

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
Thursday, 11 January 2018 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-11jan18-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p57vbcjudk5/>

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

Attendance

Members:

Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)  
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP Primary)  
Lawrence Owalale-Roberts (BC Primary)  
Jen Wolfe (RySG Primary)  
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)

Participants:

Kris Seeburn (NCUC)  
Pascal Bekono (NCUC)

Apologies: Mahendra Limaye

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Marika Konings  
Emily Barabas  
Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: And the recording has started. Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you so much, Wendy. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> 2018.

On the call today, we have Kris Seeburn, Laurence Olawale Roberts, Jennifer Wolfe, Sara Bockey, Rafik Dammak, Pascal Bekono, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, and Lori Schulman. We received an apology from Mahindra Limaye. And from staff, we have Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Emily Barabas and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes, and to please mute your phones and microphones to avoid any background noise. Thank you all so much and over to you, Jen

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you so much and Happy New Year to everyone. I hope you all had a great holiday and some time off with your families over the break. Excited to see so many people on the call this morning. So thank you all for joining us.

Just to briefly review our agenda, and then we'll go ahead and jump right in. I'll momentarily ask for any updates to your statements of interest, and then we'll move in to discuss the status of the consensus calls for the implementation charters for recommendations four, five, nine and 17. Then we'll touch base on our revised work plan and where we are.

And then we'll move on to discussion of the revised implementation charter for recommendation 34. And then we'll move on and discuss the draft response to questions posed from the OEC. And then time permitting, we'll move on and discuss the implementation charter for recommendation 22 and our next meeting schedule.

Right now, are there any updates to statements of interest to start the New Year? Okay. Seeing none, we'll go ahead and move right on to the first item. Julie, could you give us an update on the status of the consensus calls for recommendations four, five, nine and 17?

Julie Hedlund: Hi. Thanks, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And yes, this consensus call ran for a longer period of time, three weeks to allow time over the holidays. And it ended on Monday the 8th at close of business. And at that point, there were no objections or comments on these implementation charters for recommendations four and the combined charter five, nine and 17.

And so those were taken as approved by consensus, full consensus and that notification was sent out on the 9th of January. So those have now been posted as implemented in our status page on the Wiki.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thanks, Julie. Any questions or concerns there? Okay, great. Julie, could you then go ahead and move on to the next item and bring us up the revised work plan?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely, Jen, This is again, Julie Hedlund from staff. And just as a note, the action item from the last call on the 14th of December was for staff to update the work plan, in particular to indicate whether there were any anticipated budget effects.

So what staff has done now is added that information in and then also revised the work plan to have it starting now in January 2018, and noting those items that have - taking off those items from the last year or so. And those are now complete also. So just to very briefly go through the plan, I'll just highlight where we've indicated possible budget effects.

So for today's meeting, we are going to look at recommendations 34 and 22. We do not anticipate any budget effects with either of those recommendations. For January 18, we hope to address recommendations one, two and three. And here, staff notes that there's possible funding for more targeted programs and to remove cost barriers to participation, if current programs and funding are not deemed sufficient to meet the recommendations.

So we've noted that there. And of course as we fill out those - that particular charter, we may have more information to add on possible budget effects. Recommendation seven and 12, if we're also able to address those at our next meeting. Those relate to possible real time transcription or transcription services.

Those do have cost, sometime significant. So staff will try to gather some information on what those costs may be, and depending - at least save perhaps for standard meetings so we could extrapolate from there what the cost might be if the plan was to provide real time transcription for all meetings or most meetings. So we'll provide more information there.

Then moving into our February schedule, looking at recommendations 20 and 21, there will be possible costs to commission analysis of trends if these have not already been addressed by current ICANN activities. And then we're noting that we have recommendations 26 through 29 that are currently on hold pending possible impact from the GDPR rules. Right now no budget effects are anticipated with those.

And then also recommendations six, 33, 35 and 36 are on hold. These are pending the recommendations of the CCWG accountability sub team on diversity. And the budget effects would depend on the recommendations coming out of that sub team. So that is a pending item. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any questions or comments on the revised work plan? Okay. Seeing none, let's go ahead and move on then to a discussion - I'm sorry.

Nathalie Peregrine: Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see that. Maybe I'm frozen. Okay. Go ahead. Sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi. Thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Julie, thank you very much for the plan. Now, I have two comments. On the first, in January, what we are doing in January. So is that realistic to cover five recommendations in the next meeting?

So I'm just wondering, you know, the number of recommendations, it may be a bunch of kind of the same kind of recommendations we are talking about here, the one, two and three and the other one is seven to nine, what the number is. That's one question.

The other thing is, I think it would be really helpful when you are going to calculate needed times for the transcription services, that you can - could present us that in detail because normally usually people are thinking about what could be the effect. (Unintelligible) what is real coming on? Everybody has different ideas.

So it's really necessary, otherwise we would need I guess several meetings now to come to an end with that calculation. But these are my comments. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And then just to address your points, yes, it is perhaps a bit optimistic to - for us to try to cover both the charter for recommendations one, two and three, although those do have a fairly close relationship as well as the recommendations for seven and 12. And staff has been adjusting this plan as we go along and we are somewhat ahead of schedule.

So we do have - you know, we should take the time, this working group should take the time it needs to fully digest these charters. So we aren't trying to rush things and we're happy to spread things out a little bit more to facilitate a more in-depth discussion. And to that end we will then try to provide a proposal with as much detail as possible on recommendation seven and 12 relating to real time transcription.

We do have I think a fair amount of information at our disposal as real time transcription is already offered at ICANN meetings, for some meetings. And also I think the ALAC is now deploying it for some of their meetings. Have to gather as much detailed information as possible to present for discussion.  
Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie and thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Any other comments? Okay. Let's go ahead and move on then - excuse me, to a discussion of the revised implementation charter for recommendation 34. Julie, could you bring that up and take us through it?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Hang on. Let me make sure I get the right one here. Okay. All right. So again, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And recommendation 34 is one that we have discussed a couple of times. And this is on rotation of PDP working group meeting start times. We did discuss this again at the meeting on 14 December, and staff and made some edits based on that discussion.

So I'll just go to those edits and just briefly go over those. So this is in the section when we talk about the solution to how to address the recommendations. Just as a reminder again, these recommendations - this is that working groups rotate the start time of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world.

And so we added some text as far as what is currently done to determine rotations. So we note that staff and the working group leadership does an analysis of the composition of the group, that is the working group, and the location of members in developing the rotation. Attendance records are gathered, posted and periodically assessed for patterns and communications regularly go out to the working group to see if the rotation needs to change.

and now, the next paragraph relates to some of the - one of the points that this working group raised at the last meeting, and that is some of the

limitations relating to the gathering of this information, and also just whether or not the rotation, you know, necessarily increases participation.

So in this next paragraph we note, however staff notes that there are limitations to the way that data are now collected. Several platforms are currently used for sign up and statement of interest completions. The current method for taking attendance also is separate.

However, ICANN has a project in the pipeline for centralized on boarding and attendance tracking, although there is not yet formal activity taking place. With the proposed tool, all three of the above mentioned data collection processes will be combined and allow for more robust information about participation patterns.

And then to the second point that I mentioned about participation, we note in the next paragraph, however, the gNSO Review Working Group notes that participation is not just an issue of time zones. Other lifestyle factors and commitments also factor into a person's ability to participate.

And then finally in the third paragraph, we add that staff notes that the review of the effectiveness of meeting times is ongoing and may vary among working groups. In addition, there are currently in place processes for working groups to assess the effectiveness of meeting time rotations within the limits of the current data collection methods.

Finally, a potential tool may be developed that could facilitate the assessment of participation patterns. Thus staff recommends that the gNSO Working Group consider these recommendations to be implemented via the current working group practices and processes.

And then in the working group determination, we note that the gNSO Review Working Group has reviewed the current working group practices and processes for the rotation of meeting times, and has determined that they

address the recommendation, that PDP working groups rotate the start time of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world. Thus the working group determines that this recommendation is implemented.

And then I see some notes in the chat. Kris Seeburn says, the rotation is good but seems we are still trying to get it right. We end up with questions that was already addressed, but it comes back. I think you're right, Kris, that part of the - part of what we try to accomplish with rotations is that we may end up having to discuss certain - discuss documents or decisions twice so that if we have say part of the group attending at one time, we would make sure that we cover all of the documents and decisions in that meeting, and then also in whatever the rotation meetings are.

So there is some duplication, unfortunately but that way you also can make sure that everybody has the same information. I'll stop there and turn it back over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks. Any comments or questions?

Nathalie Peregrine: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben has his hand up.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. I think my screen - my computer must be delayed. So if you can let me know if I'm missing someone.

Nathalie Peregrine: I sure will.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. My question is here with regards to the - to say that what the working groups, not all the working group, but you know, the working groups, who are doing the work and who are dealing with these schedules and these questions of rotations. And they are faced, every time there - have meetings, have this question.

To be very specific, a determination here or recommendation that which says that it's - in the end, it is up to the working groups to decide themselves to raise no general rule of doing it this way or that way. It depends on the assessment of the working group itself. Is that clearly spoken out in our recommendation? That is my question here. Or is - or was it discussed before anyway?

So this is - I'm just looking and thinking about what is really our recommendation. Our determination is that we say okay, yes, we have checked all this. So there are pros and cons and maybe this and that way and that's it. So - but in the end, you know, I think it might be useful also to point out that the working groups, they are the leaders in assessing this. So thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So we do say, but maybe we need to say it more strongly. We do note that the review of effectiveness of meeting times is ongoing and may vary among working groups. And then we say in addition, there are currently in place processes for working groups to assess the effectiveness of meeting time rotations within the limits of the current data collection methods.

Perhaps we could add a sentence either in that paragraph or in the working group determination where we say, you know, the working - we could say that maybe in the above paragraph that there - you know, the working group notes that there currently is no rule - what do I say? No mandate or rule governing the rotation of meeting times. The decision for rotation is left to the working group to decide based on the composition of the membership and the desire of working group members for - more and the utility of rotation.

I'll say this better when I write it, but utility of rotating meeting times to increase participation, something along those lines. Would that be helpful to add some text in - relating to that, Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. This is Wolf-Ulrich. Thanks, Julie. I think for me, it would be helpful, you know, because there may be people, some people waiting for a clear recommendation or saying - or mandating the working groups to do it this way or that way.

But I think so we cannot do that with just to my way. If that should be done, you know, there must be a greater debate of that. I think it's up to that and if you could find a kind of formulation inserting it here in the text, that will be helpful. I'm not sure - I would like to help if you come obviously to ask just to a sentence so and then we can comment on that. So let's do it this way.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'm happy to send around a draft of some text to the working group and in particular would welcome your comments, Wolf-Ulrich on that. So we'll take that action item to do that.

And perhaps what I might suggest is then once people are settled with that language, perhaps then staff could produce a final version of this charter and send it around for a consensus call. So perhaps settling on some language - final language by perhaps next meeting - next week's meeting and then running a consensus call from there.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that sounds good, Julie. And I see a green checkmark from Wolf-Ulrich Knoben as well. Thank you. Then we'll take that action item to do that. Okay, great. Any other comments? Okay. Seeing none, let's go ahead and move on. Julie, could you give us an update? You said that there were some questions from the OEC on the status report that was provided.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes. So the status report, although we did provide it to ICANN - I think we need someone to mute. Thank you. Natalie, can you find out who that is and - okay. Thank

you. All right. This is Julie Hedlund again for staff.

So we did, as you recall, provide the - our implementation status report to the OEC, at least to the staff who support the OEC following the ICANN60 meeting. That report actually - I guess the timing of the submission report is a little bit later than that, and it appears that it was sent around to the OEC last week.

So we did receive a few questions on the report from Avri Doria. And as you may recall, Avri had been participating in this working group prior to her now joining the ICANN board of directors, and now she is on the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. So we, you know, welcome her questions obviously and she probably has more insight than some of the other members as to the work of this group.

So what staff has suggested is that we've drafted some suggested responses to Avri's questions. And I'd like to then - and I think that these responses really do need to come from this working group, and I think that is actually what is anticipated by the OEC, as opposed to the staff supporting this working group. So that's why I thought it was important for staff to draft possible responses for this working group to consider.

So that's what I have in front of us today. And I should note that because the OEC really just was looking at the report last week and that's right - coming off of the holidays, it's quite possible that we may get some additional questions. But staff thought that it would be a good idea for us to be as responsive as possible in addressing these initial - these questions from Avri.

So Jen, I'll just go ahead and read the question and our responses, and then I'll do it one question at a time and see what comments or questions this working group has.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. You haven't circulated this, right? This is the first time we're seeing this, right?

Julie Hedlund: I did circulate it last night. So in effect, yes, this is the first time we're seeing it.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Unless you were reading overnight. So sorry about the lateness, but it's been a little bit of a crazy week. So the first question is on recommendation 16. And the question is, has the policy impact assessment - and I should say recommendations 16 relates to - it's a recommendation that a policy impact assessment has to be done for the PDPs. And that policy impact assessment is now part of the PDP process and PDP manual.

So, you know, we had - this working group had deemed that yes, this recommendation is met because the policy impact assessment is part of the PDP manual and is required to be done for any PDP. So her question is, has the policy impact assessment been done for any PDPs yet, i.e. those completed since February 2017? Has the template proved effective? If not, when is the first one that will test the template provided?

So as far as staff can tell in looking through the current work, there have not been - there have - no PDPs, pardon me, have been completed since February 20 17. If you look at the completed projects list, the most recently completed project was the cross community working group on the use of country and territory names of top level domains, but that is a non-PDP activity.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben is asking, what is 2017 relevant for? I think that that was - she's looking back to when this Working Group - well, this working group was started before 2017, but I think she is - that's a really good question. I

will have to - let me ask that question. Let me add that question on our response so that we understand what - why 2017 is relevant.

And Sara Bockey is noting, and the PDP would have to go through IR2 before implementing. So where would IRTPC fall into this? Actually, I think the policy impact assessment happens when the PDP working group has completed its work. No, that's - actually I take that back.

Let's think about this for a second. If we have to go through implementation, then really - if we are really looking at a PDP, not only that the PDP has been completed and agreed to by the board, but also implemented, then yes, there have been no PDP implementations. Let me go back and do a little bit more research.

I mean the PDPs that have been completed in the timeframe that Avri is asking about. And so first of all, we need to understand why she is asking about February 2017. When staff was looking ahead, the next likely PDP to complete, at least to provide recommendations to the council and then thereon to the board, is one that has been revisited. That's the protection of international organization names in all gTLDs. That one has been reconvened.

And that group hopes to complete its deliberations by February 2018, following which its recommendations will be published for public comment before the final report is submitted to the council. So I will need to - staff will need to look back and see - look more closely at the PIA process because if that process needs to be done after implementation, then there might be - for instance IRTPC might fall into this.

And he was - Marika Konings says, what the PDP manual currently says - and thank you, Marika for pulling that up. A statement on the working group discussion currently impact - concerning impact of the proposed

recommendations, which could consider areas such as economic competition, operations privacy and other rights scalability and feasibility.

I'm not sure if Avri is referring to that or is there a separate PIA that I'm not aware of. Marika, I think there is a template that - and this is actually in the original charter. There's a template relating to the policy impact assessment. That's what Avri is referring to. And hang on. We've got - Berry Cobb is typing as well.

The answer to question one on 16 is no. PIA has not been used. Likely first use will be - okay, IGO, CR - okay, the one I mentioned, the international organization names, IGS CRM. I'm not even going to try to parse out that acronym. Thank you, Berry. Sara says, also CL&D was implemented in August. Does that fall into this?

Sara, I'm not sure what that - okay, sorry. Consistent Labeling and Display. I don't think that's a PDP, Sara, in which case it wouldn't apply. Thank you. Okay. So staff will take the action to do a little bit more searching here. Okay. And Berry Cobb is noting, PIA does not apply to IRT. This is an assessment of policy recommendations. Okay. So that's clear. Thank you very much.

Let me see if I can go back to Avri and ask her, what is the significance of February 2017? And otherwise, I think based on the discussion in the chat, we're accurate in saying that there are PDPs from 2017, but it would be interesting to know why she's picked that particular date/.

So anyway, I'll stop there, Jen, and see if there are more questions or comments or discussion.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Julie. Any other comments or questions from the group on that first question from Avri? Because I know we have two others. And my computer seems to be a little slow. If I'm missing somebody, please let

me know. Okay, not seeing any, why don't we go ahead and move on to her next question?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Again, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. This is a question on recommendation 18. Given that ongoing evaluation was considered impractical, what is being substituted? Okay. So this is a reminder. So recommendation 18 has to do with the on - her reference to ongoing relates to evaluating post implementation policy effectiveness.

And the original recommendations talked about recommending that post implementation policy effectiveness would be done on an ongoing basis, rather than periodically as stated in the current operating procedures. And what the - so what the working group had determined after quite some discussion and in actuality, the gNSO Review Working Party also had the same determination that the - conducting an evaluation on an ongoing basis was not feasible.

So the gNSO - so this working group determined that it's not feasible to implement that, just that aspect of the recommendations. So Avri's question is, if we are not evaluating on an ongoing basis, how are we evaluating? And it's - at least the staff's understanding that if we're not evaluating on an ongoing basis, then we are evaluating periodically, which is the current requirement in the gNSO operating procedure. So we just then are operating under the status quo.

So let me put that out there then for comments or questions. I'm not seeing any hands up. I'm not seeing anything in the chat. So it would seem that that is an acceptable response. I see Kris Seeburn is typing. I see a green checkmark from Wolf-Ulrich. I think - Kris says, I think we need to find the - okay. And Lori Schulman agrees.

Okay. So let me move on to the final question, which is fairly straightforward. The question is, in recommendation 27 indicates that 4the membership list for

all gNSO constituencies are available. Is there a URL for these? Response is that the URLs were listed actually in the attachment to the charter. And so we just pull them out and put them here.

However, we note that recommendation 26, 27, 28 and 29 are on hold pending further guidance on the potential impact of the European Union general data protection regulation that will be enforced beginning 25 May, 2018. Any questions or comments on that? Seeing none, Jen, back over to you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. Okay, great. Thank you. And then so we still have the one final question, right?

Julie Hedlund: So I think that was it.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. Thank you. Okay. So it sounds like we're going to work on the - on our response to the first one and the others are okay to go?

Julie Hedlund: You know, actually just the only - I think the only thing for the first one was, I think we decided this is an appropriate response because the PIA only applies to policy recommendations and not to implementation. So it's correct to say that there are no PDPs to which this would apply right now, but that there is one coming up that, you know, would be the most likely one which we've got listed here.

But in going back to - and providing a response to Avri, staff will also ask Avri, what is the significance of the February 2017 date just so that we understand that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. Okay. Wonderful. Let's go ahead and move on then to - this is our first time we'll be discussing the implementation charter for recommendation 22.

Julie Hedlund: That's correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: If you can pull that up for us, that would be great.

Julie Hedlund: Let me bring that up. Okay. So recommendations 22 relates to developing needs and opportunities, specifically that the gNSO council develop a competency based framework, which its members should use to identify development needs and opportunities. And so the scope would be that staff would provide an overview of the available training and skills development mechanisms. And then the gNSO Review Working Group will review the current training and skills development mechanisms and determine whether these are sufficient to address the recommendations.

One thing I want to note is that when the gNSO review work party - working party reviewed this particular recommendation, it did take issue with the phrase competency based framework. And I have to admit that from a staff point of view, it is a little bit difficult to understand what is meant by this. I mean there - as you'll see, there are quite a number and a variety of training options and mechanisms provided by ICANN.

Whether or not these comprise a competency based framework, I'm not quite clear what is meant by that. So I'd like to call that out just initially because since that's in the primary recommendation and it is language that - well, the review working party couldn't change the language, but did call out that it was - I see Kris - Kris Seeburn says, I think it has to be something to do with people, with proper knowledge of what is being discussed.

Pascal Bekono asks, why is EU GDPR so important to have recommendations 26, 29 pending? Thank you, Pascal. So recommendations 26 through 29 deal with the collection of statements of interest and storage of those data from the community, members of the constituencies and stakeholder groups, working groups and so on.

GDPR, and I'm not at all qualified really to comment on the rules and exactly what they entail, but it does - may impact how that - how personally identifying information is accessed or displayed or stored. And here I have - others are typing. So perhaps someone can help me out there.

So because - so there is a possibility that there may be changes to the recommendations based on the requirements of GDPR. And I know that there are - that within ICANN, there's also some activity to provide some guidance in this area as well. So I see others are typing. Kris says, I thought I saw a document from EU for the internet websites e-commerce. Yes, that's right.

And Wolf-Ulrich Knoben says, any kind of data collection is falling from a European perspective under the GDPR. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. So because we have - 26 through 29, those recommendations relate to data that's collected from members of the community and how it can be accessed and stored, then these recommendations could be subject to the GDPR. And I hope that's helpful.

So back to the competency based framework. Is - do any others have any questions about - I know that Kris had said, thought it was people having proper knowledge of what is being discussed. To my mind, it could also relate to the fact that we want to have training that helps people do what they need to do within say the gNSO, within a PDP, within a working group.

And I see Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. We don't have an answer to this question. But the question is then sent to you. Did you check backwards, you know, from the beginning what the issues have been, you know, that bringing us to this recommendation so that we can better understand, you know, why we formulated in the recommendation as it is.

Just want to know - just help us to get a link to the - to where we come from. Otherwise, we should check that and that may help, you know, to understand and give us an understanding, better understanding of this. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. That's an excellent idea. And I'll - staff will take that as an action to go back to the original report from the independent examiner where there should, we would hope, be some guidance with respect to this particular recommendation. And so we'll take that action to come back with that link for the next meeting.

And we'll also take a look through the gNSO Review Working Group working parties report as well and see if there - I do know that there was some commentary on this language as well and that it was not as clear as it could be. But the language wasn't changed. I mean the language stands as in the original recommendation.

So and just a couple of things from the chat. Kris Seeburn says, I'm sure there are two legal advise to ICANN on the gDPR. Lori Schulman says there were three members of legal advise on gDPR. Thank you. So to circle back and look at that and thank you, Wolf-Ulrich for that. And then what staff did was looked through existing training options and mechanisms within ICANN.

So there are really two categories of the training options. There are those that provide gNSO specific skills. And I think this is - this is I think what the recommendation was trying to get at, was making sure that there was training that would enable the community members to more fully participate in PDPs and in working groups, and to understand the work of the gNSO.

So the training that relates specifically to gNSO is called gNSO 101. And I'm not going to read the whole description here, but there are several - this is a self-training, online training. It has various modules. You can go through them at your leisure. So there's a module on role of the gNSO council

member, and working group operations, working group formulation, working group chairs guide, the new policy development process, and communication tools.

So those are all modules specific to how one would operate, how one would participate in the gNSO, either in the council or in a working group as part of a PDP. And then there are documents relating to the policy development process. So and again, self-training. Read the documents at your leisure.

There is a section about consensus policy, about the PDP, about Working Group guidelines. And then there's a policy update archive with all of the policy updates. So those are related specifically to the work of the gNSO. And then there are - there's training options related to general leadership skills. So options to help the community understand what ICANN does and provides the skills for participation in ICANN's activities and groups.

there is the online platform, ICANN Learn and these courses, this is a - it's an e-learning type of platform and the courses cover the basics of what ICANN does, web skills, how to get involved with ICANN and more. And then there is the comprehensive ICANN academy program originally developed through a working group within the ALAC, but now is - there were some pieces of this that were piloted in 2017, but now is being carried over and will be moving into sort of a more formal program.

There's leadership program for current and incoming leaders and to help them understand the complexity of ICANN and develop facilitation skills. And so these include opportunities for leaders to meet with leaders of other ACs and SOs, discuss important ICANN topics in an in depth manner, deepen the understanding of key ICANN processes and develop facilitation and leadership skills, focused personal effectiveness to run meetings and foster processes.

There's also the - there was the 2017 sharing skills program which is

envisioned to be continued, and there are some details on that. And then there's an intercultural awareness program as well. So we had - staff have put in a suggestive working group determination, but recognizing that we need to have an additional discussion here relating to the competency based framework issue.

We don't need to get into that right now. But I see Jen has her hand up. Please go ahead, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, Julie. I was just wondering, is there anything in here that has technical training? I know that was one of the issues back when we were going through this originally, that sometimes folks need training on understanding of the DNS itself and some of the technical back end components, other than just the policy process.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you very much. And, you know, this is Julie Hedlund. Yes, there is actually a training module relating to understand the DNS. And I didn't put that in here, and I don't know - I guess I wasn't focusing on it because I was thinking PDP and working groups and so on. But there is specifically a training on that as well. So let me go ahead and add that in - the link to that as well and a description of that.

And I think also, I'm going to try to get some more details on the modules within ICANN Learn. It's - because it's - you actually have to sign in to the site to - in there. And for some reason, it's not letting me in. So I need to work on the back end of that.

But because I believe that ICANN Learn also has - may have some technical aspects to it as well. So we'll - staff will take the action to find out what is available on the technical side. And I see Kris has a question. Are there any guidelines of ethics on mailing in our working group work tracks CCWG groups? Because at times, things tend to degenerate. I would happy to do the taking care of.

And Marika Konings says that the ICANN standards of behavior apply with respect to guidelines and ethics. Also, the working group guidelines have also some guidelines on how the - how members are expected to participate within a working group, what happens if there are any disagreements and so on.

So the working group guidelines themselves, actually then that's a very good point, are - and the PDP manual are also educational tools as well to help people participate in the, you know, in the gNSO. And I see Kris Seeburn says, I agree. Yes, and then these need to be fully enforced. And Marika Konings is typing.

So I've got an action to link back to the origination of this recommendation and any dialogue around it. We have the action to get more information on technical training. Are there any other comments or questions people have, or actions for staff with respect to this charter? And Marika Konings says, Kris, there's at least one example where a working group member was removed due to failure to meet the standards despite numerous reminders. Thank you, Marika.

Jen, I'm not seeing any more hands up or any more typing in the chat. So over to you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. Thanks, Julie. So we'll look forward to those updates and then we can move forward with that recommendation. So we're almost at the top of the hour. We managed to get through all of our agenda items. Just a reminder that we are meeting again next Thursday 18th of January, excuse me, so that we could continue our work. And I think we're trying to avoid a conflict two weeks from now.

So our next meeting is next Thursday and then we'll continue on with our

every other week cycle. So any other remaining comments or questions before we close out the meeting today?

Julie Hedlund: Jen, this is Julie Hedlund again. Just a note. So we had determined that really the 11th and the 18th were the only days we could meet in January. And I think that we're also - yes, we're also avoiding the 1st of February because - and avoiding the 25th of February - I mean January, pardon me, because we have a staff retreat, the 22nd through the 26th.

But then we have the gNSO council strategic meeting, planning meeting in the initial part of the following week, the week of the 29th and then we have other community group meetings the latter portion of that week. And so there was a request not to have a meeting on the 1st of February. So our next - our first meeting in February would then be the 8th and we would just have these two meetings in January.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So will you be adjusting - I know there were calendar invites that went out, because I still have mine on the first. So will that come out as an adjustment?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I actually thought we had done that. Let me coordinate with our secretariat and make sure we have this right. But let me just confirm with the working group that - I thought there was a conflict for the 1st, that there is a meeting, at least one, if not two community group meetings. Man, I forget which ones there are.

Lori Schulman: Julie, there is. I'm sorry, it's Lori.

Julie Hedlund: Just go ahead, Lori. Thank you. Help me out here.

Lori Schulman: Yes. Julie, there is the - yes, I'm sorry. Yes, there's the gNSO Intersessional for the Non-Contracted Parties House, of which I'm a part of. I think Rafik

may be part of it as well. I'm not sure. He's not on the call anymore, but I think Rafik may be part of it too.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. That's very helpful. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. So yes, I thought - now I remember. It seems so long ago, but when we were having this discussion, that there was that conflict the on the 1st. And Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen is confirming that as well. So Jen, that's why we are avoiding that, but I'll make sure that the secretariat have adjusted the invites accordingly.

And I see Natalie is typing as well. Yes. And Nathalie Peregrine say, we will go over all the invites after the call. So thank you very much, Jen. And then just any final word to you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. Thanks everyone again for taking time for the call today. We appreciate your continued commitment to this process and we'll look forward to talking again next week. That will bring this meeting to a close

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks. Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, everybody. This concludes today's call. Operator, you may now stop the recording and disconnect the lines. Have a great rest of your day.

END