

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Implementation Plan Webinar
Thursday, 08 December 2016 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-08dec16-en.mp3>

Attendance is listed on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/MJrDAw>

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

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Implementation Plan Webinar held on Thursday the 8th of December, 2016.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call as this is a webinar. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room so if you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now? Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I'll hand it back over to Jennifer Wolfe, GNSO Working Group Chair. Please begin.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Terri and thank you to all of you for taking time today to participate in this webinar. We hope it will be very informative and particularly to help those of you on Council to understand the way the implementation plan has been drafted and consider approving the motion before you during the next meeting.

Our agenda for today is to take about 20 minutes and I'll review the deck that we have prepared to give you an overview of the plan and how the working group has arrived at this plan, and then we'd like to take questions and discussion and any other business that we have so that we may move this forward.

So let me see if I have this working. Great, okay. So to begin just as background, the GNSO Council adopted the GNSO Review Working Group during our meeting in July of this year. The scope of our work, as the working group, is to develop a realistic timeline for the implementation plan, to define the desired outcomes, to determine a way to measure the current state versus those outcomes, and to move towards the desired outcome of the GNSO review recommendations that were now adopted by the Board.

So our goal, as the group, is to help ensure that these recommendations that have been approved by Council and the Board are ultimately implemented and measured in some meaningful way.

The implementation plan has been submitted to Council. I believe it is now up for review during the next Council meeting on Thursday, the 15th of December. Our timeline is that our plan is to be submitted to the Board no later than six months after the adoption of the Board's resolution, which puts us at the end of this December.

Following the approval, our working group will continue to execute and oversee the implementation of the review recommendations and the plan that we have put forth.

To provide just a brief timeline overview of where we are, Westlake, the independent examiner who conducted the review, sent their final report back in September of 2015. In April of 2016, the GNSO Council approved what was then the working party where we had developed a final assessment and prioritization of the recommendations. The GNSO Council approved that.

In June, the Board approved that final report, including the go-ahead to proceed with the 34 recommendations. In July of 2016, Council determined steps towards the implementation plan for Board approval and approved the motion to create the working group for us to then move forward with creating the implementation plan.

Our group convened in September of this year and we now have a motion before Council to approve the implementation plan with the goal for it to be delivered to the Board by the end of December.

I want to just briefly provide an overview of the organization of the plan because I realize it is a cumbersome document, and you all have many cumbersome documents that you're reviewing in this process. And just I know one of the concerns that has been raised is are we trying to do this too quickly? And I want to just alleviate some of those concerns by recognize that this really is a macro plan. It is essentially a plan to create smaller broken down plans.

So when you review the document you'll see there's an executive summary, there's an overview of the recommendations, there's a prioritization and dependencies. And I'm going to show you an example of each of these here in just a few minutes. A methodology, a timeline and then of course in the annexes is the background and the charter of the GNSO Review Working Group.

Did we miss a slide there, Julie? It looks like it's missing to me.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. The example slides are actually at the end. Sorry about that. Well, the examples...

Jennifer Wolfe: No that's okay. That's all right, okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'm sorry, the examples of each phase is at the end, pardon me. But, no, I think otherwise these slides are in order.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great. I just wanted to check. So one of the things that we included in the plan was any prioritizations and dependencies so we were very concerned about ensuring that if there were other work being done that we identified those and flagged those so that we knew that there were some dependencies. And again, we'll show you that here in just a few moments.

As we approached our work we wanted to categorize all of these recommendations. Having 34 of them, that would be too many to attack in 34 different small groups. So we grouped them into three big categories. One is PDP improvements, effectiveness and implementation. The second is anything related to membership, so GNSO Council, stakeholder groups, constituency appointments, membership, procedures and so on. And the third dealt more with performance, participation, meeting tools, outreach and volunteers.

So we've taken all of these 34 recommendations and put those into these broad categories. And from there we then look at the dependencies, again, any other project that's going on within the GNSO that might impact that particular grouping of recommendations.

And then probably the most important piece for all of you to go back and look at is the who will implement. This is where we've indicated our recommendation of whether it should be staff, some other working group, our working group to follow through on it or some other combination within the

community. So I would say as you review the document, to really focus on the who will implement component because when I say it's a plan to create a plan, the who will implement is who will be creating that micro plan for those specific recommendations.

And then we also look at the resource requirements, any resources needed to accomplish the recommendations that have been set forth. We've also looked carefully at any budget effects, are there any costs associated with the implementation of those recommendations? Anything where there might be an increase in staff needed, studies and so on. And so we've noted those in the plan.

And then finally, again, this is another area I would suggest that you focus on when you read the document is the proposed implementation steps. So these are the steps that we propose are taken to implement the plan again, going back to that notion of a plan to create a plan. So the two key steps I would look at is who is going to be creating that micro plan? And what are the proposed steps that we have in place?

We've then taken this to put into three phases of work in terms of when would each of these batches be undertaken. So we looked first at Phase 1 which would be work that's already underway. We identified 14 recommendations where we believe that there was some other working group or somebody else somewhere in the GNSO was already doing something along these lines. So we believed that that would be low hanging fruit, so to speak, that would be relatively easy to deal with those items to see that they are followed through and have a plan to know that those have been implemented.

The second phase we looked at was what was determined by Council and by the Board as high priority items. So these would be items that we think have the greatest impact but also need the most amount of work so I would focus also as you review the document on this Phase 2 high priority items. There were five recommendations in that category. And we looked at those to

accomplish during the first year. And those can overlap with the work already underway, the Phase 1. But we believe the focus on this Phase 2 should be where the most emphasis is provided.

And then Phase 3 would be those recommendations that were prioritized as medium or low priority so that included 15 recommendations. So this would then be overlapped into the second or third year of implementation since those were deemed as less important or less impactful.

The methodology that we used is built upon what was developed for the ATRT 2 implementation. It's been determined to be a best practices by ICANN. And so therefore we've utilized that approach and methodology in building out the plan. This allows us to take several recommendations and combine them into one project charter plan. So again, we're trying to manage these 34 recommendations in a way that's most effective and efficient and that we can actually see the greatest impact.

So the charter will signify the consensus on the vision, scope, authority and overall deliverables of the project. So again, as you read the plan let's focus on who's implementing and what the implementation steps are so that we can measure the effectiveness of it in the longer term.

So each charter template will include the following details: Who's on the team, the recommendation team; background; scope; assumptions and deliverables; a solution analysis and options and proposed solution; any key dependencies on other work; risk identification and key performance indicators.

So as we had mentioned this phasing approach, you can see here on this slide we have these three phases. Phase 1 we recommend is realistic to accomplish between January and May of 2017. Again, that's work that's already underway somewhere within the GNSO so we believe that should be relatively easy to deal with.

Phase 2 is the high priority recommendations. This was, again, five recommendations that we believed are high priority for the GNSO. We've provided a timeline of January to December of 2017 to implement those recommendations.

And then Phase 3 would not begin until June of 2017 and continue until the end of December 2018. And that is, again, where we had 14 recommendations that were medium or low so we wanted to ensure that we had a realistic timeline to implement.

What's on the screen now is just a sample Gant chart. Again, when I talk about this being a plan to create a plan, each of the groups charged, the who's in charge of each implementation group, would create a chart similar to this to determine how many days and at what point in time is this recommendation implemented.

So you could an example here might be Recommendation 18, there's a 30-day implementation period or all the way down to Recommendation 6 is a 350-day implementation period. So these charts would be created once the plan is approved.

This is another sample of Phase 3 as we're looking now out into June of 2017 all the way to the end of 2018. So you can see the things – I'll scroll back here – you can see things that may be very easy to dispense with could be done with 30 or 60 days. That's work that's already underway. This orange category, the high priority, we've got a full year allocated for that. And then the Phase 3, these are the things that were medium or low and so we've determined that that could be pushed out into the following year.

So what we're asking for at this point in time is, one, for Council to really encourage participation. We have had a hard time getting full participation in our working group so we certainly ask that you encourage your stakeholder

groups and constituencies to participate. We do have a deadline for producing this plan so I understand concerns about it being a short time period, but also do ask for you to consider this really is a macro plan; it's a plan to create the plan. It's a plan for who implements and how do they go about doing that, not necessarily every single detail in the implementation process.

So we are hoping that we can answer questions of Council during this webinar and that we'll be able to proceed with the implementation plan and present it by the end of the year.

I'd like to take just a minute and show you a couple of examples from the document and then we can stop and take questions and have discussion. So you'll see here, this is a Phase 1 example. Remember, Phase 1 is those things that are already being done somewhere else in the GNSO Council. So I'm not going to read through all of this but just so you can see the organizational structure.

We listed the original independent examiner's recommendation, where it was prioritized, comments from the working party during the process, any additional comments from Council, the status of any sort of existing improvement effort or who's leading in that space. And then a couple of key categories that I really want you all to look at are the dependencies, what is this dependent upon? In this case you see there's another working group already addressing this issue.

Who's going to implement? We have that here as staff because it's already being done somewhere else. The resource requirements; the budget effects, which you can see here are minimal; and then the proposed implementation steps where you can see we've listed the steps that need to be taken to implement this recommendation.

I'll show you another example from Phase 2. Phase 2 are those recommendations that we deemed as high priority. And again, what we've done here is we've grouped several similar recommendations together so that they would be implemented as one project. So this would be Recommendation 26, 27, 28 and 29. Again, I'm not going to read all of this here but want you understand those have now been grouped together. You can again, see any working party comments, Council comments, dependencies.

And here we have who would implement, and we have that as the working group and the GNSO Council meaning the working group would tackle these recommendations, create the more detailed plan and then take that to Council for approval. And I think you'll see many of the recommendations that is how we have it allocated so the working group continues to create the micro plan for each of these and present it to Council.

We've got budget effects to determine whether there's any additional staff needed; and then the proposed implementation steps is that the working group would develop procedures to address these issues. And I think you'll see as you go through there, many of these that's the approach that we took.

So again, as you read the plan, you know, really look at what are the dependencies, who will implement and the proposed implementation steps. Those are probably the big key issues for you to look at.

Another example here from Phase 3 that you can see on screen, again, this would be the medium or low. Those would not be addressed until a later point in time. Again, if you look at the who will implement, this is one where we have it allocated to stakeholder groups and constituencies and we have an implementation plan set forth here as well because that's who we determined would be the best person to implement those plans.

I'm going to pause here and see if there are questions, comments? Any other comments? That's actually our last slide so I'm happy to go back through any points that we raised in this webinar. I thank you all for letting me brief you on where we are and happy to answer more specific questions or go into details into the document further.

I see Amr saying, "The tool table is incredibly helpful." Thank you, Amr. Any other questions, particularly from Council members as we are certainly hoping that the motion will be approved so that we can move forward with the plan into 2017. James, please go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi, Jen. James speaking. And first off, you know, thank you very much for taking the time to not only to do all this work and put this plan together but to present it to us, I mean, with everything going on it's so easy to lose track of something so important.

Question, and I may have missed it somewhere in between the timeframe and the discussion of dependencies and which group was on the hook for implementation. But yes, this slide. When we talk about Phase 3 going out to December 2018, and this – I'm sorry, this has very little bearing to the actual plan except to note that was there any discussion or concern about that being right into the, you know, front porch of the next GNSO review? That we would still potentially – and if there are any delays that Phase 3 implementation could actually be concurrent with the, I'm guessing, 2019 GNSO review?

And just, is there anything – do you have any thoughts, as someone who I know was instrumental in both the review and putting together this implementation plan, do you have any thoughts on how we can start to work to compress these time cycles a little bit? Anyway, that's just an observation I guess. And I would be curious as if you had any thoughts or if it came up during your work.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, James. That's a great question. And it most definitely did. You know, I think – I think we will probably be able to do this sooner. I think we're erring to the side of caution in putting the timeframe together just so that there is more time. And I definitely – we do understand it would be bumping right up next to the following review.

You know, I think we were just trying to give us a buffer in case there is more time needed and focus, you know, on the high priority issues first. We do have it slated to start in June and I think it's quite possible that that could be completed – it could be completed by the end of 2017 if not mid-December. I think what we were trying to do is just ensure we didn't have an unrealistic deadline.

One of the challenges that we really have had in the working group is that we've had a very low participation rate so many times we have a very small number of people, you know, participating. And so just sort of anticipating with all of the strains on the volunteer community we could continue to face that; we wanted to give ourselves a buffer so that was the reasoning for that.

Wolf-Ulrich, please, go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Yes, thanks, Jen. And thanks, James, for the question. Well, just to add on this, James, (unintelligible) developed this plan, it was clear, you know, that the – we should not go beyond at all beyond the end of 2018 because of the new cycle of the GNSO review then. So that needs to be seen as a very, very last – very last end. So we are going to put all efforts on squeezing, you know, the time and putting – and keeping that together.

That was also the reason why we were pushing ahead, well, to keep the deadline right now end of this year and not as it's seemed to be – seemed to go that way from some people, well, to ask for, let me say, a more time, well, to understanding and presenting the plan because we wanted to start immediately in order not to get to that border. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Any other questions or discussion? Julie, would you like to add anything?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. And I'll just note a comment related to the timeline that I put into the chat room. These are suggested timelines. The working group fully expects that as the timelines are developed for the implementation of each of the phases and each of the recommendations within those phases, they will be much more precise and also likely compressed from what we have here.

And as Jen noted, yes, we did put in a bit of a buffer but then again, this is just a suggestion. And the intent is to try to complete the implementation of the recommendations in as a timely a way as possible and to avoid bumping up against the commencement of the next review period.

And I'll just note too, that while this is a somewhat detailed document, it needs to be. There are, you know, the 34 recommendations. We did try to, you know, to group them and align them and to connect them based on their dependencies. So while it may seem somewhat cumbersome, there is a definite method there that should make implementation more streamlined as well.

And I'll leave off there and turn things over to Jen noting that Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Jen. Just it came to my mind, well, I think with regard to the motion we have on the table so we have – the motion is just saying so that the Council is going to approve the plan, the implementation plan, and then put it forward to the Board. I'm wondering whether we shouldn't and discuss or think about well to – not to set the Board a deadline, let me say, that's too

much, but to make the Board aware of our time – of the time we have available. We would like to start immediately, well, so that the Board should give priority to that approval. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Absolutely. And I think the Board is aware of our timeline and we can certainly make sure that they understand our desire to move forward so that this timeline can stick.

So any other questions, discussion points? Amr, you're assuming that all is being communicated with the OEC? Yes, I believe it is. And I would just ask Council members, again, to please do encourage your members to participate perhaps if they were not able to attend to listen to the recording and/or to ensure that you have representatives as we move forward into the implementation next year. We would certainly appreciate a few more people participating in the process. That certainly helps us to have a better outcome.

Any other remaining questions or comments? Well I thank all of you for taking the time to participate. I think any of you who listen to the recording later – and if you do have questions as you go through the documents, please don't hesitate to reach out to me directly. I'll be happy to respond and provide any clarity. Julie from staff obviously is instrumental. And thank you, Julie, for all of the hard work that you've done. We greatly appreciate it. We couldn't do our work without you.

And if you do have questions please let us know. Again, we are hoping that this motion will be adopted next week and that we can move forward into the implementation plan next year. So thank you all. I wish you all very happy holidays. And look forward to picking up our work next year. That will bring the webinar to a close. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again, the webinar has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END