

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
13 April 2017 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-13apr17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p55qqjixk6i/>

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

**Attendees:**

**Members:**

Heath Dixon (RrSG Primary)  
Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)  
Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP Primary)  
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)  
Donna Austin (RySG Alternate)  
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts (BC Primary)  
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)  
Avri Dori (NCSG Alternate)

**Participants:**

Pascal Bekono (NCUC)

**Apologies:**

Renata Aquino Ribeiro (Participant NCUC)  
Marika Konings - Staff

**ICANN staff:**

Julie Hedlund  
Negar Farzinnia  
Amr Elsadr  
Berry Cobb  
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the GNSO Review meeting held on the 13th of April, 2017. On the call today we have Pascal Bekono, Jen Wolfe, Avri Doria, Donna Austin, Wolf-Ulrich

Knoben, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Lori Schulman, Rafik Dammak and Sara Bockey. We have no listed apologies for today's call.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Negar Farzinnia, Amr Elsadr, Berry Cobb, and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants 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 turn it back over to our chair, Jen Wolfe. Please begin.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. And thank you all of you for making time for this call today. I know we're coming up on a holiday weekend for many of you so thank you for taking time to join the call.

To just briefly review our agenda for today, we're going to start with a flow chart of work to just update everybody on what the work plan looks like and get some feedback on that. And then we will continue in the work that we've been doing to review the revised draft charters based upon the notes that we had at our last meeting, which was the 30th of March, and continue our work through the charters of the various recommendations and then of course look at our next meeting, which is scheduled for the 27th of April.

I do just want to briefly ask if anyone has any updates to their statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, we could move on to presenting the flowchart of work. Julie, would you like to take us through that?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. Let me get up and then also – there it is, okay. And I will be happy to talk through it, it's kind of small. Make that bigger. All right, I hope – I'll make it even bigger still. Heath Dixon is joining, I see.

Okay, so I did this late yesterday and I hope it makes some sense. It just chatting with Jen and also with our vice chair, Wolf-Ulrich, I got the sense that

– or we got the sense that perhaps people needed to think a little bit about how we wanted to proceed with the work. We've obviously, you know, we've got the recommendations, we've been doing the charters and yet we haven't really talked about how we want to tackle these and, you know, what our process will be.

And so staff thought it might be helpful to put this down on paper. And it's a fairly crude flowchart since I'm not actually very good at doing flowchart graphics. But I hope you'll ignore the fact that it's a little bit messy, but I'll talk through it and welcome any questions.

So one of the things that staff talked about with Jen and Wolf-Ulrich was if we look at sort of a scanned all of the Phase 1 and 2 recommendations, which staff has actually put into – just sort of a summary document, which I can also bring up for the meeting today.

As we look at the various recommendations while that's happening staff has taken the initiative, we've been doing this, as you've noticed, of drafting – doing draft charters just to help with the work to move things along maybe a little bit more expeditiously so that we don't have to do that step first of deciding whether or not there's a smaller group within this working group that wants to draft charters or whether or not the full working group wants to work on drafting charters.

Staff has taken the initiative to draft charters at the same time as the working group has been looking at recommendations and deciding how to address them. And in looking at the recommendations, and looking at the charters that the staff is drafting, what the workgroup can decide is if this something that the full workgroup wants to work on?

So once there's a charter and the working group can decide if there's going to be worked on by the full working group or is there – does the working group want to form a sub team to work on these items? And that, you know, and it

may be that that would depend also on whether or not there are enough volunteers to form a sub team. We generally have a fairly small working group so it might not be feasible to do that, but that's a possibility.

Then, sorry, my scrolling is a little bit fussy. Then once we decide, you know, working group decides whether or not it wants the full working group or the subgroup, either way than sub team or the full team – a working group, sorry – would consider the charter and the draft charter that the staff has produced, and decide whether to approve the charter. That is the process that we've been in now with some of the charters that already exist.

And then once the charter is approved or not, we'd go back and forth if the charter's approved, make revisions, and that's the process, again, that we've been in right now where we've been looking at the charters and staff have been making revisions.

In the final, you know, once the charter is approved and we moved to implementation. What we've seen in some of the ones – some of the charters that we've been looking at now is that some of the work in Phase 1 is identified as work that has already concluded or is currently being addressed.

And so for some of the Phase 1 recommendations this may actually be more of a perfunctory process of saying, yes, this is implemented. For some of the more complex recommendations that we will come upon in Phase 2, and also in Phase 3, then it may be that implementation will be a longer process; one that the working group will need to monitor and then sign off on.

And then, you know, at the end of the whole process there would be a reporting to the Council from the working group. There is actually a provision for I think quarterly reporting to the Council.

So that's the workflow as staff is imagining it, and happy to take any questions.

Jen Wolfe: And, Julie, this is Jen Wolfe. I'll just note in the chat that Avri had comments about subdividing into teams, you know, could take some extra work and extra volunteers. And I think, Avri, you're absolutely right, we are all very well aware of that. And just to add commentary to that, I think there's probably only a couple of recommendations where that might be, you know, needed if there's a lot of work to do. And we could, you know, take those in turn.

But I'd like to look to the group for comments on this basic workflow, you know, just within the context that this is – we're tackling still the recommendations where we think there was work underway, we think they should be easier to dispense with first and then we'll move our way into the more meaty ones, if you will. Any other comments from the group? Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, hi, Jen. Thanks, Julie. Well, it's easy to understand this and I agree to this flow. The only question is can we, you know, in the end, as you have a bunch of recommendations to cope with, so is the question how many we can do in parallel really? So the chart is clear but what are the criteria to decide then to – whether to divide it in sub teams or not and to do that?

I think it depends on both things. The one is the complexity of the content on the one hand and the other one is, well, what Avri is commenting on is the question of availability of human resources here to have. And so the question is I think it will come – become to a more complex over time, you know, when it comes to the stage we start, you know, to implement the charter we have finalized and then other recommendations come into scope.

So I would say let's go a practical way here, so just start with those things and then we have the first recommendation, the first charters available and can start the work and then, you know, fill it up with the other tasks and we'll see how we can do it in practice. So that's how I see that process. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Any other comments? I see Lori is adding in, "I agree, human capital needed and human capital is in short supply." Avri, you've got your hand up, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, hi.

Jen Wolfe: Oh there you are.

Avri Doria: Avri speaking. Yes, just took me a while to find my mic and unmute. One of the question I have in addition to the human overhead, and basically I'm not even saying that, you know, do we have enough people if we were just the doing of sub teams takes – adds extra work. So unless there is really a good reason for it, like there is hundreds of items to be worked on or the items are so intricate that they're different.

Let the other concern I thought is to what extent will they all be touching on the PDP or all touching on similar things? So, you know, do we have a situation where we might create some teams that then get into some form of deadly embrace with the other in that oh I can't do this until they have done that type of notion.

And in reading through, and I haven't delved deeply into the charters but I've looked at them, it looks like there may be so I'm wondering if that part of the analysis as done is do any of them touch the same thing at the same time? But I guess with a limited number of tasks, sometimes looking through them sequentially is actually quicker then adding the organizational overhead.  
Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Avri. And, Amr, I noted your hand up and then, Lori, I see your hand is up too. But, Amr, why don't you go ahead?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jen. This is Amr. But I think I'll let Lori go first because my question is not about the sub teams, it's just about the flowchart in general...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: ...so once we're done with the sub teams topic, yes, thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Lori, go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Yes, can you hear me?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, we can hear you.

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me?

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Lori Schulman: Oh good, okay. This is a new mic and headset so just making sure. Yes, I tend to agree with Avri. I think (unintelligible) to create your own special problems. And I have a strong preference given the small number of participants that we have in this group to just work each item methodically and thoroughly and just get through the work rather than creating more process. I think we are on process overload right now in some other workgroups (unintelligible) I know that Avri's cochairing on Subsequent Procedures, I am mired in RPMs at the moment, some other Work Stream 2 efforts.

And as much as I want to participate, if we start divvying up the work and creating extra calls, you might lose me. And I don't know if you'd lose anybody else. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Lori. Amr, did you want to go ahead now?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jen. This is Amr again. And I have a general comment on the flowchart. I think it might be helpful, and this may not become necessary, but

I think it might also be helpful when this working group is reviewing the independent examiners' recommendations as well as the GNSO Working Party recommendations on those to consider whether when faced with implementation issues, if some of those present as problematic than this working group may want to consider how best to address those.

And that may require some refinement to the flowchart, I think, it might require at some point to communicate with the GNSO Council, just a thought.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Any other comments on the workflow chart? Okay, seeing none, why don't we go ahead and proceed with the follow up from the draft charters and recommendations from our last meeting? And then if we get through those we can keep moving forward. And I think this whole idea of sub teams we can address, you know, if the issue comes up and we think it's appropriate we can discuss it, you know, as we move forward since we have so many things to keep moving forward through.

Julie, do you want to pick up on where we left off last time and any changes that have been made?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. So we will go ahead and proceed through the draft charters based on the actions from the call on 30 March. So the first of these is Recommendation 8, that is that working groups should have an explicit role in responding to the implementation issues related to policy that they have developed.

And a recommendation here was that language should be pulled in relating to the implementation review team principals and guidelines. So in addition to the text that was included in the revision of the PDP manual, addressing how implementation should be, you know, should be conducted, there is also a set of principles and guidelines for implementation review teams.



And actually, let me make this even a little bit bigger, and these guidelines actually address the composition of implementation review teams in a way that staff thinks may then also address the recommendations.

First of all under IRT Recruitment, Section 1, the principles and guidelines notes that the call for IRT volunteers should, at a minimum, be sent to all members of the PDP working group that was responsible for developing the policy recommendations. And, you know, then the call may need to go beyond the working group but staff notes that it is specifically called out that the recruitment should go to that PDP working group that developed the policy.

In addition, in Section 2 for the composition of the IRTs, it says that IRT should include at least one participant from the original PDP working group who can provide insight into the original reasoning behind consensus policy recommendations.

So the principal and guidelines go even more specifically to ensuring that as the recommendation says, ensuring that the working groups would have an explicit role in responding to the implementation issues as working groups are explicitly called out in the recruitment and also in the composition of the IRTs.

So this is in addition to the fact that the implementation review teams are called out in the PDP manual and, you know, so we have both the provision whereby, you know, the PDP manual states that the implementation review team has to be created and has to have adequate expertise but its composition also has to include – recruitment has to be to the PDP working group and the composition needs to include at least one member from the PDP working group.

So from the staff point of view, it would seem that the current, you know, existing – existing resources do meet the requirements of this recommendation. The other change that was requested was that to the key

performance indicators, the KPI, and that call out that future PDP working groups should be aware of the requirements in the PDP manual with respect to working group participation in the IRTs as well as the provisions concerning recruitment and composition in the principles and guidelines. So staff made that change as well.

So these were then – these are then – the changes that we made in this version 4, which – sorry this is so wonky – for, you know, following up on the last call. And so the question staff has to the working group is, you know, the working group needs to decide has this recommendation been achieved? You know, as in the flowchart, you know, we've got the draft charter, the working group is reviewing the charter. The working group then decides, you know, that we can move to implementation.

Here implementation appears to have already occurred because this is ongoing work. So the question staff has to the working group is, is this, you know, this recommendation achieved? You know, at what point does the working group decide that? Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. So to that question, do we have comments from the working group? Do we think this has been achieved and that that would be our recommended approach on this recommendation? I see Amr is typing. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, hi. Avri speaking again. Before calling it all done, one of the things I want to make sure of is coincidentally in one of the Work Stream 2 review teams, we are talking with staff about exactly this policy implementation issue. And from that perspective, it didn't seem that there was even knowledge of there being a notion of implementation review teams. Now this was a more senior part of staff, and it wasn't a specifically GNSO part of staff.

So that would bring me to the question, and I see that they've been documented in GDD's policies, are they in operation? Are they being used?

Are they working? Because I guess, I mean, I've known of some going on. I haven't been involved in any of them so have no personal views on how well they're working or if they're working. But just curious about that. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Avri. Amr, I see you were addressing this in the chat. Do you want to respond to Avri on that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Jen. This is Amr. Well, in my not extensive experience but I have spent some time working with a couple of the implementation review teams following up on GNSO PDPs, and in that experience, yes, I have seen GDD staff refer to specifically the principles developed by the Policy and Implementation Working Group and how implementation review teams are supposed to – what their role is, what the role if staff is and what the role of the GNSO is.

And one recent example of when this was something that was kind of front and center was when the thick Whois IRT decided to send a letter to the GNSO Council pertaining to the evolving privacy and data protection environment and how that affects the recommendations of the thick Whois PDP Working Group that is – which is now a consensus policy in the works.

And I do know that there was a recommendation coming out of this working group and instructions from the Council and from the ICANN Board to the implementation review team to sort of flag these issues. So this isn't purely an issue of principles that were adopted into the consensus policy implementation framework but that did have a role to play in it and in other cases as well, I've noted, that they do refer to these principles on multiple occasions. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Do we have any other comments or some consensus on how we move forward with this recommendation? Do we think this requires more work? Any other comments? I see Amr's typing. Julie, what's your thought then in terms of how we move this forward?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, this is Julie Hedlund. So one possibility is, and Wolf-Ulrich would be familiar with this, is the way the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation worked. So this was the group that, under the GNSO, that would address any questions or, you know, concerns about GNSO operations and ways to improve those operations. It actually started out, you know, after the last GNSO review and recently wrapped up at the – last fall.

And this GNSO review working group is now the replacement group for the SCI that will address any changes to, you know, to the GNSO Operating Procedures. So that is also under this group's purview. And what we – how that group operated and this group could consider, is we would do a consensus call.

Now that group operated under full consensus so there had to be full consensus for any, you know, any changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures. In this case we're not looking at changes to the Operating Procedures. And I need to look back in the charter but I don't believe that this particular working group now operates full consensus.

But what we would do is for that group was to put out a notice to the list and say this is a consensus call and, you know, to have people respond within, say, a week or so. And if there were no objections to the recommendation to the implementation of this, you know, recommendation, or plan for implementation, then it was considered to be accepted and then this reported out to the GNSO Council.

Actually Avri was also on the group and so she's quite familiar with this process as well. So, you know, a staff suggestion could be then that this recommendation will be put out for a consensus call. If there were no objections to this having been implemented, then – or this implementation of this recommendation – then this would be considered to be implemented.

So that's one suggestion, and I'm just trying to keep up with the chat too. And I think we can see if that is relating also to this question.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, thank you. And I know there's a lot going on in the chat, probably too much to read into it right now. But it looks like there's some debate about whether or not this – excuse me – recommendation will, you know, meet the needs and is sufficient right now.

So I think you could be right, if there is not further comments from the group right now in the interest of moving through our recommendations, perhaps that is a good way forward so it gives everyone on the call a little bit of time to just think and reflect on this conversation and then we will put it out for a consensus call or vote where everyone can then think about this and respond, you know, at a time that works for you. I do realize for some of you this may be very early in the morning or very late at night and you might want to have time to think and reflect on this a little bit.

So unless there is objection or if there are further comments on this from the group, is there agreement but that's a good next step for us for this recommendation? Particularly anyone who's opposed to that approach?

Okay, seeing no comments, no objection, Julie, why do we proceed accordingly with this recommendation and then we can move on to our next charter.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. And pulling up the next item. And I've also tried to capture what is – I'll also try to capture what's in the chat, just putting it in so that we have it as part of the notes. And I know that the chat does get circulated or at least put into the wiki, but in some cases the staff find it useful to also record in the notes for the call so that it's handy for people to reference.

So this next – the next recommendations are the request from the working group was that these two recommendations should be pulled together to one charter because they were both ways to address the timeliness of the policy development process.

Recommendation 14 had to do with the feasibility for breaking PDPs into discrete stages. Recommendation 15 had to do with the general timeliness of the policy development process. So staff has put these together into one charter so this is a new charter that combines both.

So Recommendation 14 was that that GNSO further explores PDP chunking and examines each potential PDP as to its visibility for breaking into discrete stages. Fifteen, that the GNSO continues current PDP improvements project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.

And the scope for these were that staff would confirm whether or not the approach of determining the feasibility of breaking PDPs into discrete stages is already being used, whether there are any provisions in the PDP manual that would prevent or encourage chunking. And staff to confirm whether the expedited PDP procedures have been adopted.

So in the staff analysis, staff determined that PDPs are already being chunked and divided into phases, a particular example is the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP has divided its work into four work tracks. And then also it's specifically called out in the RPM charter that chunking would be a possible approach.

And also – I see Avri has her hand up. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. Pardon me for interrupting the flow. But just to be clear on the chunking, we have – I'm trying to distinguish between things like was done in some PDPs where we actually divided it up into discrete different

PDPs, and I'm not sure that chunking into different phases of work is the same as the parallelization of sub teams which isn't necessarily staged.

Now the New gTLD did do a stage in terms of two levels of community comment, but it was still a one continuous PDP. So I just want to make sure when we're talking about chunking, I thought we were talking about dividing up into separate PDPs more than parallelization of work. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Avri. And I think actually the breaking up into chunks, and I have to say that I'm not as familiar with the RPM example, but I know that – I'd have to look back at our notes but I know that – and I think also with RDS, Marika had suggested on the last call that at least with one of those working groups the actual – the chunking, that is separated into phases as opposed to continuous was actually called out in the charters as a possible approach.

And okay and I see that Amr is saying another example of chunking may be IRTP and Avri Doria says, "exactly." So staff is trying to call out here was that it appears that this is an option that PDP working groups are considering. But, staff notes, and this was pulled out from the last call, that current Working Group Guidelines do not specifically encourage a phased approach, and here we do use the verb "phased" which I think is more along the lines of what Avri is suggesting.

And so staff is asking the working group whether specific language should be added to the Working Group Guidelines whereby working groups are specifically encouraged to consider whether or not a phased or chunking approach should be taken with respect to all PDPs.

And then just to – because we've got sort of two questions here, the other is the speeding up of PDPs and the staff noted that the working group could consider whether a more formal process should be undertaken for speeding up PDPs. There was, you know, the Policy and Implementation Working

Group, there were recommendations that came out of that group as far as allowing for expedited policy development process and so on.

There was the improvement of having the charters be put out in a – in the initial reports and then so that these charters could be adopted along with adopting of the PDP, but staff asks whether or not there should be a more formal process for sharing information about how a PDP could be speeded up.

For example, at the end of each PDP there is a working group assessment questionnaire, this is actually something that's not – it's not detailed within the GNSO Operating Procedures, it's actually a separate questionnaire, so it could be modified without having to go through the public comment process, but whether or not specific questions about how the PDP could have been sped up and whether or not this, you know, whether this information then be shared with the Council, whether or not that it something that could be – could more specifically address this recommendation.

So two questions then for the working group, should there be specific language in the Working Group Guidelines relating to the phased approach? And should staff undertake, you know, some language with respect to that? And should there be some inclusion in the working group assessment questionnaire that would address the sharing of information on how PDPs could be sped up?

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. So let's take those questions out to the group here. Any initial comments? Lori, please go ahead. Lori, we can't hear you just yet. Lori?

Lori Schulman: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Oh there you go.



Lori Schulman: ...I just want to make sure I understand the question right. Yes, can you hear me? Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Yes, we can hear you now.

Lori Schulman: ...I just want to make sure that I understand the question right. Okay, so that you can – so the IGOs do we incorporate into whatever we get in terms of managing PDPs that we advise that they be phased in some manner? I hate the word “chunked” but that they – that – I think that this should begin as advice for efficient working as opposed to a directive because there’s some – there may be some PDPs that lend themselves to chunking and some don’t.

So I would worry about people feeling that guidance is prescriptive rather than what it is mean to be, which is guidance. And there should be some latitude, I think by leadership and to how they do the work with the consensus of the committee or the working group, I’m sorry. Does that make sense?

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Lori. Yes, yes. Do we have other – please continue. Do you want to continue on or...?

Lori Schulman: No, no, I would just empathize that I think we should definitely stay on the guidance track as opposed to the prescriptive language track, that’s all.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. Do we have any other comments from the group? And our overarching question on this recommendation on this charter, I should say, is then do we believe this is sufficient for our purposes that this recommendation from the review has been implemented and is complete or do we believe that this requires additional work? Julie, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund. So well and the other question – so what staff has collected here is, you know, the comments from the chat which seems to suggest that there are various – there are various examples of phasing at least in some ways. I'll note that Avri said that the community comment 1 and 2 approach of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP might be considered phasing though the tail of one phase overlaps the beginning of the other phases. And they have a dependency.

Amr is going to check to make sure that RPMs was one example but notes that there is phasing on RDS. Berry notes the RPM also has phasing; Phase 1 is the RPMs for new gTLDs; Phase 2 is the UDRP review. And Lori is confirming Berry's comment that RPMs are being done in two distinct blocks of work.

So we certainly do have examples of phasing happening now. We do have the suggestion that perhaps this should not be prescribed or mandated but then, you know, that it is something that working groups are taking into consideration already.

The other question is whether or not anything should be done with respect to speeding up PDPs. And that – whether or not there should be a more formal process. In the recommendation, just to go back to that Recommendation 15, the GNSO continues its current PDPs improvement project initiative to address timeliness of the PDP. Staff has noted that that does seem to be proceeding.

And then just the question for the working group, should there though be something more specific perhaps in the working group assessment questionnaire that asks whether or not the PDP that was just conducted, you know, so the questionnaire is asking the working group, you know, how did this PDP go? You know, what were the issues that you encountered? And, you know, and then this is reported out to the Council.

Should there be specific questions in that questionnaire relating to how – whether or not that PDP could have been sped up in any particular way that then might be helpful for future PDPs?

And I see that Avri Doria has a note on ways to speed up PDPs, “In my experience, whenever we talk of speeding one up it ends up taking longer because of the extended discussions on whether it could be sped up and how.” Okay, that might argue for not including language. I’ll put this into the chat. And over to you, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Oh thanks. I was laughing as well. Thank you, Avri, for that comment. I share that sentiment that we do spend a lot of time on process issues that seem to suck up time from some of the more substantive issues. So with that, are there any other comments on this issue? And I think we can move forward. Anyone else? Any closing comments?

So, Julie, are you good we’ll move forward with this accordingly?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Yes, I think then staff will take the action to also put this one out for a consensus call?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, absolutely.

Julie Hedlund: And – excuse me – and we’ll go ahead and do that. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Absolutely. Okay, so let’s go ahead. We’ve got – I’ve got about 13 minutes before the hour on my clock. Why don’t we try to keep moving forward here and get as much done as we can?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. And – oh and I’ll just note that there were a couple of things in the chat. I’ll go ahead and rather than reading them out I’ll actually incorporate them into the notes here.

So the – so Recommendations 16 and 18 so staff did quite a bit of analysis with respect to these recommendations from the last meeting. Just as a reminder, these recommendations were – that the policy impact analysis would be included as a standard part of any policy process. And, 18, that the GNSO Council evaluate post-implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis rather than periodically.

And that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP charters. Sorry, again, for the wonkiness of the – of this screen here.

So I want to thank specifically Berry Cobb and Amr Elsadr for their analysis. Looking back, Berry had noted that the current policy development process did not document PIA but does however, I'm sorry, but a review is documented, and though there are several links noting that.

Then moving down, there are various recommendations that came out of the final report of the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group. And Recommendation 3, in particular, and I'm just noting the new material that staff added since the last meeting, that there is a template created and deployed now in the current version of the GNSO Operating Procedures and also in the GNSO site.

And these templates contain a new section, the drafting team and deliverables and timeframes added to the initial report template as well. And these are recommendations concerning including a policy impact analysis and a set of metrics so that working group now has to do this. So this is a PIA that have to be completed. These are – I'm not going to read through the various steps that need to be done.

And then noting that the various recommendations have been completed. Staff also notes that the Global Domains Division, along with the Policy and Compliance Department of ICANN have roles specifically called out in terms

of reviewing the effectiveness of consensus policies beyond consensus policy effective dates.

These are outlined in the GDD's Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, that's also linked. And that staff notes also that the Expired Registry Recovery Policy, ERRP, recommended a review of that policy. And that review is actually underway.

And so the workgroup consider whether this recommendation, this particular recommendation on the conducting of reviews might be revisited following the ERRP review, so that this working group could see, you know, how did that review, you know, go, you know, was that effective, the effectiveness of that particular review.

And then the other point that this staff want to bring to the working group is that part of the Recommendation 18 was that the GNSO Council evaluate post-implementation policy effective on an ongoing basis. Now when the working party evaluated this particular recommendation, they rated it as medium to hard to implement. And staff notes that it is in scope of this, staff feels that it's in scope of this particular working group to determine the feasibility of this particular recommendation.

And as I think Amr pointed out earlier, you know, in our flowchart we don't have it circling back to the Council but there's working group could say – could look at whether or not an ongoing review is feasible, and if it's found not to be feasible than could go back to the Council and say, well with this Recommendation 18, the working group finds that it's not feasible to do an ongoing review process. So that the question then for the working group.

And I'm looking in the chat and I note that Berry Cobb says that ERRP is in the data collection phase for now, announced its initial report are on deck. Once completed it will be delivered to the GNSO Council. And just seeing if

there's other points relevant to this particular discussion. I think that's the main one.

Okay, so I'll turn it over to you Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Great thanks, Julie. Comments from the group. I know I see we have some things going on about the general ICANN meeting structure in the chat. Anything directly related to this recommendation and its status? No, Lori, it's fine. I know we're – there's a lot of important issues to address here. I just want to keep us on track with trying to hopefully get through this one before the close of our call. Any other comments? Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jen. This is Amr. I just wanted to add to what Julie said in terms of periodic versus ongoing reviews of developed policies. The PDP manual in Section 17 specifically does outline, or does state that these periodic reviews are necessary.

And what Julie mentioned, regarding what's in the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework of how policy staff, GDD, and Compliance work together to perform these reviews I think is something that this working group may want to take a look at and sort of compare how that is done with any sort of perception of how implementation of an ongoing review of consensus policies might be done.

To that effect, I just have a question of whether it would be helpful for someone – someone perhaps from GDD to come and sort of give this working group an overview of the details of how periodic reviews are done and how the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework fits into that or not. I'm just wondering if this might be something that may be informative to this working group in determining – other recommendations in this charter might be – my work. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Do you all feel like that would be helpful before we move this recommendation on to give some additional information from the GDD? Lori is saying yes. Donna have a question, "Have they done any review?" So it sounding like, yes, and Avri has put a checkmark in. It sounds like yes, there's some agreement that that information would be helpful.

Julie and Amr, could we put that as a next step for our next meeting to come back to this one with somebody from GDD on to address those issues?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Yes, Julie Hedlund, we will definitely go ahead and consult with our GDD colleagues and put out an invite for someone to join at the next call.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Great, well I know we had one more charter. If you all will indulge perhaps we could at least just start the discussion or presentation on this one, because I was looking at it, this one might be a little bit faster to get through. But if you could maybe just give us a start on it, Julie, and then we can pick back up on it if we need to next time.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely, Jen. So this is one that we just – staff had teed up but has not yet been discussed but does seem to be fairly straightforward. It's Recommendation 31 and it's the GAC liaison on PDP working groups, specifically that the GAC, excuse me, GNSO Consultation Group on GAC early engagement in the GNSO policy development process would continue to work streams as priority projects. As part of the work to be considered how the GAC could appoint a nonbinding, nonvoting liaison to the working group of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.

So actions for staff were to confirm the status of the implementation of this GAC Consultation Working Group and determine, you know, of course whether or not that status would, excuse me, would then satisfy, excuse me, satisfy this particular recommendation.

Sales staff did do a review and determined that the GNSO GAC Consultation Group has completed its work, at the link here. So one approach would be for the GNSO Council to ask the GNSO GAC liaison to take this role. We do currently have a GNSO GAC liaison, and I have to check, I apologize, to find out who that person is. Or the alternative option is that GAC members of the PDP working group could fulfill the liaison role if only informally.

For instance, there is a particularly active GAC member on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures and this person does appear to be endeavoring to represent the interests of the GAC on the working group.

So that is been this recommendation. I see we have two minutes until the top of the hour, at least so we've put this forward to, you know, have continued discussion on this perhaps at the next call.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, Julie, I think that's an excellent idea. I'm glad we were able to just at least start presenting it to everyone to give some thoughts to this issue and do we think that this is sufficiently addressed. I know we do just have another minute or so before the end of the hour. I see there's been some more comments in the chat about 16 and 18, so that will be good for everyone to continue to think about. And we will definitely be re-addressing that issue in our next call.

Just to conclude the call here, our next meeting is scheduled for 27 April, and at that time we should have put out the first two sets of recommendations for consensus calls. And if there's any follow-up to that at that point in time we can address that then. And then we will revisit 16, 18 and pick up again here on 30 and if possible continue to move on with our work.

Any other questions or comments? And I see Donna had a comment on that she doesn't think the GNSO GAC is fulfilling the role, so thank you for that. We will pick up on that.



And I also encourage all of you, you know, as you come off of these calls if you would like to make comments on the email list, I don't think we've been real active on the email list, please do go ahead and make comments so we can have some discussion that may help us move forward with our work as well if we come to a call and there's already been some email conversation about some of these issues, so certainly encourage you when you have time, if you have time to comment on some of these issues.

Is there any other business? I have we're right at the top of the hour. Anything else? I know there are few things in the chat, want to have some more discussion on this Recommendation 31 so we will definitely do that next time. Any other comments or questions? Okay seeing none, thank you all so much, you know, for your continued time and commitment to this effort. We certainly appreciate it.

I hope all of you, if this is a holiday weekend for you, have a very good holiday weekend. And we will speak again in two weeks. Thank you. And that brings this call to a close.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Have a great morning, afternoon, evening.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. (Rachel), the operator, if you could please stop all recordings. To everyone else, please are never to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END