recommendation.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks for Marika. Any comments from the group on this recommendation or the general concept of defining how these are analyzed, what metrics are put in place? Okay, let's go ahead and move on to Recommendation 10, which deals more with the formation of working groups.

And on this one the independent examiner's recommendation was that the GNSO Council developed criteria for working groups to engage professional facilitator in certain situations. It was prioritized as medium. Some of the comments that we had during the process of the review was what does it mean to engage? Is this costly? You know, and obviously that there was an existing pilot that was already underway.

So to a certain extent I think this one certainly we would want to look to the outcome of the pilot. And I'm not sure, Marika, you can probably tell us what the outcome of that pilot was. Please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So actually the assessment of the pilot, I have to clarify here that the pilot itself is the culmination of face-to-face time with or without moderators, so in certain cases a moderator was involved, in other cases it was the working group chair running the meeting so it was a bit a culmination of that.

But especially in relation to the face-to-face aspect that was deemed to have, you know, very successful and helpful to the progress that the policy development process working groups can make. So that is something that actually has already moved into a standard feature that, you know, Council has the possibility to recommend for each ICANN meeting to have the PDP

working group either meet the day before or after, some very limited funding is available to implement that aspect.

Edit also in principle perceives that a moderator could be involved. As part actually of the implementation of the PDP improvements project, one of the specific recommendations that the staff still has on its to-do list is indeed to come up with a list of guidelines or rules around how the selection and, you know, rollout of that face-to-face meeting, including the use of a moderator, should take place. So that actually work that's already in progress.

And once staff has produced that it will actually go back to the GNSO Council for review and approval. But as it's also on the plate of this effort it may make more sense to first pass it through this group and if you believe indeed it aligns with a specific recommendation then it could go as well with your kind of seal of approval to the Council for their consideration.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Marika. So it sounds like one of the other dependencies on this could be is there a budget to engage facilitators, and my understanding that correctly that that wasn't part of the pilot, determining if there was a budget?

Marika Konings: No, I mean, there is budget available. And I think it also foresees that a moderator could be engaged. But again speaking here from personal experience, based on the evaluation we did on some of the face-to-face meetings; those, you know, with a moderator and those without, I think some did question the value of having an external moderator not familiar or not having the same in-depth knowledge of the subject matter on the discussion to be really successful.

So again it may be more on a case-by-case basis whether indeed maybe some criteria can be established in which circumstances it's deemed helpful to have an external moderator or whether, you know, there may be possibilities to see is there a pool of more insight moderators; people that, you know, know ICANN well, know as well from the subject matter

experience and therefore may be more successful in, you know, forging consensus or bringing people together.

But that was one of the feedback for one of the experiences - issues we experienced that, you know, having a completely external moderator didn't really resolve in I think the steps forward that we had originally anticipated.

But having said that I think, you know, the pilot does foresee the option to engage a moderator. But of course it's part of a kind of a budget envelope. So it's again for the Council then as well to make the kind of assessment, you know, what is, you know, most important in supporting the group. Is it indeed bringing in an external moderator if it's to, you know, provide additional time?

So again I think it's part of an overall evaluation of what is most - the most useful for certain working groups to move forward in its work.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you. That's very helpful. I think that's helpful to understand the outcome of that pilot. I guess I would ask for comments as we look at this recommendation the recommendation as it was adopted is to develop criteria, not necessarily to say that they should always be used or should sometimes be used but to develop criteria. So it sounds like there is actually a little more work to do on this recommendation in terms of an implementation plan for us to really look at how that would be done.

And I know, Pascal, I question the chat of, "Can we have brackets examples?" Yes, I think that's an excellent idea that we would have certain examples of where perhaps a professional moderator might be helpful, you know, or perhaps in some ways it's just a professional facilitator that then works with chairs or cochairs who might have more substantive knowledge. But that a professional facilitator may be able to help move things along a little bit faster.

Any other comments? I see Marika saying there is an evaluation document that we could include here, so that would be helpful. Did I hear someone else want to speak up? Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Can you hear me?

Jennifer Wolf: Hi, Wolf-Ulrich. How are you? Yes, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Thanks. I'm in the car, sorry. But it came to my mind the question for me is here first is did I understand it correctly, it is about facilitators on working group then? That's...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolf: Yes, that's right. That's the recommendation is to develop criteria for when that would be used.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So it is more or less up to the working group to themselves come up with that question in case they, you know, they've been confronted with situation that they don't find a way out or so because of, well, (unintelligible) what else, you know, so that is up to the working group.

And the – is the process, is that described how to deal with that or is it just – I just want to understand, you know, with regards to the pilot we had, is it just about, you know, to find out situations where it could happen that a facilitator should be engaged or is it also about, you know, the – well the formalities about that?

Jennifer Wolf: So the recommendation just...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolf: ...states to develop criteria and it states that the GNSO Council should develop criteria. So I think our question is, okay, if that recommendation is to be implemented what needs to happen? You know, is it that this is work to be done by Council? Can we make a recommendation that, you know, it's left to the discretion – as you suggest, perhaps it is left to the discretion of the working group, if they determine this is a very, say, controversial issue and assistance may be helpful, then they can request it.

I think that's certainly an interesting, you know, recommendation that we could make to Council in developing criteria.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay so that was just for my understanding. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you. Any other comments on this one? Certainly if anyone else has comments, I feel like this is one for the -- where we could really add all the more to the discussion as we look at an implementation plan. Any other comments? Okay well I think as Marika has suggested that we can have some of that additional information circulated. And as we continue our work we can come back and incorporate that information.

Okay let's go ahead and move on then to Recommendation 33, this was the final recommendation reads, "The stakeholder groups, constituencies and the Nominating Committee in selecting their candidates for appointment to the GNSO Council should aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its participants as defined in ICANN core value Number 4."

This was prioritized as medium. We had commented during that process that we thought this work was really already being done but perhaps we needed to better improve the metrics of what was done. And right now what we determined was that each stakeholder group and constituency essentially holds itself accountable but there's assistance provided by staff.

I don't know, and perhaps Marika or Julie, you can help us, I think we are tracking that information, are we not tracking that information right now?

Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I don't believe the information as such is tracked. I mean, it is covered or captured as part of statement of interest that people provide. But there is -- I don't think there's any kind of, you know, tally that's done at the end of the day.

You know, I do know that the different stakeholder groups and constituencies I think most if not all have specific requirements in their charters that need to ensure geographic diversity for example, when they select Council members, although in certain cases there are exceptions possible in those cases where, you know, they're not able to identify suitable candidates from a certain region because in certain cases of course membership of stakeholder groups and constituencies is limited by the nature of their membership and especially thinking for example of, you know, contracted parties. There's a certain barrier that's in place which means that not just anyone can, you know, sign up for those groups.

But something that's worth here maybe also looking at because I believe this is also something that's being looked at from a broader perspective I think the Accountability Working Group also made recommendations in relation to diversity. And I think there is some work that's ongoing in that regard, because of course there's also the question indeed, you know, how do you, you know, what is diverse?

In certain cases, you know, certainly they value diversity based on diversity of skills not necessarily gender or geographic regions for other groups that may be different. So again I think there is already a broader conversation going on in relation to this topic as well. So there may be a need for the working group also to look at that work in relation to seeing what is in place in relation to the GNSO per se.

What does happen in the working group context is that there is assessment indeed and their diversity is more the view that is their diverse of representation from the different stakeholder groups and constituencies, but there's no kind of tracking or, you know, assessment. You know, do we have enough people from this region or are there enough females on this group. That doesn't happen as far as I'm aware.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks Marika. Any comments from the group then as we look to implement this recommendation of tracking diversity? Any comments on how diversity is defined and/or how the various groups are held accountable for tracking and reporting on diversity? Any comments?

I think certainly defining diversity, I mean, obviously we have some definition here, geographic region, gender diversity is fairly clearly defined. There are other components of diversity, oh I'm sorry, Donna, I just saw your hand go up. Please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Jen. I think I was going to say something consistent with what you're saying. I mean, this is a tricky one. Diversity, it's a good goal but it shouldn't get in the way of practicality. And I think, you know, at the end of the day what's the real aim of making sure that you do have diversity of participants, I mean, I understand it's not - we don't want everybody to be from the same region, you know, but we just need to be a little bit careful with how we go about this because, you know, diversity is a good goal to have but as Marika has explained, you know, sometimes it just isn't practical in some of the groups. So we need to balance that as well.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Donna. Is this something that we think we would push back to each group to define for themselves what diversity goals they would strive to achieve? So that they could, as Marika said, in the contracted parties to participate you have to be part of a contracted parties so that may, you know,

limit the pool of people from which to choose, you know, or there may be other constraints. Donna please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jen. One of the things that always strikes me about, you know, when you put working groups together one of the first regions that fall off his Asia-Pacific specifically because of the time zones and the challenges of getting people to, you know, the balance of the calls always go towards North America and Europe friendly time zones.

So I don't know how we can incorporate something in here about, you know, time zone rotation because I think, you know, that's one of the first challenges that any group faces is trying to organize the rotation of times for calls to make sure that you do have continual engagement from everyone within a group, not just, you know, probably something that amounts to 2/3 or, you know, slightly more of the group.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks Donna. And yes, I think you're absolutely right. And we all know when the time zone is not convenient for us it becomes challenging to participate. So if it was continually a challenge it becomes more difficult to participate. I think that the next one point. Julie, I see your hand is up, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'll just note, and I'll capture it in the notes here too, and, you know, some of this I, you know, didn't capture initially just because the way I worked through this so quickly, I do need to circle back on some of the dependencies.

There are other recommendations, not in the work underway recommendations, but in some of the ones that are in the high priority recommendations, you know, that have been agreed to that relate directly to outreach, outreach as it relates to say, translations, to rotating time zones.

There are several recommendations coming up that are tied together in that way. So it might be that this particular item is one that could – this

recommendation we might have to note is tied to, you know, X, Y and Z other recommendations. And so that may be a dependency in that it might be that this item may not be able to be completed as work underway or we may want to combine it with others, you know, that are in the sort of the agreed to but not underway section just because of those dependencies.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks Julie. I think that could be helpful, that maybe let's extract this one from this section because it sounds like it's going to need a little more work, I think that would be helpful.

We're coming up to the top of the hour, and I know I have another call at the top of the hour as I'm sure many of you do too. Why do we try to talk to one more recommendation and then we can just discuss our next steps and recap where we are and how we're going to continue to move forward. Let's go ahead and hit Recommendation 11. Looking at this it might be - and actually these next two might be relatively easy to address.

This one states that the face-to-face PP working group highly project be assessed when completed. If the results are beneficial guidelines should be developed and support funding made available. Marika, this is the same PDP working group highly you were discussing previously, is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And again here it may make sense to link those two together because at least from the pilot those were both part of, you know, the same pilot project. And my understanding or expectation is as well that for the, you know, the guidelines are being developed that also will be considered together. So maybe it makes sense to just put those together.

Jennifer Wolf: Yes, I agree. I think any of these that relate to the PDP working group highlights why don't we circle back and we will just look at those together because I think it could end up and be relatively easy to dispense with those as, you know, proceed with the recommendations from that pilot project.

Let's just go ahead and hit 14 here too, it's very similar, that the GNSO further explores PDP chunking, and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages. I think that general comment was that - this is already somewhat being done by the GNSO Council as PDPs are approved. Is there any other comments on this particular one? This one could be just the checking the box that that is what is continuing to happen. Any other comments on this particular recommendation?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. For some reason I'm not able to raise my hand. But just to note as well I think this is one as well where the working group would say like nothing prevents the Council or working groups from doing so as the PDP manual and guidelines provide a lot of possibility in relation to how work is done. So maybe it's something as well just to emphasize that there is currently nothing preventing this from happening, it's really something queer indeed may be something where, you know, the working group just encourages, you know, the Council to give due consideration to, you know, breaking up pieces of work.

But, you know, as you already mentioned I think in several of the recent PDPs this is actually already happening. You know, RPMs, they are working into phases. RDS PDP actually even has three phases I know that the new gTLD PDP is working through a number of I think some teams or tracks they're called.

So I think especially with PDPs getting kind of bigger in scope and nature there is I think a natural tendency to try and carve that up in more discrete pieces. And again, nothing in the current rules or guidelines prevent that from happening.

Jennifer Wolf: Okay thanks, Marika. That's helpful. Yes, I thought that way too, that that was just seemingly is already being done. We've only got a few more minutes until the top of the hour so I think we should stop and just talk about what our next steps are and our calendar.

I would ask for staff, I know we're going to have a two-week bi here with the ICANN meeting coming up where people are traveling next Tuesday, November 1, and the meeting is continuing through November 8. So our next scheduled phone call is on Tuesday, 15 November.

In between those calls, you know, certainly would like to see that we can continue to restructure this document, put in some additional pieces of information as we've talked about, try to reorganize these recommendations to be right next to each other if they are dealing with each other as we talked about in this call today.

And then we can continue to work our way through the recommendations into an implementation plan that can hopefully be presented to Council in December. Julie, I see your hand is up. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'll just note that there is a meeting, a face-to-face meeting in Hyderabad that is on November 7 from 11:00 am to 12:15 pm. And so, you know, for those who are there that would be another opportunity for a working meeting. And what staff was planning on doing is, you know, obviously taking the changes that have been made today and incorporating them and adjusting - and placing these things in batches, actually creating a batched section really I think or rearranging what we have here.

I think staff also has seen the trend of the discussion here today, could look through the recommendations that, you know, that we haven't yet discussed and put in some suggestions, you know, for additional information, you know, for, you know, resources. I know Wolf-Ulrich mentioned the importance of trying to get some of the budgetary dependencies in there. Staff have taken a stab at that but we can do a little bit more of that, really just to try to fill in as much as possible with the batching and the dependencies.

And then try to provide a draft that allows people to have some time to look at it, you know, to be able then to work through it the 7th – the meeting on the 7th.

Jennifer Wolf: That would be very helpful, Julie. And certainly too, if people are listening to the recording were reading the transcript later, you know, please as these documents are circulated take the time to read them, provide comments on list, you know, I know I'm not able to be at the next meeting in person. I know some others may not as well. But certainly all the comments that you have can be incorporated, you know, on list and in the future calls that we have.

So thank you to Julie and Marika and Terri and everyone on staff for continuing to help us move this forward. We'll have the meeting than in person, as Julie said, on the seventh. And then our next phone call will be on the 15th. And we will just continue to try to move our way through this and stay on track with our goal.

I know were at the top of the hour. Is there any final comments from anyone? Okay with that we'll close out this meeting and we'll look forward to continuing our work. I think all of you who have joined today for your comments and continued participation. So thank you. And that will bring the meeting to a close.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day. (Bob), the operator, if you could please stop all recordings?

END