

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen  
GNSO Review Working Group  
Wednesday, 15 March 2017 at 3:15 CET**

**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 recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:  
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>**

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, from Copenhagen, so, here we are the GNSO review of open group meeting and first I would like to disclose for those who are not familiar with what's going on, we're calling to a motion that GNSO just took over to an approved – it is the so called Glen de Saint G ry, named supporting organization review working group team meeting today.

So, I would like to invite you all to participate in this discussion of today. So, what we are going to do is we go at first through some slides and then we dive into the continuing base discussion of our ongoing work here. But before we do that, I'd like to ask whether there is any statement of interest to disclose, any change to that, nobody in the room is raising his hand, so, let's go to the next one, which is some slides we prepared for this meeting where I will give you for the ones that are not familiar, just an introduction, (Shirley), would you bring up the first slide, so, this is the history of that all, so, the plan – recommendations plan of the team has been adopted by the board of directors and we were assigned to work according to that plan under certain

conditions, next slide please, so, and our task is well to execute and oversee the implementation of the GNSO Overview recommendations, which is an ongoing task over the next two years, at least.

So, and we have to also to be in close contact with the OEC with regards to reports and to input which may be given by them to us. If it comes to budgetary implications, with regards to the implementation, so, that is something which should fit into the ongoing annual budget processes. Next slide please, so, we have for the next two years, we have packaged our recommendations in three phases, one is business work on the way already, second phase, so called high priority items, and then the rest of medium and low priority items.

We – that has been approved and so, on this page we are working on the chartering for this recommendation work, next slide please, I think we can skip that, that is just a framework that we have agreed to, to base our work on a project, project frame, and so, now these are reactions from these project frames, that is that we are going through all the recommendations and that we will charter these recommendations and charter on the basis of an existing charter identification form for each recommendation, and staff is one who is going to prepare for each recommendation of these charter forms, and so, we will go through all these charter forms and build – discard that – in respect to what is expected from us should it be addressed, specific recommendation by the entire group or should we be split up in teams, for example, do we have to – can we group some of these recommendations with regards to the implementation plan? Maybe there shall be changes to the plan over the time, maybe discuss that and then we have to integrate that and have to take care about that and at the end, we have also each plan, we have to adopt here in this group and then the work can go on.

We have agreed to a meeting schedule, which brings us to a meeting every other week from the end of March onwards and this is also a straight time table and I do hope that people attending this group from the beginning will

stay as well until the end. And as usual, we've discussed then some how to cope with this work, next slide please, okay, these are the time tables we have imposed with regards to the ongoing work in green and then I think high priority work, is that in the next column in the color?

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: And then I think the next phase – slide shows for the work to be done in 2018, the rest of these recommendations. So, come in, we'll start with that work for this working session is to go through each draft charter, which is available at the time being, we have already drafted one of these charters with regards to recommendation number 8, and Julie updated that according to the last meeting we had, we should go first with that charter and then consequently follow the other plans, but before we start that, I would like to ask you the bunch of people we have in the room, will they agree to that plan, to that schedule we have and really kind of work we are doing here, or whether there are any ideas, comments to the workplan itself, pardon me?

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: This is Rafik speaking, just maybe to kind of catch you up and to have clarity and then how we proceed, so, for each recommendation we have a charter, for each accommodation we have a charter and implementation plan and for some cases group different recommendation in having the same charter will have one recommendation, one charter, and anyway, how the working group will kind of put it out, do we have kind of it all or just maybe clarity about the process since we have so similar charter to review and think how we handle them by accepting and so on, I'm kind of concerned really with having the size to do it in my sub-team because maybe it's added some overhead and that will help with the volunteers we get, so, just kind of clarification about that.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Rafik, just to get it right, what did your question to be careful if we answer that with what we are doing in discussing it or getting an idea from it, because on this plan already we have laid down here the idea of looking to the implementation plan for each recommendation or group of recommendations, so that means that we have to take that into consideration whether some of these recommendations could be grouped, for example, and then could be also then the work would be done within one bunch and not with that, that is in the scope of this group around, as well, we understand that establishing sub-teams is not any easy way to do – if you look at the number of people here available, but we have to take – we have to discuss that, so, in this forum we can do that and if we have to split the work load and then build – I think we will go step by step and take this into consideration, thanks.

Man: Any more comments from?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff, I will note as – before I cast on – the plan as approved – too close here – does have groupings of the related recommendations, it's not to say that this working group couldn't decide to separate some out, but the idea with that, where there were clear relationships between recommendations, so as not to say make the charter for one and a charter for another one and then find out later that there were actually inter-dependencies between them, the idea is to make sure we're addressing, you know, related recommendations together in case there are, you know, where there are recommended – sorry – inter-dependencies and they are already grouped in the plan according to those where work has been identified as already ongoing by the work party, the Genesis Review working party, and so, those are the ones we're tackling first in phase one, but, it's also envisioned that the phase two, according to the plan, that the phase two, high priority recommendations, and that's two groupings, should also start – work should start on them concurrently with the phase one items, so, what staff has endeavored to do in setting up these working sessions, this being the first one, and we did a little of this work in our first meeting, was to take

the recommendations in the order in which they are grouped in the implementation plan in phase one, phase one and two, starting with phase one and taking those recommendations in order and chartering them, the first was recommendation 8, and then follows on – I forget the exact order – but 14, yes, there's like four others, and so, and it happens that these are also the recommendations where the working party thought that work had already been done or was close or that they were close to being completed.

So, these would be, hopefully ones that the working group might be able to complete relatively quickly and perhaps without having to set up working groups or sub-groups, given that we do have relatively small number of volunteers.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, thank you, I think we have a plan around to move forward and I think we should quickly dive into the forms so that everybody can see, also if you have a first look, go through that form, please raise your hand if you don't understand how it's structured and what it means, in the end, it should help us in this format that we have at first a clear description of what we're doing and clear allocation of tasks and in the end we have to offer some kind of reporting where we can follow what we have done. So, I think that is the idea of this project structure and the chartering, and I would like to ask Julie just to bring up the first one on the screen and then we could really start and dive in, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you (Unintelligible), and the first one is the recommendation 8 and this is for version 2 because we did discuss it in the version 1 at our last meeting, I have un-synched the document and I hope everyone can be in Adobe Connect because you can see how it's impossible to read from this screen, if you do – if you are in Adobe Connect you can then, you know, blow it up and make it larger so that you can actually read it.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Julie, is that feasible to everybody? That's – you can enlarge it so.

((Crosstalk))

Man: It's working?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes, when you open it up it's full screen.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, okay, okay.

Julie Hedlund: Alright, I've put it in full screen in Adobe Connect, but that's just for my computer here, but you should be able to do the same thing for yourself – and this is Julie, sorry, for the transcript. I note that – excuse me – Julie again – Wolf-Urich, you had asked if there was a red line version, I realize I have the clean version, would you prefer the red line version?

Wolf-Urich Knoben: No, thank you very much, thank you, you have sent it to me but if you put it on the screen it's very confusing because there are more red lines than other lines.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: So, it's great that we have this here and – on the screen – and Julie, if you don't mind, so, could you guide us through this, this slide here on the recommendation 8 and then maybe go to the discussion of it, because that is already fixed almost, the other – just briefly on what it is in regard to the structure of the document because some of these people have not been available the last time we met, so basically this is an example of how we are going to structure that and so, and I do hope that it's feasible and self-explaining. Julie, please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Urich, this is Julie Hedlund, so, in the structure I should explain for those who haven't been involved, is actually a structure that was developed as part of the ATRT process for implementing recommendations, particularly ATRT 2, and we modified it a little bit for our purposes, taking out things that may not apply, but some of the things we've definitely kept in because they are important to show, for instance, if you look at the beginning here, and I'll – we're calling these charters, they're charters because in the framework of the, sort of the review process, you know, again stemming from ATRT 2, the idea is that recommendations say coming out of the board or elsewhere would be given a project charter, you know, envisioning that there would be a scope and steps that might need to be taken, dependencies and.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry about that.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, there we are – and so on, so, that's where the elements came from here with some modification that we discussed at our last meeting, so, just to run through, this was on the first of the recommendations in the phase one, which is considered to be mostly work that's already under way, and these have to have a title, so, we're trying to pick titles that reflect the recommendation, so, in this case working group role and implementation, it's important to align this recommendation with the strategic plan and this one appears to align with the plan element that's promoting ICANN's role in multi-stakeholder approach, and the goal, which is a goal that's taken out of the strategic plan, is to encourage community role and implementation and the recommendation is that the working group should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.

The scope description comes to a certain extent from some of the steps identified by the GNSO overview working party, and then modified as a result of the discussion at our last GNSO working group meeting, whereas on staff, will review the final report of the policy and implementation working group that

was adopted by the council and particular recommendation 4 recommends that PDP manual be modified to require the creation of an implementation review team and this change was actually approved by the council, the staff will review the revised operating procedures, including the change to the manual to determine whether this revision gives working groups a role in responding to implementation issues as part of the implementation review team.

And an example of how this could be applied is actually this working group, that the – this GNSO working group is actually comprised of the working party, many of the working party members who developed the recommendations and are now responsible for participating in the implementation of those recommendations. And then the scope is that the staff would present the results of their review to this working group, which would then determine whether or not the revisions would constitute an implementation of that recommendation, that there is an explicit role for working groups in responding to implementation issues.

And then there's to be an analysis of whether or not the above scope is clear, these are all staff recommendations that you see in here that it seems that it was sufficiently clear, the assumption is that there's going to be, or has been, a revision to the operating procedures and the deliverables would then be the revised operating procedures.

Staff deemed that there did not need to be other options considered, you know, to certain extent it's because work has been done, and the solution as presented here and discussed to a certain extent last week with some minor modifications, is that the staff did review the final report of policy and implementation working group, and recommendation for – staff did review the revised GNSO operating procedures and particularly the changes to the PDP manual that was published on June 24th in version 3.0, as to whether or not it gave working party – working group's a role in implementation as part of the implementation review team.

The staff suggests that the manual appears to fulfill the implementation of recommendation 8, and notes that text from the manual that says, GNSO council must direct the creation of an implementation review team to assist staff in developing the implementation details for the policy, really the rest of it is just sort of what happens if the council decides not to set up such a review team, but that would be an extreme circumstance.

And from the staff's point of view, it seems that the establishment of a requirement in the PDP manual for an implementation review team and keeping in mind that these review teams are open to, of course, the members of the working group that developed the policy and in fact, as we've seen with this group, this working group, our – those members are encouraged to participate in implementation, the staff sense was that establishing this requirement in the PDP manual appeared to satisfy the implementation of that recommendation, and – but, of course, the final determination is up to the working group, just some key dependencies, and these, you know, really have actually – could have actually already occurred – the recommendations have been approved to be included in the GNSO operating procedures and the revision was published on the 24th of June, a risk would have been if that council had not approved and a performance indicator is set as the manager of the PDP GNSO council is expected to ensure that it's operating procedures are followed.

I'll just note something that we can consider whether or not we want to reword things here, that is that several of the recommendations that you will be looking at, that staff have prepared, seem to appear retrospective, I mean enough time had passed while the GNSO working party was doing its work that some of the processes that were already under – being undertaken, you know, have completed in the time period in which the working party completed its work and in the time in which the, you know, or even before that work was completed, you know, while it was being considered by the board and while the implementation plan was being developed, so, to a

certain extent, the charter doesn't apply as well in this case, because we do appear to be looking back, but that does depend on what the working group – whether or not the working group agrees that this is an implementation of the recommendation.

So, that's my explanation, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Julie, so, this is – so, it seems that this work is because of us already in connection with the other piece and the – so, with respect to the policy and implementation working group, that work has been done, that time, so, and it seems that the work has been implemented, so, any questions to that, any questions to the form? Any questions to the format, to the result of it?

Lori Schulman: Yes, I have a couple of questions.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Yes.

Lori Schulman: And I apologize because I have not been to all of the meetings, so that might explain some things, okay – Lori Schulman for the record, thank you, so I have a general question about the scope statement, the way I read this, does that mean that a PDP working group would then become the IRT? Or there would be an IRT – I'm not clear what happens to the working group here, because when I read it, and here is the explanation, sounds like almost it's going to morph into an IRT, rather than a separate IRT, maybe I just don't understand that, first question. Second question.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: I don't this so, sorry, but maybe Chuck can chime in, so, normally, what I understand is, you know, the working groups are doing the work, they're providing the work and the result of the PDP, which is then approved by the council, and then normally the working group has done its work/

Lori Schulman: Right.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: So now it comes to the implementation phase, which is also the – approved by the council and so we have some steps, the question is then who is the reference point, you know, to the work to be done in case there are questions, that is usually the working team, isn't it? Chuck, please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes, and I'm just an observer, but, I was involved in the group that developed the recommendations and no, it's not expected, in fact, we realize that the chances of getting everybody in the working group to continue are pretty slim.

Lori Schulman: Right.

Chuck Gomes: But, we also recognize, like, Wolf-Urich just said, that some continuity from working group members, could be really useful because there will be questions that come up in terms of what was really meant or even like what you're asking now, you know, this kind of thing, so, if you can get a few members to continue, that's a really good goal in the IRT, sometimes you need different – as you know – you take the registrar transfer policy, it was so critical to get registrars on that, whether they were involved in the policy development or not because they knew the impact and so forth and could really be involved in that, so sometimes you actually need different people for implementation in terms of policy development. But for understanding the policy recommendations, having a few people that were pretty active, obviously if you could have a chair or a vice-chair or something like that, that's really helpful, but of course then we also have the staff that were involved in the policy development process workgroup too, that's very helpful, that was the intent really of that recommendation.

Lori Schulman: Lori for the record, I have a follow up question, so then would the working group then basically stay in status or active status or whatever the term is, until the IRT was completed or, because, you know, the report happens, the recommendations are made and the work group is essentially over, but what

you're suggesting is that it sounds like it would remain intact at some level or, no?

Chuck Gomes: No, sorry if I gave that impression, I think that's unreasonable to expect, especially when you take a long working group and the – some IRTs are really long too.

Lori Schulman: I've been on the IGO IRT.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Lori Schulman: For years.

Chuck Gomes: I know, I know.

Lori Schulman: Literally.

Chuck Gomes: So, no, that was not the – the working group could end, now, could there be a situation – I mean this is coming up with the IGO issue, as you know – where the board finally rejects the advice and you need to reform it, that's a possibility, whether or not you can get the same people, is probably questionable, if you can get a few again, it would be helpful, but no, you know, the – no intent to keep it formed or even to require people to be a part of that, but if you can get some, it would save having to go back to the working group members to ask questions.

Lori Schulman: Okay, I understand, thank you.

Wolf-Urich Knoblen: So, thanks Chuck, and Lori for the question, just to add to that, I think – okay – just so in between though and then to – I think so, it could depend on the situation, yes? Because it could come up, you know, after a while, so the council is obviously the competition of the council is at the end the council is who really decides to see what's going on here and then if there are opinions

and there are issues which have been brought to the council in context of the conversation of the IRT, then the council should take care of it to fill this IRT, this team with this additional people depending on their interest and so on, but I think that is also in the loop.

Man:

Thank you Wolf-Urich, this is (Unintelligible) with ICANN staff and I just wanted to expand on what Chuck was saying on IRTs and Chuck chaired the working group, the Balsein implementation working group that came up with these solutions, so, please if I get anything wrong please correct me, it is not envisioned that all working group members will join an IRT, but it is certainly desirable to bring them in, of course, I think also when the language was being developed to develop the IRTs and include that in the operating procedures that there would be a call for volunteers as well and especially to try to recruit experts who may not have been involved in the working group and may provide additional expertise to the IRT that may be helpful. There are a number of other scenarios as well, there's at least one scenario where sometimes when more than one PDP is being implemented and there may be significant overlap between the two, there's always an option to merge more than one IRT into a single one so that they could implement more than one PDP working group's recommendations together, and of course, the GNSO operating procedures now call for the formation of implementation review teams following the conclusion of the work of the IPP working groups and they are concluded, so the working group is – does not – no longer exists when it – once the council accepts its recommendations and sends those to the ICANN board.

But it is the ICANN board that instructs staff to work with an implementation review team in the process of implementing policies that it adopts. So, I just hope that helps explain the process when similarities are formed and how it begins it work.

Lori Schulman: I appreciate that, I just was trying to clarify where the changes were, and it sounds like it's more in philosophy, you know, making sure there's continuity versus an actual process that.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, let Chuck say, as.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Again, and if I recall, and it's been a while, but didn't we do a draft charter for an IRT, I mean a very high level one I think that we included some of the things that you're talking about, but I don't recall for sure so.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, there is indeed a draft charter, that's actually part of the policy and implementation plan that was approved by the board.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, so, for this information on that, any more questions to this particular charter and the results of it, because that is – it belongs to the package of phase one which means ongoing work already underway or already done, so, thank you Julie. So, let's move to the next charter.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Just a minute.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, this is Julie, I will go to the next recommendation in the order in which it appears in phase one, that was recommendation 8 we were just on, the next one is recommendation 15.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: We're trying to bring it up on screen, recommendation.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: 15 or 16.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Apologies for the technology difficulties.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: No problem Julie, so, we come up with recommendation 15, so, which is the off charter for that, which is new to us, so, let's just go through step by step what is it about? It is about the timeliness of the policy development process, well, to recall exactly what does it mean with regards to the time schedule of the policy process or what is that behind, to be clear, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolf-Urich, this is Julie, so, the recommendation was that the GNSO continues the current PDP improvements project initiative to address the timeliness of the PDP. So, this was a project that had been initiated and was ongoing and since this is a recommendation about, you know, continuing that project, the way staff has written this here is, you know, again, you know, how does it align strategically, it appears to align to promoting the role of clarity – role clarity in established mechanisms to increase trust within the eco-system and in particular, allocation responsibilities, so, design, development, implementation of policy, so, essentially it's up under the group of policy improvement and so, in the scope, what staff was suggesting is that staff would first confirm whether the expedited PDP procedures have been adopted, those procedures that were, then recommendations that came out of the PDP improvements project and then the GNSO review working group to determine whether the adoption of the expedited procedures fulfills the intent that this recommendation, that is to address the timeliness of the PDP and then if that has been met, then the working group would detail how the

intent was met, if not, the working group would detail what parts of the recommendations are still outstanding and how these would be implemented.

Staff is suggesting the scope is sufficiently clear, suggesting that the assumption is that the implementation requires revisions to the operating procedures and a deliverable will then be revised operating procedures. This is another one where staff looked into what work had already occurred, and so, again, we're looking at the final report of the policy and implementation working group, and in particular, recommendation 2, of that report recommended the creation of three additional processes, namely the GNSO input process, GNSO guidance process and in particular for the purposes of this recommendation, a GNSO expedited policy development process.

And these were then outlined in the report in the various annexes of the report, in its analysis, staff noted that on June 24, 2015, the GNSO council recommended that the ICANN board of directors adopt the new GNSO processes as outlined in the report and recommended that these processes should be available for use following adoption of any necessary changes to the by-laws by the ICANN board. By-law changes were required in order to incorporate these new processes, and those by-law revisions were completed on the 16th of February and the revised operating procedures, with these new annexes were posted on 17th of February 2016 at version 3.2.

So, staff reviewed the revised GNSO operating procedures 3.2 and the addition of annex G, the GNSO expedited policy development process, which appeared to staff to complete the implementation of the recommendation that is to address going back up to the recommendation to address the timeliness of the PDP. In this case by creating a process whereby a PDP could – excuse me – a PDP could be expedited and then, you know, this is a result that staff would present to the working group and the working group would determine if that would constitute implementation of the recommendation.

And I'll just note, much of this information was actually already – what you see here is actually information that to a certain extent was contained as next steps in the implementation plan and really has been then carried over here to be consistent with the plan and, you know, and also to, you know, to be consistent with the plan, the plan also has to be consistent with the steps and information that the GNSO working party had identified when it was analyzing this particular recommendation. But that being said, staff certainly could put more information in here such as some, you know, wording perhaps from the new annex G, for example.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, thanks for that explanation and introduction Julie, so, well what we have seen that over the years there was some work coming out from this work of the implementation and of the new policy process of this working group, and this was already incorporated here in all the procedures and all the by-laws and so on. So, well to really understand Julie and the teams to recall that, to understand the timeliness of this item or process, where's the point that you reflect – you refer to the question of timeliness here so that people are aware about that, so, to understand this.

Julie Hedlund: So, I guess to answer your question Wolf-Urich, and this is Julie, I think that's a very good question, I think to a certain extent in writing this staff has implied but has not made necessarily a direct correlation to timeliness, you know, implied that an expedited PDP would address issues related to timeliness, but that may not be a clear enough correlation to the original recommendation.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: No, my question is, it does – I would like to just be clear when we're having the scope and talking about timeliness, what was – I personally don't recall exactly the recommendation at the time being right now, I have to read it, what it means with regards to timeliness, maybe everyone has otherwise a different understanding about timeliness, it may be covered here and what I would like to see is just the relation between the recommendation itself and the steps that have been taken with regard to this specific point here. Maybe

if anybody is around, Chuck or others, may recall more than I about this recommendation with regard to timeliness and whether it's covered here, so, then it's okay to me, it's just for my personal point of view I have a question mark here. Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, and I don't know how helpful I will be, but, if I understand the effort initiated – and I think it was several years ago now – I mean there was a lot of complaints about timeliness of PDPs, so, there was a project that was started that – well, I don't know if it was really a formal project or just a general intent – maybe staff can help me out there or somebody else, but I mean, the timeliness issue was the goal, how can we make PDPs go faster? And if any of you have that answer, give it to me please for the RDS PDP working group.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: We just had a great session but I think it may slow us down because we saw new complexities. But I don't think there's anything magical that – was there ever a formal effort to – or was there a small group or something, working on – I don't remember – but there was some intent to focus on seeing what could be done to improve the timeliness of PDP working groups. And – but, frankly, I wasn't involved in that effort and I don't know if it was a formal project or just a general intent, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: So, and I have to say up front this is Julie, I was not involved in this but just looking at the information that we pulled into the plan from the deliberations of the working party, there is reference to a PDP improvement project initiative, and I think that actually may be the older initiative that then got taken into the policy and implementation plan and became sort of the, you know, the expedited PDP and the question was raised, is there a way to in cases where it's possible, and I'm afraid RDS is probably not one of those cases, but, where it's possible to have a streamlined PDP and I think that was sort of the genesis of coming up with the expedited PDP, but, I'd be happy to look back

and see what I can find on what was this PDP improvement project initiative, I don't think it was a formal thing because it doesn't show up in any of the formal archives that we have, but, I mean I'm certain there's some information somewhere, I hope.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Julie, Chuck again, and yes, that's kind of what I – I don't remember anything formal, nor do I – and I chair, co-chaired the improvements of the policy, what is it? Totally blank, I'm not tired or anything.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: It's the implementation.

Chuck Gomes: But the policy and implementation – thank you, Wolf-Urich – the – you can tell I'm on day five or whatever day we're on.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: But I don't think in the policy and implementation work group that we ever generally focused on timeliness of PDPs, thanks (Ahmirk) as you were on it and Wolf-Urich was too, but, you're right that one – if there certain conditions are met, an expedited PDP could be done a lot faster. Because that basically assumes that certain work has already been done, but that's not – I don't think that's what this is really – I think this was more of a general effort to how can we speed up PDPs.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Yes, come up please.

Man: Yes, thank you Wolf, (Unintelligible) and yes, Chuck is absolutely correct, the reason why the expedited PDP is a faster process because under certain conditions, as Chuck mentioned, where a very tightly scoped policy question needs to be addressed quickly, then it can go through this expedited PDP which is a part of the main significant difference between EPDP and a regular

PDP is that you remove the issue scoping phase so you don't have the preliminary issues report and then you don't have the public comment period on that report and then you don't have a final report, so, it goes straight to a charter that is accepted by the GNSO council, but in terms of the staff project to sort of improve the PDP, one of the changes that we've seen over the past few years that has greatly assisted in streamlining PDPs and making at least the early stage move along faster is that, policy staff now include draft charters in the preliminary issue reports and that didn't used to be the case a few years ago.

So, there used to be a call for volunteers for charter drafting team which would get together and deliberate on a charter and then this charter would be submitted for public comment and this would follow, I believe, the final issues report back then. So, you'd have this whole stage of the drafting getting team getting together, deliberating on a charter, having that up for public comments, getting it adopted by – or accepted by the GNSO council, so, that was a major part of the staff project, or initiative to improve the PDP and the GNSO council worked on that and now I think it has cut – has significantly decreased the time needed to initiated a PDP, so, I hope that helps.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, Chuck before.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again, and as I think about this one, I think the wording of the recommendation has been overtaken by time, because the recommendation was formed probably a couple of years ago and it might – this might – and that's not a serious problem I don't think, but this might actually be a case where this group, the IRT, could actually think about recommending that a more formal process for speeding up PDPs be initiated. Now one of the problems is workload, right? And people's overload and so forth, but, it actually probably wouldn't be a bad idea if there were a few people that wanted to – have worked in some PDPs – that would like to come up with some more recommendations, just like (Ahmer) said, the charter thing was one little improvement that was made, if you've got a half a dozen people or

so that were willing to just based on their experience on PDPs, they could probably come up with some ideas, they may not fit every situation, but that's a little bit different than continuing the improvement initiative, like Julie said, but I think that would be a very valid thing to come out of the IRT, if you thought that was a good way to go.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks (Ahmer) and Chuck, so, well I think with regards to that recommendation itself, so, there were two activities, one was just the staff project, so, obvious improvements of this PDP as a whole and on the other hand, throughout work which was done for the policy implementation working group, several kinds of PDPs arose from all this, including the expedited PDP, which is in certain cases, a means to improve and to accelerate things, if you could incorporate in one or two phases these things here in the charter, that would help as well, yes? I understand also, and everybody understands in the GNSO that it is still – it is continuous work, working on improvements of the PDP and either come back to us, I mean to the council or the GNSO through the work of working groups like the RES and so there's no end to be seen and how can we improve these things? So, it will follow us, but, so, for this purpose, I think it will help just to add a sentence here.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks, one more comment, Chuck please.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, sorry to talk so much, but – this is Chuck – and I'm just thinking, you know, an ongoing effort this wouldn't require a working group so much, but if periodically through any PDPs, a little survey was done to working group members to share ideas in terms of how maybe it could be speeded up and the staff could collect those and some of them will apply, some of them won't for different PDPs, but I'm obviously jumping ahead to the actual IRT work rather than the charter, so, I apologize for that. But there are things that could be done and so, it might be useful to make it clear that this group – the wording of the recommendation is a little bit outdated, but they should have

the freedom to – and I understand that they have the freedom in the IRT to come up with some ideas.

Wolf-Urich Knochen: Good ideas, thanks Chuck. Are there any more questions with regards to that part of this charter on recommendation 15? I think we can bridge to the next one.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund, the next one is recommendation 14, and recall that these are not in numerical order, they're in order by priority, actually a priority – a prioritization process that the working party undertook – this one is entitled feasibility for breaking PDPs into discreet stages. The recommendation was that the GNSO further explores PDP chunking and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discreet stages for the strategic alignment, the suggestion is that this comes under promoting the role and clarity and established mechanisms to increase trust within the eco-system relating to design, development and implementation of policy operation processes.

And so, scope description with staff to confirm whether the approach of determining the feasibility of breaking PDPs into discreet stages is already being used by PDP working groups and whether there are any provisions in the PDP manual that would prevent and/or encourage chunking. The GNSO review working group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented.

And I'm just looking back at the implementation plan, some of what we picked up from the implementation plan with respect to a possible solution here is that in its analysis, staff notes that ongoing broad subject PDPs are often chunked and divided into phases and/or sub-groups. In the case of the PDP, on review of all RPMs and all GTLDs, the phasing has even been added to the PDP charter, in the case of the PDP working group on the new detail and subsequent procedures, it has been divided among four work tracks, each managed by sub-team and is referenced to the charter and a reference to the PDP new detailed subsequent procedures. Staff also reviewed the PDP

manual and the working group guidelines and determined that nothing in this document prevents or discourages the phasing or the dividing of the PDP into sub-groups, however, the working group guidelines do address the potential risk – a risk that’s noted under risks below – of sub-groups lacking community representation, but the guidelines also note that this may not be a barrier to the formation of the sub-groups.

In particular, section 2.2.1 of the working group guidelines states that the chair should make it clear that participation on sub-teams is voluntary and encourage balance – not reading this verbatim – and it’s also acceptable to have a small sub-team that is not totally representational. So, staff suggestion would be that indeed chunking or phasing is already happening where it’s deemed feasible, or useful to do so, and there doesn’t seem to be anything to prevent this phasing or chunking and that in fact, it could even be said to be encouraged in that there’s nothing in the PDP working group guidelines that would deter a chair from setting up sub-groups, even if there wasn’t necessarily sufficient or broad representation to do so.

So, dependency would be say feasibility, the risk might be that in some PDPs there may not be enough representation or volunteer capacity to break into sub-groups or it just may not make sense for a certain PDP to be, you know, to do so. And performance indicator would be that council is expected to ensure that the PDP process is as efficient as possible, so, I guess the question from staff to the working group is, you know, for the working group to consider it as, you know, it’s – this might be enough to consider that this recommendation is implemented and that it does appear to already be underway and something that the PDP working groups are free to consider.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Yes, thank Julie, I think the scope is clear, the results are clear, what has been done here with regard to the working group guidelines, the only question is here, I understand why this is here, nobody, no working team is prevented from doing so, the question is should it be encouraged? Or if it’s just up to the working group team to do so, and this could be just only from

the experience you have, you know, Chuck, has a lot of experience, Lori has a lot of experience with working teams and so – and I understand that while that it is – it depends on the item to be covered, on the one hand, and the amount of work which is envisioned to be covered, I don't know where there's other criteria which means that we should actively more pro-actively encourage teams to think about chunking or not, Chuck please.

Chuck Gomes: So, I think it should be encouraged when it works, I mean, we shouldn't assume it will always work, I mean, look at the – of course the classic example of when it's done is the registrar transfer policy – that was really important to break that up into chunks and it worked. By the way, there's another example, Julie, the RDS PDP working group is broken down into three phases, and even within those phases, there's, you know, it's possible, especially in the second two phases to use sub-groups and do stuff like that, so.

But to Julie's question, I think probably what you've done – I'm not sure anything pro-active needs to be done, except maybe putting a qualifier on it should be encouraged where applicable, because it may not be applicable in all cases, and by the way, in phase one of the RDS PDP working group, the recommendation from the framework was actually that you do not break up into sub-groups, and that it be done with the whole working group, whether that's right, wrong or indifferent, that's an example of where it was actually discouraged.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Chuck, so, we will come back to this team as well, with the same question, whether or not and then in which – could we break up or not – any more comment to this one, please Julie. Yes, Lori first and then Julie.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I just have a question about the KPI on this one, which if I remember right says the GNSO ensures the efficiency, how is that a measurable KPI? I mean, that.

Julie Hedlund: Good point, I'll look at that. I think it was – it may need some more thought.

Lori Schulman: Okay, well maybe we can figure that – I mean that's where I think we should be figuring out.

Julie Hedlund: I'll take another stab at that.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Okay.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: But we put that low to the council.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I guess one question I have is with respect to encouraging, phasing or chunking, I've got to think of a different word than chunking, whether or not that should actually be text that we would recommend adding to the PDP manual, I mean it's not in there right now, I mean, nothing prohibits it, but it's not in there, you know, and it could be that, you know, the one thing to consider is not to suggest a death by a thousand drips, but, you know, there may be little changes here and there that will be useful to make to the manual or the guidelines or the procedures, these all have to go through, of course, public comment and so on and I can say also that there will be changes coming out of the next meeting we're going to, the by-laws drafting team, you know, with respect to, but perhaps in looking at these initial recommendations there were a few relatively minor changes that would not appear to be controversial, perhaps we could fast track them and kind of get them out without having to necessarily be bundled in what will be a very possibly large group of changes coming out of this drafting team, I don't know, just thinking out loud, another thought related to that is one of our – one of the phase two recommendations – sets of recommendations – and remember that those are high priority and those are supposed to be dealt with concurrently now with

the rest of these, relates to in various recommendations relating to statements of interest.

And one of those is a change to include years of service in a statement of interest and when staff were discussing the possibility of improving the tool that is used for statements of interest, you know, our tech people said, well, we can just add this in, you know, we'll add this into the questionnaire and we'll change the questionnaire except that those questions are contained in the GNSO operating procedures, and so any change to the statement of interest right now would require a change to the operating procedures, so one thing this group could also consider since this is also, you know, statements of interest is also an item that is supposed to be looked at is whether or not a straight forward change might be to take those questions out of the procedures and have them be a separate template, so that every time you change that you don't have to – I'm – I know I'm looking ahead but my point is that there might be a little package of changes to the procedures that could be dealt with relatively easily for some of these recommendations that are supposed to be, you know, expedited and really actually happen within a relatively short amount of time.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Julie, well, I think with regards to SOIs, we'll come to a specific recommendation throughout when we cover that point, so, the question here is now just with regards to Lori's good point here, the key performance indicators, what to put in here, so, do we have an idea or we will have an idea after this meeting how to – it could be an area – it's about – this is about chunking, so, we cannot come up with a figure of how many chunks we shall have, so.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: It's not something we should impose, so, the question is whether we should leave it open?

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: I'd rather have something open than silly, to be honest, and this I think is going to come off as silly. It's just – people are going to be like how do – you can't measure that, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Frankly, I think more thought needs to go into this particular item and in fact, staff is having to go back and look at again some guidelines for KPIs, I think they're pretty specific and I think staff can come up with something that is not – we'll say this – I don't think every KPI for every one of these recommendations is going to be obvious – and obvious thing to measure – but it certainly can be less fluffy, shall I say, then what we have here.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, thanks Julie, so, we'll come back to that point. So, we have still 15 minutes to go in this meeting, that would mean that we could cover another one, yes? I think that we're now approaching more and that's the stage where the work comes closer to us, isn't it? So, not only what we already covered to review but all the various work to be done if I have that correctly, so, if you come up with the next recommendation and charter we will see.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, I realize I skipped over this one, 14 was the next recommendation, 16 and 18 was next, but I don't think for our purposes here that makes that huge of a difference. So, this is recommendations relating to evaluating post-implementation policy impact and effectiveness. I won't go through the strategic alignment, at this point let's just get down to what the recommendations were, recommendation 16, was that a policy impact assessment be included as a standard part of any policy process, and 18, that's the GNSO council evaluate post-implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis rather than periodically as stated in the current GNSO operating procedures.

And that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes. Now this actually one of the things that the working party noted was that this seems related to what was then an ongoing effort and what is now completed work and that was the final report of the data and metrics for policy making working group that DMPM, and in particular, how that – the recommendations of the – that came out of that final report were implemented. So, looking at the scope, staff could look at, you know, whether or not these recommendations were implemented, such as, developing a framework for accessing policy impacts, what should be measured corresponding metrics, there' – there was a DMPM straw man that identified metrics and also then to review the PDP manual to see what needs to be done for post-implementation policy effectiveness. Just – so moving ahead – this is another one where work proceeded, you know, and was completed and implemented sort of while, you know, while, you know, the, you know, the implementation plan and GNSO review was under evaluation. So, it appears to staff that these recommendations were addressed in the final – this final DMPM report, that report was actually approved on the 21st of October 2015, and the – some of the recommendations resulted in revisions to the GNSO operating procedures that were incorporated in version 3.2, that was published on the 17th of February, so in particular, the recommendation two of the DMPM final report directed staff to update annex 2 of the procedures concerning early outreach with regards to audience scope and quantitative input, recommendation three directed new templates, and these were templates that related to – I don't have the details here, I'm sorry, I can't recall – but at any rate, they are relating to the policy and metrics, that annex 2 of the policy development process manual would include a section metrics request decision to re-inform, and recommendation 7 directed staff to import the metrics request decision into the annex 1 working group guidelines.

These are all changes that were implemented in that version 3.2 of the operating procedures. So, it would remain for this working group to

determine whether or not the recommendations as they appear here are actually covered by the changes resulting from the DMPM, I think that just looking at this scope and the analysis, that probably while recommendation 18 seems really more to the gathering of metrics, and perhaps also 16, now that I look at this again it might need to be more clear correlation between what has been implemented and whether or not that addresses some of the questions that are sort of identified in the, you know, in the working party, for instance, you know, is it sufficient for, you know, collecting metrics, is it sufficient outreach, is – are the templates that are included now, you know, sufficient?

So, just looking at this again, I'd suggest to staff that there could be some additional analysis done to assist the working group in deciding whether or not there's been implementation here.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Julie, for that introduction, I understand that we have two recommendations combined here, and the – my first question is here with regards to the first one, I think which was referring to the so-called peer process, it means policy implementation or impact of – that was an impact assessment – should be done, is that reflected here as well? I've – maybe I overlooked that, the question that every PDP should include a policy impact assessment, is that included in the PDP rules itself? For example, where does it – is it covered? That would be question here, but I'm open to learn as well from others.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: If I might Wolf-Urich, this is Julie, if I could read some comments that (Barry Cobb) is typing into the chatroom, (Barry) supported the DMPM working group and the development of the final report, so, he has a few things that might be useful.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Yes, thanks, also your comments that the DMPM, the peer was not used or touched, so, it's just a question, so, what is to be done? Do we have to come up with some ideas with regards to the peer question here? Where it is covered, is it already covered or should it just be mentioned, I'm not aware – I'm not sure about that, whether there is something to be done with regards to the existing words here, so if we can cover that.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, well (Barry) is noting that was not something that was a recommendation that came out of the DMPM, I think that staff needs to take a look – another look at what's in the current PDP manual, but I suspect that's not covered and a possible staff recommendation to this group would be – this working group would be as an implementation that there should be wording along the lines of there being a policy impact assessment conducted at the end of a PDP and probably there needs to be that staff can suggest and the working group could look at, what the criteria would be for that, I mean, what does that mean? And come up with some suggestions for that and it says (Barry Cobb) does say again, I'd be happy to gather more details to inform this group, honestly it's been a while since I've seen the details for the report, we did note that metrics do need to be defined to conduct a PIA of sorts.

So, it is something that evidently the DMPM contemplated but did not come out as a formal mandate, so to speak, with necessarily with guidelines and what that should be.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: I'm not raising my hand in the chat because of the way the document is – makes it hard – Lori for the record, I have a question about the DMPM report, in terms of evaluation, if the evaluation assesses that the policy has not been well implemented, was there a recommended triggering mechanism for improvement or does it stop at the evaluation?

Wolf-Urich Knoben: I think in this regard we have really to rely on what (Barry) is typing in there.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Okay, I can't see the document.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Urich Knoben: I don't remember.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Oh, okay. Somehow, I'm still in full screen, okay, I'll just read it then, no worries.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Okay, maybe we can clarify that and let's not forget that we have to sometimes open the peer and we will come back to that, the other question for me is as I was not personally involved with DMPM, and the question you also raised here is a group of your opinion that this is – that this relates sufficiently to each other, the recommendation itself and the outcome of the DMPM? So, I wonder does anybody here has an idea or who has knowledge of both sides or should we check that knowledge to be sure about that or is that what staff is providing here, is that enough from our point of view here, let's just question for me, any idea from your side, if you have a feeling that it's sufficient or we should more dive in that so I will be happy to hear that. Julie, please.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund, in looking back over this again I think there does need to be more of a direct correlation made between the two recommendations and to what is the implementation of the recommendations from the DMPM, and staff are happy to do some additional analysis there and also I've noted the action item for staff to look further into the PIA and to look at what was

recommended there by the DMPM and guidelines there and to perhaps look at how something, you know, like that as a mandate could be, you know, included in the PDP manual if indeed there isn't such thing in the PDP manual, which I think there isn't.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Julie, I think in this case your staff should – let me say – assistance from us, you know, because while anyway somebody has to look at this so, also just I would like to minimize sort of the work to be done, but just going through these overall report from DMPM, which is, I admit is a big report to go through, but just to be sure to mirror what is here in the recommendation, so, I wonder how it should be – could be done – is it – could it be done in let me say with the support from (Barry) who is aware of that, so, that he can have a clearer picture about that by next time?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, absolutely staff can work together including working with (Barry) who I'm noting in the chat, so I don't think there's a lot of work to do here, mostly aligning those recommendations with the details of the report, I mean that's my sense as well and frankly, I think it just needs a little bit more time on the staff part to make those correlations. And in fact, maybe even a little chart would be helpful.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: So, we'll come back with that information by the next time, so, thanks very much for that, are there any more questions with regards to this charter here? So, I would say yes, we are two minutes – just have two minutes to go, let's talk about our plans in the future, well this is what we are going to do with all recommendations will go recommendation by recommendation, we sought out what shall be left to our group and then we shall decide how to come up with that work, so, it's starting smoothly and it will go into more work later on with the other recommendations. And so, if there are any questions with regards to that process, any more, please come up, also on the list, otherwise we will continue that by the next time.

The next call shall be – is already.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Scheduled, this is Julie, the next call is scheduled for the 30th of March, it is 1200 UTC I believe.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Chuck, please.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry – Chuck Gomes – just a quick question, noting that you’re doing a charter for every recommendation, what’s the intent in terms of working on the charters? Is it going to be a working or an implementation review team that will combine several of the charters all in one, you’re surely not expecting to form an IRT for every charter.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: Thanks Chuck for the question, I think it was also raised, this question in a similar way by Rafik before, how are we going to cluster that and one thing is to have it in a format where – which you can refer to any time so in terms of pocket of the work to be done and in terms of scope of this work and all these things, the question whether we could cluster it so we will maybe did it already, bunch it in phase one and so on, and if there are – if you come up to a cluster in a more populated way you can do that, yes.

Julie Hedlund: And I think that since GNSO overview working group is actually considered to be essentially an IRT, I mean, it is the implementation, so, I think the hope is that many of these can be taken by the working group as a whole and dealt with, you know, charter by charter, but with, you know, definitely looking at where these things can be combined, yes, I mean, to minimize and also again, to take advantage of dependencies and if they weren’t identified in the plan if we see them now we certainly can combine them.

Wolf-Urich Knoben: So, thank you very much for all your contributions, thank you, meeting is closed, thank you very much, bye.

END