

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
Thursday, 26 July 2018 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-26jul18-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p7itdrppic3/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/c4tHBQ>

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

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 26th of July 2018 at 1300 UTC. On the call today we have Jennifer Wolfe, Kris Seeburn, Rafik Dammak, Sara Bockey and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. From staff we have Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Julie Hedlund and myself, Andrea Glandon.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you and you may begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Andrea. This is Julie Hedlund from staff and just welcome, everyone. And I will go ahead and turn things over to Jen Wolfe. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. And thanks, everybody, for your continued commitment to this working group. I know it's been a long haul and we are really almost at the finish line here so thank you all for taking time again out of your busy schedules to be here today.

Just to briefly review our agenda, today we will be discussing the GNSO review implementation final report as well as the GNSO Council motion for adoption of the final report and then we'd like to spend a little time just providing some feedback to staff in terms of long term options to address timelines and reviews and then a couple specific questions there and then if there's anything else we can address that.

Just before we start are there any updates to anyone's statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, why don't we go ahead and move into discussion of the implementation final report. Julie, did you have any updates you wanted to give to us other than what's been in the email thread?

Julie Hedlund: No. Excuse me. So what I had actually put now - what I've put into the - put into the screen here is actually the version that Wolf-Ulrich Knoeben edited of the implementation final report because he had some very helpful formatting changes. And so what I thought I would do is I could just talk through the report, at least those aspects that are new from the update that we provided to the GNSO Council.

The rest of the text, that is the text of all of the recommendations and their implementation, is the same as provided to the GNSO Council with the exception that the final set of recommendations that was out for review for a consensus call, the ones relating to diversity, then that call was completed and those were agreed to have been implemented by full consensus as of June 21. So they were not in the GNSO update of as implemented by consensus but they were in that last update with their full recommendation and determination, so there was no change to the recommendations or determination. The only update is that they now show as having been implemented by full consensus.

So if that's acceptable I can walk through just briefly the sort of main front sections of the report and see if there are any further edits in addition to Wolf-Ulrich's.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie, that would be great. Does anybody have any comments before Julie takes us through that? Okay, doesn't look like it, so, Julie, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks so much. So the executive summary is essentially the same as previously in the update that we sent except for the last sentence where we say, "The Working Group has agreed by full consensus as of 21 June 2018 that all of the GNSO2 Review recommendations have been implemented."

And so the status summary is updated accordingly that there were a total of 34 recommendations as previously noted, and there were actually 36 - there's a footnote associated with that that there were 36 recommendations but the GNSO Council agreed not to adopt two of the original recommendations so we have 34. Of those in Phase 1 - all 13 Phase 1 recommendations were agreed to have been implemented and for Phases 2 and 3 all 21 recommendations have been implemented. And then there's the link to the wiki which I also updated accordingly.

And then noting in the timeline that all the recommendations are completed prior to the - ahead of the original timeline which was September 2018. That is of course assuming also that the Council approves - I'm wondering whether or not we should make that caveat there. I mean, the working group has agreed these are completed, I do think though that for the Council also has to have adopted the report by that deadline. I'm wondering whether or not it would be worth mentioning, you know, that further step? Anybody disagree with that suggestion?

I'm not hearing anything from anyone. Seems okay, so, Kris, okay, good.  
Glad somebody's hearing me.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, I think that sounds okay if nobody's got any objections.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. I'll make that small change. And then that then leads into the next steps, submitting the report to the - for final consideration by the Council and then provide it to the OEC for consideration. And then this is just the updated implementation status final showing all of the recommendation as implemented and their implementation dates. And that's the only change then from the last report was showing that the diversity recommendations that were implemented by consensus on June 21 so right there.

And so this background is - excuse me - is a new or well an updated, let me say, an updated section. What we did was we put more background in here; we actually pulled some of the background from the implementation plan just because for historical purposes it seemed right to go back to the beginning. So, you know, we talk about how, you know, when the review was initiated, and the representatives that served on the working party and what the working party did.

And then the scope of the review and the various themes, the feasibility and prioritization analysis that was submitted to the Council, and then the Council approval and Board adoption so really just stepping through all the steps. I'm noting there's - we've got an issue here with the formatting and we'll put an extra space in to correct that problem.

And then the request for the implementation plan and then the adoption of the charter for the Review Working Group, the adoption of the implementation plan and then - I'm just looking - this is an incorrect date actually; I think this is should be 2016 so we'll make that correction. And then what is new is - excuse me - and I see - accept. Andrea, Pascal Bekono seems to be trying to

enter the room. He is in this group. I just tried to accept him and then he disappeared so if you know...

Andrea Glandon: Yes, it's been happening. I think it has to do with the AC room and he maybe has to do the add-in and it's not working for him.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, that's possible, okay.

Andrea Glandon: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry for that...

Andrea Glandon: I've accepted him a couple times too.

Julie Hedlund: Okay good. Sorry for that diversion, folks. So this timeline is - was requested at our last meeting that we should add this in. And this really is the timeline that shows the review from its start until it's you know, its completion of the final report to the GNSO Council. And it's - as you can see it was quite a lengthy process; many of you have been involved from the start. So yes, that is quite a long time. And it just - it's basically just a graphical depiction of the narrative above it.

And then we go into the implementation details, which I noted before is just the same as we had previously provided except for this - this charter here which is the charter for the recommendations relating to diversity that were accepted, agreed by full consensus on the 21st of June so these are now reflected as implemented, so that's the only change in the implementation details.

So that's the report. Excuse me. And let me ask if there are any questions or suggestions for further edits? And it looks like Pascal made it in.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, it doesn't look like - Wolf-Ulrich has said, no (unintelligible). Does anybody - we'll just make sure we give everybody a good moment to provide any feedback. I think it looks good. And I know for a lot of us this has been a four-year journey so - to be in it from the very beginning so good work, very good work. Any other comments though before we close out that piece? Okay, doesn't look like it, Julie, so do we need to look at the motion - the proposed motion?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. And so - and staff will take the action item to just fix that formatting item in the report and there's a date that's incorrect; we'll fix the date and the formatting item in the report. And I think there'll be some edit to the motion so what we'll do is after this meeting we'll send around an addition with the notes, we'll send around the final version of the report and if we've got changes to the motion, which I think we will, the redline changes to the motion, and as we do have - we have time before the motion deadline for the August 16 GNSO Council meeting is the 6th of August.

I'd suggest perhaps that we could go ahead and have Rafik send this by this coming Monday, the 30th of July. So we'll just send that around and let people know that it'll be sent if that's okay with you, Rafik, sent to the Council by the 30th of July.

And let me pull up the motion. All right, so here's the motion. And Wolf-Ulrich had some very helpful comments and I'd like to just go to those, those have to do with the resolve clauses and let me go back to his email. Yes, so I think it's a very good point. Wolf-Ulrich says, "At which time will the present Review Working Group be disbanded? After the Board or OEC will have accepted the final report?"

I think that's a really good point. I think that they would not be - excuse me - I don't think that the GNSO Review Working Group would be disbanded formally until after the OEC and the Board accepts the final report because I would think that if there were any questions coming back from the OEC that

these would need to be dealt with by the Review Working Group and then, you know, those would need to be addressed.

So it's - we don't actually say in the resolved clauses that we're disbanding the Working Group, we're thanking them. So I'm wondering whether or not we can keep that in and/or maybe add to it? And, Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I just wanted to be clear about that, you know, what is the timeline with our group here. I don't think that we have to include it in the motion itself so the Council can at any time, well, discuss that and ay, okay, that would be the best time, you know, after having get the approval from the Board to disband that. And then if that approval is given the Council will send a note or so around to that this group is going to be disbanded right, I think that would be enough.

That is from my point of view okay, but it should be mentioned at the Council meeting that the Council - it's in the hand of the Council to decide. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And I have Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie. And thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I think in such case to avoid situations that the Council has to develop another motion or to put this for discussion again is just to put the resolved - some trigger or condition just that say by - and maybe that's what Wolf-Ulrich tried to explain is just when we get approval for example by the OEC or I think it's better by the Board and that will be the trigger for disbanding or, I mean, the current working group.

So that will help the Council, so otherwise if we are going to wait that the Council's schedule again to discuss how to deal, with this with the working group is not optimal just let's put the condition resolved. And maybe we can find out anyway the wording during the Council meeting.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rafik. So I guess this also gets to the second note that Wolf-Ulrich had and pardon me, I've just been kicked out of the Adobe Connect room so it'll take a moment to get back in. But and that is with respect to the call for volunteers. So just to note that it's a little bit different with this particular Working Group and that it's - while this task will be deemed to be complete once the Board approves the implementation plan or report, this is not the only work of the GNSO Review Working Group.

This working group was also chartered to replace the GNSO - excuse me - the - well, let's see, the SSC, the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation that was the group that was tasked with, you know, with reviewing the - any changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures that were proposed.

So that task still exists; it's still part of the charter. And as such, we, you know, that does need to continue. And that was then the point behind the other task, the other item in the motion was to call, you know, do a renewed call for volunteers for that group. But I agree with Wolf-Ulrich, it's an excellent point that I think that's premature because if the group is not actually being disbanded until the implementation final report is approved by the Board, then it's premature to do a call for volunteers for this ongoing charter task. So I think the suggestion would be to delete this clause from the resolved clauses. But, Rafik, I see you have your hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: And then followed by Wolf-Ulrich.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Can we have the quote from the charter so we can see exactly what it's saying? At the end we can, I mean, we can suggest all the amendment when we send the motion to the Council, it can decide, I mean, about the fate of the working group so I guess maybe we can - instead of trying to tweak around the motion maybe if we can send the note about those points so that

can put - as a discussion for the Council and I am happy to maybe to highlight that, so, and just instead of trying that we over-engineer for now the motion and trying to figure out what is the best resolved.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rafik. And I'm trying to pull up the charter right now but in the meantime let me go to Wolf-Ulrich. Oh and, Wolf-Ulrich, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, is faster than I am and has put the text into the Adobe room. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Yes, thanks Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I checked the charter before I was sending my comment and so I think you put some phrases of this charter already in the motion in the Number 4 or 5 of the motion, the solution. And so one thing is, you know, this charter, that is the charter for the present working group, so we are just thinking about, you know, how to continue what - with this working group or with type of working group in order to fulfill the ongoing charter task and this is just one task; this is to deal with, as you say, with the charter saying any new request by the GNSO, as the Standing Committee of Improvements in former time did.

So that would mean to my understanding that the charter is going to be fully revised because you can forget all the other parts of the existing charter because they are not relevant for the future working group itself. That's one point.

And the other thing is then I was thinking if we just - if you just go and call for volunteers right now in a more general way, not saying, you know, there are actual problem - actual issues to be dealt with, then you will not find volunteers really about - for this. So my question would be, do we have - or did we have over the past, let me say, two years any issues which have been raised, for example, in this regard? So what the new group should deal with? Or do we expect to have some items to be dealt with in the near future?

I would then recommend if that is not the case well just to leave it as it is, to say there is something which could be - which should be convened and the call for volunteers should be done at a time when one of the issues is - a new issue is going to come up. I think it's not a big problem then to do so because we can rely on what is that in this existing charter. Thank you.

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

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So just to clarify for the call of volunteers, do we mean that we send, how to say, a notification to the SG and C to either to confirm their current representative or to continue on? Or we having here to open like - to open call to everyone who want to volunteer? Or it's for both?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rafik. That's a really good question. It would be, and it would be actually a call for volunteers for the SGs and Cs to either confirm their current primary and alternate representatives or, you know, or to, you know, signal that they have new primaries and alternates. But to Wolf-Ulrich's point, it does seem like it would be better to wait to leave this off and wait to do a call for volunteers when there's something specific to be considered.

I believe that - and I think Rafik could probably speak better to this, but I believe with respect to the PDP 3.0 discussion paper there may be some work - some changes following that discussion to the - and proposed for the GNSO Operating Procedures, I think not least of those - well at least the Working Group Guidelines Section 3.7 I think is one area that the Council is considering whether to do some revisions.

So there might be some work coming in the next say couple of months and it might be then appropriate to do a call for volunteers or a re-constitution of the Review Working Group. And I also note Wolf-Ulrich's point that this charter really should be revised because obviously the main part of the work, the, you know, the implementation of the recommendations, once that's complete that no longer needs to be in this charter. But that - the charter as it stands

wouldn't really need to be revised in order for a, you know, for it to consider any changes being recommended to the GNSO Operating Procedures, the policy development manual or the process manual or the Working Group Guidelines.

But, Rafik, please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: And, thanks Julie. So while the working group focused on the implementation of the GNSO Review, my understanding it's also that was kind of replacing the SCI, the Standing Committee and as you said, we may, with the PDP 3.0 we may have some changes coming in some Operating Procedures.

Regardless of that, so I mean, if we - what we will send to the Council is the final report, which means that we - I think we finished our task but with - I mean, I don't know if either that we have say it's to convene or to have a new working group, should we or, I mean, can we take the kind of have the task to do some review of the charter and suggest some amendments or just we leave that to the Council to decide either to disband or maybe just to kind of reconvene the working group and by - also by doing a new call for volunteers and so on?

So I think it's more like we can, I mean, the working group, is it up to us to ask this question or make suggestion or something like that? I think that will help the Council but, I mean, I think just all this open at the end we finished our task and the future just depends how the Council want or, I mean, is planning to manage the workload here. So just I mean, wondering if we can be proactive and make some suggestion regardless what we will put in the motion that maybe having kind of note or like review of the charter, all this kind of - how to say - task that may other working group to in general or other standing committee do after they do their work, so, I hope I made sense.

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

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. Sorry. Thank you, Julie. Well, I have - so my feeling is these two parts or two things should be separated, that means the one is the report and, you know, the finalization of the report, something - the other thing is what to do in future with the outstanding items or these items where the charter is in addition relating - referring to. So in this respect, so thinking about that, I would really strictly in this motion just to replace the Number 4 resolution by a sentence which I drafted here, "The GNSO Review Working Group will also," no - it's, "The GNSO Council shall decide to disband the Working Group after the final report has been approved by the ICANN Board," in this direction. So final formulation to be done.

So and that's full stop for this resolution I would say. In addition, and when it comes to discussion of this motion, well, the one who is going to introduce the motion should add that there is an open point with regard to the charter so what you were just discussing, and please, well it should be clear on Council how to do that, there is a suggestion, one could be to call for volunteers in connection with some actual issues as available, and so that could be discussed and then from that should be the Council should act - they should act. That would be my suggestion. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I'm wondering if it might be helpful if staff produced just a slide to go along with this item that could be shown during the Council discussion that has the points that you just made, Wolf-Ulrich, and that could also go along with the, you know, along with the motion and the report, you know, as the materials that the Council would have to review, you know, prior to the discussion taking place on the 16th.

So staff could do a short slide say today to go around with the report and the revised charter. And if I got it right, Wolf-Ulrich, you're suggesting to replace the Resolved Clause 4 with the statement that you have here that, "The GNSO Council shall decide to disband the working group after the final report has been approved by the ICANN Board," something like that. And Wolf-Ulrich says, "Yes."

Great. So and Kris says, "Yes, support." So staff will go ahead and take that action to send those materials around today for review. And then pending any further changes we could have everything ready for Rafik to send to the Council say by this Monday, this following Monday, the 30th of July. Anything else?

Jennifer Wolfe: Julie, and you said the Council meeting was August 6, is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: No it's the 16th, so the deadline for motions...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...and documents is the 6th.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, got you. Okay, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: So we would be submitting a full week early. So, Jen, I don't see any - let's see - just people typing, see if there's any other comments. While that's happening I can go ahead and pull up the other document, which I need to pull that up on my computer in any case. So I'm not seeing any other hands up, Jen, should I go ahead to agenda Item 4?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, please.

Julie Hedlund: So how this item came about is the GNSO Council is preparing comments to a public comment forum that has to do with the timeline of reviews and options to adjust the timeline of reviews. And actually Donna Austin has been the author working on the comments and she just sent this document that you see before you to the Council yesterday. But was also interested in any comments that this working group might have with respect to the timing of reviews given this group's experience with the GNSO Review.

And so just to very quickly note what we have here is this is the Council commenting on the long-term options to adjust the timeline of the reviews and the purpose of this paper is to seek wide support to stagger the 11 reviews in order to overcome the burden currently being placed on ICANN's budget, staff and community resources caused by a number of these reviews occurring concurrently. And we agree that having the ability to stagger reviews is a step in the right direction.

So I'm just going to skip to - skip ahead actually first to note that the section on organizational reviews talks about the work of this particular working group for the GNSO Review. So generally an organizational review runs for about four years from start to finish; that is true of this particular GNSO Review. And talks about how if, you know, based on, you know, reviews that have happened such as this GNSO Review, it might be helpful to find out whether there's some measures for efficiency improvements that could be - drive from the review cycle.

So here it's noted that the Council is expected to sign off on the final report of the GNSO Review team in the next month or so, so that is this GNSO Review Working Group, I'm actually going to correct it so that it states, "Review Working Group." And that - and she's actually pulled in the timeline that we've included in our report.

So in accordance with the bylaws, it's noted here, that the next GNSO review is to start no later than June 2021, so that would allow three years to test these recommendations. However, one of the things that's noted here is that the recommendations were made well - yes, at least two and a half years ago, and noting in the timeline there's a fair amount of bureaucracy in the process from the time the Council adopted the recommendations in April 2016 to the time the Board approved the implementation plan in February 2017.

You'll see there's a number of steps between there in that, you know, so the independent examiner did the final report in 2015, then it's not only - it's only been that the GNSO Review Working Party was able to formulate recommendations. Those got adopted by the Council in April of 2016 but they were not accepted by the Board until June of 2016. And, you know, and then there are the steps to adopt the working group charter and the implementation plan and then the Board acceptance of the implementation plan. So there's a considerable amount of time taken up on those steps.

And here's a suggestion and I'm interested in seeing if any of you have any comments on, based on our recent experience of hands-on strategy planning during the intercessional meeting, would it - should it be possible to make the organizational review process more efficient in terms of letting the independent expert or coach to work in parallel with the working party team or respective SO/AC leadership and collaborate towards a forward-looking work strategy instead of looking for and fixing past mistakes?

And that - and actually I'll pause there because I see Rafik has his name up. Rafik - hand up - please go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Julie. So, yes, I just heard your suggestion about how the independent examiner can maybe work in parallel. But I think it's not just about the GNSO but even for other - for other review. If you - one of the issue was with the work of the independent examiner and deliverable, so I think just one of maybe the problems that we have to fix first, I just skimmed quickly through the - the report for the public comment, not the Council comment but document submitted by the staff.

So I mean, they said that about the issue and how maybe they will work how to fix that. But I think from the GNSO standpoint it's something we have to figure out because I don't think that the previous work was now satisfactory, at least I mean, for some parts of the GNSO. I cannot speak for the whole - for all stakeholder groups but yes, something we should have in mind.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I mean, sorry, thank you, Rafik. Wolf-Ulrich, please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thank you, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So I'm not commenting so the Council paper here, but just taking some points of it. So one was, you know, I was not clear about, you know, the five year cycle or so but it was written here in this paper that it is in accordance with the suggestion is in accordance with the bylaws, not later than 2021 or so. And then that could include, okay, it could already start in 2019 if I understand it correctly. That's one point.

The other thing is the four year cycle - four years and eight months which was derived from our experience here now, so I would see well some possibilities what to discuss at least, you know, whether this is time - could be shortened, let me say, in this regard. The first part, well, the review itself plus implementation part on the other hand, as well, so which we were going through almost two years.

So but it's a question of discussion so for example, why shouldn't we think about, you know, or discuss the implementation phase to be done purely by staff, let me say, but with some points, somehow to say that some activity points in between, some deadlines where, you know, it is going to be discussed the results done by Council discussed with the - the results which have been derived by staff then to discuss on the entire Council.

Well it would be - it would concentrate the work on that so that is my feeling on that, so we could save time with it and think about, you know, it's just a suggestion, well, to go ahead in this way. Also, looking back to the review time itself, which took two years including the independent examiner and these things, this is also something which should be sorted out whether it could be concentrated in, well, in a way that for example, at ICANN meetings there are a highly concentrated working group meetings not only on specific issues but on strategic issues with regards to the review in order to save time.

So I see a lot of points which could be discussed, should be taken into consideration, could be discussed, well, it's - in the end, well, it's a question of discussing it on GNSO level and you never know what will be the outcome of that but some suggestions available. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And Jen, please.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, Julie, so one other thought in this, as I reflect on the four years that we've spent through this process is, you know, we spent a lot of time at the very beginning trying to sort of reorganize and group the recommendation into something that was manageable and it seems like perhaps the direction that's given to the independent consultant examiner who does the initial review that instead of giving us this sort of long list of recommendations that they could do some of that work up front or staff could do some of that work up front when we first get the recommendations because it did take us quite a long time to sort of bucket those into something that we could break it down into manageable pieces.

And I think throughout this entire cycle a lot of what we've done has been what I would call that sort of just organizational administrative work of trying to put things into manageable discussion points, and that, you know, as Wolf-Ulrich has said, you know, trying to streamline the use of volunteer time to really be providing that important feedback from the different community groups versus doing some of that work.

And obviously you all have done such a phenomenal job of doing the heavy lifting and moving everything forward, but I think when you think about this four-year cycle that is a lot of what has been doing through that so the more that that could be done through, you know, the consultant that you're hiring to do the work up front or by staff I think that could help streamline this process.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Jen. Rafik. Rafik, if you're speaking we can't hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie. Okay, can you hear me now?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So okay yes, I mean, it's all good comments, it's about how the, I mean, the community involved in this review and we talk about four years, but I don't think we have the kind of the same involvement in every phase, so this maybe is some caveat to have in mind. I mean, one issue I think that happened before is that defining the scope or the term of reference of the review and so this is something I mean, the GNSO as a whole need to think about. And then after even if we have this independent examiner or the consultant to do the work, I think what we find out it's the recommendation maybe it's not really in sync of the - what happening in GNSO or what it's really expected to make improvement or at least to assess the current situation.

So we still have to get the community involved. I think now it's the - the approach is have the working party so this is something maybe also to need to be reviewed, is it the right vehicle? Is it doing its work and so on? Is it helping? It's not just to focus on GNSO but also to see what happened in other SO and AC.

I understand that we are trying to kind of streamline and so on, but we need to be cautious. So what we mean by we're just trying to kind of evaluate the current situation, GNSO or trying to say here's just recommendation for, you know, kind of continuous improvement or really expecting maybe that recommendation to make substantial changes and so on. And from that we can kind of move back how to think the community's involvement. I'm not sure just leaving that to the consultant or to count only on the staff to do the work is the right way.

I understand there is a lot of focus in term of the workload and how we can manage the resources, but at the end, you know, reviewing and making recommendations that will make - possibly makes the substantial changes in the GNSO and so impacting the dynamics, its work and so on it cannot be left without really to the community to be informed in each process closely and directly. So I think this is what we have - we should have in mind.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rafik. So Jen, I guess over to you. I'm not seeing any other hands up right now. I think we've gotten some good feedback on this paper that we can pass onto Donna.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, so thank you, everyone for your comments and continued feedback. So in terms of our next meeting, so, Julie, am I assessing this right that we should probably wait until we have heard back from Council at this point, that this would go forward to the OEC?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I think that's - Jen, this is Julie from staff - I think that, yes, we should wait until, you know, we know that this has been approved by the OEC because I think there's always the possibility and, you know, of course well, even before that see if there are any questions coming from the Council and then if none then see if there are any questions coming from the OEC and then I think you know, once - you know, and then we can schedule meetings as needed.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, so do we want to just - do we want to try to put something on the calendar for late August just to have it on the calendar for everyone? Or are you suggesting that we wait until we hear back and know what is needed? I mean, it would be easy to cancel a meeting if we didn't need it. And I see Rafik has his hand up, please go ahead, or no, he just - okay so people are saying wait.

Julie Hedlund: Old hand.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie from staff. I would suggest that we wait.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Because you know, I mean, there's a possibility questions could arise say - well let's see. If questions arose prior to the Council meeting or during the Council meeting I guess well let's - if we stayed with our - here I'm contradicting myself, if we stayed with our current - our current schedule we'd be looking at August meetings on the 9th and the 23rd. I guess the 9th would take into consideration any comments that might come from the Council prior to the item going on the agenda such as if it was - if there were questions and if it was deferred and 23rd could take into account if there were any issues raised in the Council discussion on the 16th.

So maybe we should go ahead and tentatively go ahead and put placeholder calls in on the 9th and 16th in case there are any questions that come from the Council.

Jennifer Wolfe: So I'm seeing in the chat some folks are saying we don't need a call; we can discuss on the list. You know, I mean, I'm really fine either way. I mean, I don't mind having a placeholder and we can always cancel it but at the same time if we want to say let's just wait a couple weeks and if we need it we can either discuss it on list or go ahead and schedule a call, is that - if anybody can - should we hold off on scheduling the meeting? I see a few people are typing so let's take a look at feedback here. Kris is saying he's fine with the proposal. Typing.

Okay so let's go ahead and I think the consensus, Julie, is let's wait, let's not go ahead and schedule it and we'll wait and see what's needed.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much. And we'll note that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well excellent then. Is there any other comments, questions, discussion topics? We're coming up to the top of the hour. So I'm not seeing anything, so thank you, everyone, again for your continued commitment to this process. As we said it's been a four-year journey and we're very close to completing this part of our work and then determining, you know, what else may be needed. So for now thank you again to staff, to Julie, to all of you for all of your hard work and pulling all of this together and keeping us on track throughout this entire process, so we'll look forward to seeing the motion put before Council and any questions or comments that come up and then determine what we need from there. So pay attention to the list and again, thanks, everybody, we appreciate all of your work and commitment to this process and look forward to bringing this all to a close.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. And...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...and thank you all and especially to Jen as Wolf-Ulrich noted for your four-year term and thanks all of you for your dedication and time and efforts and let's hope all goes well with the Council and the OEC and, you know, and then maybe you'll want to join again but maybe not.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, that's right. Okay, thanks, everybody. Have a great rest of your week.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thanks all. Have a great day and great...

((Crosstalk))

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

Jennifer Wolfe: Bye.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you.

END