

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 14 September 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: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-14sep17-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p7ohjjqbxn3/>

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 Olawale-Roberts (BC Primary)

Participants:

Kris Seeburn (NCUC – Participant)

Apologies: Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Amr Elsadr
Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Wendy). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Review call on the 14th of September, 2017. On the call today we have Sara Bockey, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Kris Seeburn and Rafik Dammak. We received an apology from Jen

Wolfe. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Amr Elsadr, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. And hello, everybody. So let's just dive into the agenda immediately. The agenda was sent by Julie yesterday. Any comments? There was some comment received? Not yet, I don't think so. Any comment to any amendment of SOIs? Nothing, I don't think so. Thank you.

So sorry, may I ask you, Julie, well just to update us on the consensus call which was started for Recommendation 31 and what we have to expect and what to do? Please, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund for the transcript from staff. Yes, so the Recommendation 31 after the last working group call the one that was cancelled actually, we decided to go ahead and put Recommendation 31 out for review for one week, which we did do. And no comments were received during that review.

And so then following the review it was decided to put Recommendation 31 out for a consensus call for two weeks. So that consensus call began this Monday, the 11th, and will run for two weeks through the 25th of September. And thus far we have no comments or objections received. If no objections are received by the 25th of September, Recommendation 31 will be accepted by consensus.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you very much, Julie. Okay, the (path) is clear so that there is still time for the stakeholder groups or constituencies to react on that, otherwise it will be accepted and as consensus for it. Thanks very much. So

then the next point is good to discuss and to see how – where we stand, what are – what is the updates with regards to our timeline and what can the forward or communicate to the Council and to the OEC later. I think that is intended at ICANN 60 to do so at least.

So Julie, if you don't mind, well, to guide us through that document, please?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So what you see in the Adobe Connect room for those of you who can see it, for those of you who are not in the room we did also send the timeline out along with the agenda materials...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: So where we stand is that we are essentially complete with Phase 1, the work already underway. And we are beginning Phase 2, the high priority recommendations. This is a little bit behind time. Phase 2 was to be started notionally in June but keep in mind that the original timeline in the implementation plan was really for guidance, it was a suggested timeline so that we could see, you know, how much time might be needed for implementation and to ensure that we're able to complete all the recommendations in a timely fashion.

What we have found is that we generally needed at least two meetings of the working group to work through the implementation charters for the recommendations and that has slowed us down a little bit. But we have achieved quite a lot. We have actually completed nearly all the Phase 1 items, and those that have not been complete, and I'll speak to those, have been pushed into Phase 2.

So just to walk through the Phase 1 part of the timeline, we have completed Recommendations 14, 15, 16, 24 and 25, 30, 13, 19. And then for those moved into Phase 2, Recommendation 31 actually was moved into Phase 2 but that is now, as noted, out for a consensus call and if that is complete then this will be implemented as of the 25th of September.

Then those items that we've carried over from Phase 1, Recommendations 10 and 11 related to the use of facilitation for working groups and whether or not there should be guidelines for facilitation. And we wanted to hear the outcome of the facilitated session for the geographic names discussion that falls under the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group that was held at – that was held in – I'm going to actually un-sync the timeline so you can move through it yourself – but that was held in ICANN 59.

So we do actually have an analysis that's been provided by the facilitator to the leaders of the PDP working group and so we're waiting for an analysis there and then staff will incorporate that into any suggestions into the recommendations and then put that out for review by this working group.

And then the other items – excuse me – that are pending from Phase 1 moved into Phase 2, one so Recommendation 18 and there we are waiting for an implementation review to be completed so that's ongoing. And then Recommendation 33 relates to diversity and there we are waiting for the outcome of the work stream CCWG sub team on diversity and a questionnaire that was sent around to the community.

And then just moving along to Phase 2, there are actually two sets of charters in Phase 2. The Recommendations 27, 26, 27, 28 and 29 all fall into the same charter as they are related; they all relate to statements of interest for the community at various suggestions for changes to statements of interest and also constituency membership.

And then Recommendation 6 is also a Phase 2 item. And that is – both of those are now scheduled for this working group to take up. So again, we're starting a little late with them but the plan is that they would be completed by the end of the year, and I think we are still on schedule to do that.

And then just moving to Phase 3, we have not taken up any of the Phase 3 recommendations, these are medium and low priority. These – some of these are suggested to be completed by the end of the year and we think that that's still possible and some of these actually extend into 2018 with some even towards the end of 2018.

Now of course we'll try to move along as quickly as we can and hopefully staff can assist by identifying recommendations that may have components that are already complete that then could be addressed more quickly and also those that may need a little bit more resources and, you know, try to do some of the groundwork on those as well.

And then I'll just note that as Wolf-Ulrich said, we have updates that this working group must provide. There are twice yearly updates to the OEC, the Board committee that has oversight of the reviews. And so that update is due at ICANN 60 or just prior to ICANN 60. Staff has received a template for producing the report for the OEC. And staff hopes to send a draft report to this working group to review perhaps as soon as next week.

And the report itself would be due probably about 10 days, I would imagine, before the ICANN 60 meeting or before the meeting with the OEC so that there's plenty of time for review. And the same report could be used for the GNSO Council. And that update will happen at the Council meeting on the Wednesday of ICANN 60. And so staff will then not only have the report sent ahead of time to the Council after it's approved by this working group, but also will produce a presentation that we could use for both the OEC and for the Council.

So I'll stop there and give it back to you, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, this is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks very much for this, Julie. Just to the last point, so I understood, so we are on the agenda of the Council meeting in Abu Dhabi, aren't we?

Julie Hedlund: The intent is that we will be. The agenda hasn't been developed yet but the Council has asked for an update in Abu Dhabi and the likeliest place for that to happen would be at the Council's meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's good. Thanks very much. Another question is as you mentioned, well these reporting, I think that would be helpful also to have it here on the screen as a kind of – how to say that – an item just here in this timeline, well, to see where we have – when we have to provide, you know, reports or, yes, reports to the OEC or to the Council. If that could be just put as one – not as a bar but just an event or just – here that – in that timeline that would be helpful I think, so.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund and...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's my comment. Who is – well who would like to comment as well?

Julie Hedlund: I see Kris Seeburn has a few comments. He did just agree with your suggestion of adding the milestones of the, you know, the OEC and GNSO Council report to the timeline.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And does have a question too, "Just a question, when do we need to complete them?" I think that was relating to the report so to be more clear, the report should really get out I think no later than mid October or at least

whenever the document deadline is for ICANN 60. And I note that Kris also says, "It seems people are slowly losing interest and the most I've seen is on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures." Yes, that PDP working group is getting a lot of attention.

And so for that, then staff will, again, take the action to send to the list requests for people to indicate that they are still interested in participating in this group and, you know, or suggesting alternates if this is not something they're able to do.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay, thanks Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So looking to that that we have to provide at least, let me say at the latest, mid October report so would it be possible to have a kind of draft report available by the next meeting in two weeks from now so something, you know, that we can – if, you know, that we can see, I think, it shouldn't be a very complete one so but just, well, to see what's in the report also. I don't know how you plan that but maybe the team here will have a chance, well, to have a look before that if that is possible?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, so this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So what staff had planned to do is we have received from the OEC support staff a template that we can use to complete the report. And – and it's very straightforward, it really is just a listing of the work that's been completed and how it's been implemented and whether or not there are any budgetary issues with – or costs associated with those implementations.

And then there is the list of the items that have not been completed and an indication of when they're expected to be complete, and also whether or not they have budgetary implications. A lot of this information actually already exists in that – for the items that have been complete, this is the information that we've captured in the implementation charters that we already have.

And then for the items that have not yet been completed we also have captured that information in the implementation plan where we have a description of the recommendation, we have a description of how we think it might be implemented and then also, you know, when we think it might be implemented.

So from a staff point of view it appears to be sort of a straightforward just gathering of the information that we already have and putting it into the report format. So staff has a goal of getting out a draft report prior to the next working group meeting. The next working group meeting is the 28th of September. So yes, we would like to get something in front of the working group to be able to discuss at that meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh great, thanks very much. Anybody else, any further comment on the Adobe Connect or...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund. Just a note from Kris Seeburn, he says, "Does the Board need a detailed report or a summarized one?" I'd say it's actually a detailed report in that they want to know, you know, what is the – well, you know, what is the recommendation and how is that recommendation been implemented and when was it implemented. So while they don't need the detail – the complete detail that exists in the charters, so in that respect I guess it's a summary, it's sort of rolled up information. They still do want a fair amount of detail but it is detail that we do have existing in the charters or in the implementation plan.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks very much. I think that is helpful because you know, even the Council, people, members of the Council are a little bit distant to that. But the OEC members are even more so – and to make some understanding of what we really did, you know, in terms of, you know, what was requested by the recommendations and what was done or what is the way how to implement that. So it needs some basic information for making some understanding, you

know. So I understand and I'm very confident you will do it the right way because, you know, this procedure.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. And I'll note that we've been tracking the work of this working group on a wiki page in the working group's wiki that has the status of all of the recommendations and also statistics on how many are out for, you know, how many have been – reached consensus, how many are out for consensus call, how many are out for review, etcetera. And so we – while we don't need to (unintelligible) that detail in the report to the Board or to the Council, those details are available for anyone to see and we can link to them so we'll have that as well as the charters are also linked there, you know, as backup information to the report.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I do have a very last question with regards to the Recommendation 10 and 11, which we have on hold because of the geo names issue. Isn't that, you know, I understand, you know, the Council has one group as well dealing with it and the sub team I think is dealing with the – with this – these issues especially in they're doing – they are proceeding. So is that your relation, because that seems to me if it's connected to that team it may take some time until we can close these recommendations...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So it won't be as complicated as that. Yes, the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures has a, you know, very broad and detailed amount of work, but this actually relates to just the one session that was held at ICANN 59 and that was the facilitated session. And the facilitator has produced a report on, you know, how they, you know, how they thought the session went. That report has been provided to the coleaders of the PDP working group. And they're reviewing it.

And my understanding is I don't – I have not seen any changes. And I think as soon as that is ready to be released to the full working group then it's really available for us to be able to extract the you know, the determination of how successful the facilitation was from that report. So I'm anticipating perhaps only a few weeks or so that we would be able to do that. So I wouldn't – I don't think it should be a lengthy delay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay good. Yes, thanks very much. Are there any more questions on the Adobe or comments?

Julie Hedlund: I don't see any more questions in the Adobe.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so thank you very much so we can close this topic and move over to begin discussion on Recommendation Number 6 which was sent out some weeks ago. And so I think I had also one comment but I would like just to hand over first to you, Julie, to guide us quickly through that recommendation and talk about that. Please, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And also I will note, Wolf-Ulrich, that I did capture your comments that you made when you reviewed this previously. And so when we start discussion I'll pull up your comments because I think they're actually very helpful and would be helpful to get the session going as well.

But just to move through the draft charter, so this recommendation is that the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on working group participation including diversity statistics. And then as a scope statement we have that the – excuse me – the GNSO working group will direct staff to determine whether there is a general ICANN effort relating to diversity such as that related to the results of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 subgroup. The GNSO review working group will work with staff to develop the definition of diversity in the GNSO as well as metrics and data collection guidelines that are consistent with ICANN efforts. And then upon approval of that definition, and

guidelines, then staff would be – would use that to collect and publish statistics.

So moving into suggestions on implementation, so as with Recommendation 33, which also relates to diversity, staff notes that this GNSO working group will likely need to await the results of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 subgroup on diversity. At the least, the working group will wish to consider the results of the questionnaire on diversity and that is a piece that we're waiting on for Recommendation 33 as well.

Upon receipt of the results, staff can draft a definition of diversity and a proposal for metrics and data collection guidelines. Upon approval of these deliverables, staff can implement a plan to collect and publish statistics .

So additionally, staff notes that while macro level statistics of working group participation and diversity of members are not available, each working group currently tracks attendance to measure said participation. For example, the Registry Directory Services PDP Working Group stores attendance records on its wiki. The attendance logs, participation of meeting at the individual level and by affiliation at publication of the working group's initial report and final report, this information is placed within the report to demonstrate consensus levels of recommendation that complement interests of participants. However, diversity types of data are not collected at this time and thus cannot be measured.

Staff further notes that ICANN Org is currently working on a project called Global Enrollment. The intent of this project is to create a centralized system by which community members can either participate or observe working groups. As part of the Global Enrollment process, information collected today as required by the GNSO Operating Procedures will continue to be collected, that's such as the statement of interest information.

In terms of understanding geographic diversity, in addition to time zone, a country designation will also be collected. However, it's not within the scope of the Global Enrollment Initiative to collect other diversity types of data such as gender, age or specific location. It will be noted in further detail to Recommendations 26-29 but also a part of the Global Enrollment tool will be to centralize, manage and report on statements of interest.

The outputs of this tool will allow for macro level reporting of participation across most if not all groups facilitated by ICANN for which the community participates. Thus the community will be able to see trends of participation by affiliation, geographic designation and other attributes to be defined later as the project progresses. There is no official target delivery date but the ICANN Org project team is aiming for FY'19.

So staff notes a key dependency for this implementation of this recommendation is the work of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 group on diversity and also then is tied closely to the project on Global Enrollment.

One other thought for discussion is the data privacy requirements, the GDPR, anticipated to be put in place, I forget, it's next year, I believe, and I forget the exact date that it takes effect. But we may need to determine whether or not some of the data that is being requested here might be affected by, you know, whether or not it can be collected, whether or not it can be displayed publicly, could be, you know, a privacy issue.

So I'm going to stop with that and Wolf-Ulrich, if you'd like I can go ahead and bring up the comments that you had related to this recommendation and then also obviously open things up for discussion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. We can come to that comment, well. But, well, let me just first, well, whether there are other comments on the list in Adobe Connect

and any different ideas to what was written in the recommendation so far here in the charter?

Julie Hedlund: So, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. In the chat room we just have a note from Sara Bockey that the GDPR implementation is – goes into effect May 28 of 2018. And also I'll note that Rafik has his hand up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay and let's go for Rafik please. Hello, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Rafik speaking. Can you hear me?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So this is Rafik speaking. With regard to the diversity subgroup, its recommendation to the CCWG first plenary for first reading. And it will go through a second reading in two weeks. So if it's approved at that time it will be moved to public comments. So this the current status of the recommendation. And it includes, say, a recommendation about data collection, setting metrics and so on and requesting that the different SO/ACs and stakeholder groups so I think it will apply to the GNSO if it's approved and then implemented.

So maybe we should have that in mind so I guess that will impact – it's still a dependency and it's also will impact how this recommendation will be implemented and if we want to avoid duplication or doing work later so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh thanks very much, Rafik. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. That sounds great, you know, so it's – well personally I didn't expect that because I didn't follow CCWG well, they made progress in that so it seems to be that they are on a path, well, this is going well to come as a recommendation out of this working group. And that would be very helpful to our work as well.

So I was a little bit personally hesitant on what can be expect which time that as the reason why I was requesting or saying, well, that we should have maybe a link to that working group or the deadline of which the working group is displaying, yes, on its Website with regards to when they are ready. So it may be not necessary. If we really can expect, you know, within the – it sounds like, you know, until maybe until the end of this year also that is something on the table which you can make use of. So but so that's very helpful, yes.

Julie, anything else from your side?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So a couple of comments in the chat from Kris Seeburn, he notes, "Personal and private information needs personal consensus and should clearly state what is the use for that information and who will have access, any third parties, etcetera." And Amr Elsadr says, "If I'm not mistaken the Work Stream 2 subgroup on diversity working document also contains a draft definition for diversity which may be found to be helpful for this working group."

And then Rafik has put a link into the chat that the report sent for the CCWG, he's got a link to the report. And it includes elements of diversity. So Wolf-Ulrich, I would suggest that we would then hold this recommendation – well we can first of all make edits to the charter to link it to the work – closely to the work on the subgroup on diversity and noting then that, you know, a timeline for when that work is likely to be complete and then that then the outcome of the recommendations as approved could be incorporated into the charter.

So for example, if there is a definition of diversity then there's no need for, you know, obviously for this working group to come up with a definition and we could adjust the charter accordingly indicating that the working group would use the recommendations and definition as approved from the CCWG subgroup on diversity.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Julie. That's very good suggestion, well, to do so. So I would also suggest so if there are some comments with regards to the phrasing of the charter, well, people should contribute as usual to that. And in addition, otherwise we are going to move ahead like you suggested, well we have – there is – seems to be something on the horizon with regards to these inputs from the CCWG. And so let's wait for this.

If we could have a kind of – in our, you know, in our minutes, you know, kind of timeline or let me say a set date, you know, coming from the CCWG if Rafik maybe could provide that so it must be, you know, the really complete one or the definite, but you know, as you see that, you know, what is happening there, that could be helpful as well so as an addition, well in order to have that available here. So that's my suggestion that we go this way. Are there any further comments to that?

Julie Hedlund: No further comments on that. There is a question from Kris Seeburn in the chat about views for the working group on GDPR. At this point, given the work that the subgroup on diversity, that group is doing, it might not be necessary for this working group to seek a determination relating to GDPR given that there's, you know, probably quite a bit of discussion within the subgroup as well. I'd defer to Rafik on that. And I see he's actually typing now at the moment so I don't know if he might be addressing that as well. But I can read out his comment once it appears.

If you'd like, Wolf-Ulrich, though I could – oh I see. Rafik says, "CCWG will end by next June and all its recommendations should be ready before chartering organizations' approval." But I guess, Rafik, what we're wondering is what is the timeline for this specific – for the recommendations coming out of this specific subgroup? And Rafik has his hand up, so, Wolf-Ulrich, perhaps we'll let him respond.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So each subgroup has its own kind of timeline but we have to – we have some kind of the deadline. So we will – the recommendation will go through a second reading in the CCWG plenary. If it's approved then the staff will prepare it for public comment – public consultation and that will be around 40 days. After that, a few weeks, depending how many comment we will receive we will have to analyze them.

So based on the public comment, either the subgroup decide to amend the recommendation and then to take some time, otherwise if not, it will keep it as it is and so that will just send it to the CCWG and then CCWG it will have its own timeline to kind of try to check the consistency between the deliverable from the different subgroup. So I guess we can have, I mean, probably by ICANN 61 most of the work should be ready for all subgroups and if there is no problem it will be ready even before diversity subgroup. Maybe let's think, yes, earlier than that. So that's, I mean, there is kind of constraint that we have to go through the public comment maybe one or two so it depends on what we get as input.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Well thanks very much, Rafik. Well I understand that, very helpful. So the only question is for us here do we have something in addition to do with that recommendation, is that charter – the question is going to you, Julie as well, so in addition, you know, until – if it can really wait, you know, for the result of this CCWG working team, you know, on diversity issues so then that's one thing. So we could just, well, wait and see. But if there is something in addition to be done with that, so we should not forget that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Just to bring up this recommendation again, so there is actually two aspects to it, that the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on working group participation, and then in parentheses it says, "Including diversity statistics." So one thing that we could conceivably do as staff is we could break out the two aspects of this recommendation.

As noted here, from the staff research, the GNSO does already record and publish statistics on working group participation, that is already – that is something that's in the Working Group Guidelines, it's something that's captured and published on the wikis and also captured in the, you know, the final reports coming out of working groups.

And what staff could do that might be helpful is there are several recommendations that mention diversity. Recommendation 33 has elements related to diversity and diversity statistics and I believe there's also another recommendation in Phase 3 that relates to diversity as well. And perhaps what staff could do is pull together those recommendations that specifically relate to diversity into one charter and the dependency for that charter would be the completion of the subgroup.

And if there are other elements to those recommendations that could be indicated as complete, perhaps we could then show how at least some of the, you know, pieces of the recommendations are complete but those relating to diversity would need to wait until the CCWG completes its work and then we could give the, you know, rough timeline for that as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay great. Great, that would be good. Yes, thanks very much. I have a last question to that, so I recall that former times, you know, in different communities – ICANN communities there were discussion about, well, diversity from several points of view. I think ALAC was discussing that to some extent, maybe also in the, well, in the – in other areas as well. And so my question is here, are there still, do you know, are there still activities in other communities about that or are they are all hold because they are waiting for the outcome of the CCWG? Or so that's a question, so if there is something, well, going on in other communities, maybe we could also link to them.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Staff can look into that because I don't know the answer just off the top of my head. I know that there – that within the – I know staff had previously gathered one of the other recommendation charters information concerning membership and also mentions of diversity in the various constituency and stakeholder group charters. So there is already existing language in groups relating to diversity that's already taken under consideration.

I know that's true for some other groups as well, for example, in the SSAC operational procedures, there is a statement with respect to geographic and gender diversity in membership as a secondary characteristic when membership is being evaluated. And I do know that there is discussions in – I know at least in the SSAC and perhaps in other groups where it is envisioned that the groups would want to wait before doing anything new on diversity to see the outcome from the CCWG on diversity.

And so I think that in general people are aware of that work and are – groups are trying not to duplicate that work and recognizing that they may need to take those recommendations into consideration. I also know that, you know, diversity is an issue as it has been now in this GNSO review, I think it's also an issue under consideration in the reviews that are happening in other groups. Right now we have two, I think at least two reviews ongoing, the SSAC and the RSAC and I think the ALAC I think is moving towards completion.

So, yes, I think the answer is that while there might be activities I think in general the community understands that the CCWG has the remit on diversity and that, you know, trying to do something separate from that would be duplicative.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much. So I understand well, since the CCWG is a cross community one where all the interested parties and communities in ICANN are represented so that is the one who sets, let me say, in the end the

standard for – in this respect so that’s what I also think so. I only would like to avoid, you know, that there may be in other groups, you know, still discussion or – around definitions, you know, and which are not at the table of the CCWG. So if that is – would be the case so the question is then how to deal with that but that’s an ICANN question in particular.

So, okay, anyway so we are almost done, you know, at the hour so I’m sorry that we couldn’t move quicker but is – also worthwhile to discuss these parts. So let’s do a, well, as we fixed before, Julie, so that we separate these two parts, well the first part is already in – is done, you know, because it’s implemented already the question of participation in working groups. And the other one is, as we just discussed you know, underway with regards to work of the CCWG where we are relying on that.

So I think that would be with regards to this recommendation, so are there any further comments, Julie, on the chat also?

Julie Hedlund: So just that Kris Seeburn noted that it would be helpful to move things forward to separate out the diversity recommendations from, you know, recommendations that may already have been implemented. And then in the discussion about diversity and the ALAC review, I think Kris said, “Yes, ALAC is also doing the same,” I think maybe relating to the fact that, you know, ALAC is cognizant of, you know, the work of the CCWG as well.

I’ll just say that as you noted, Wolf-Ulrich, that it’s more of an ICANN issue because this particular charter is only concerned with what the GNSO is doing. So staff could just look again at what the stakeholder groups and constituencies say with respect to diversity and, you know, it would only be if they have other efforts, you know, underway on diversity that we might have some duplication of effort. Other communities would be outside the scope of this particular charter, as you noted.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay good. Great. So thanks very much. So we are at the top of the hour, but let me just – we shouldn't stop there with a new recommendation, right now, but, you know, Julie, I would like to ask you well after this meeting to circulate again this recommendation in context also with all comments already received so that people could be prepared and could also comment on the list in between over the next two years – two weeks with regards to Recommendation 26-29. I think that would be helpful. We could have an exchange on some points on the list before we meet again the next time.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so thank you. Staff takes that action item and I think you had provided the comments we have so far from you so we will send out the 26-29 charter for review and we'll also include your comments to start things off and encourage others to comment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much. Great. So I think we are done for today. Are there any more questions?

Julie Hedlund: There's nothing in the chat.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much and thank you very much so we can close the meeting.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for chairing. And thanks, all, for joining. And we'll talk in two weeks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks. Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, everyone, for joining. This concludes today's call. Operator, you may now disconnect the lines. Thank you.

END