

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 29 March 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-29mar18-en.mp3>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-29mar18-en.mp3>

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

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Review call taking place on Thursday the 29th of March, 2018. On the call today we have Sara Bockey, Rafik Dammak, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and Kris Seeburn. We have listed apologies from Pascal Bakono and Jen Wolfe. From staff we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Emily Barabas and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I'll turn it back over to Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. Please begin.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking, and hello everybody. Short time before the Easter holidays. So let's just use this time, well, to go through the agenda and if there are any comments with regards to the agenda or with regards to SOIs, please no, I can't say "raise your hands" but please comment.

I wonder, Julie, how we're doing this here in the chat also if somebody would like to chime in. Is there also a sign for hand raising or do you know that?

Terri Agnew: And...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Oh go ahead, sorry.

Terri Agnew: This is Terri. Yes, so hands – actually you hand won't pop up to the top of the name field like it did in Adobe. So we'll have to scroll through attendee names to see if their hand is raised at any time. So currently Sara Bockey has her hand raised.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: How can I see her going up? So I can't see her. That's my problem. So but on the other hand if there is something and I wouldn't react to just call on me here over the phone and then we can regulate that. So we are not so many people here. So Sara, what would you like to say something please?

Sara Bockey: Hi, Wolf. Yes, I was just demonstrating the hand raise so people could see it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But I couldn't see that, I'm sorry. I have to learn, you know, how to do that. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thanks very much. So let's go ahead. So we have the next item is the status of consensus call for Recommendation 22 that was circulated well and just to say from my side so I also circulate in my constituency there was no – not any comment to that. So Julie, what is the status from overall?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. The status is that there have been no objections raised thus far. The consensus call closes today, the 29th of March at close of business. And if there are no objections raised it will be agreed by consensus and we'll give an update tomorrow on that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, any comments from other participants? Is there anything in the background for which may have a comment to that recommendation or not? It doesn't seem the case so okay why shouldn't we step forward to the next agenda item which is discussion of the revised implementation charter for the Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, which you have also circulated and which are here in the appendix of the invitation.

Julie, may I hand over to you just to give an overview about that please?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And I do have the document up in the screen here. And this is, again, relating to GNSO outreach and working group participation. And I'll just move to the changes that were requested from the last meeting, the last meeting was on the 1st of March, and so I'll go then first to Page 3.

There was a request to pull in the comments provided in the public forum to the – from the GNSO Council to the draft FY'19 operating plan and budget relating to the CROP, that is the Community Regional Outreach Participation Program.

And so I'll just read this off here, the next text. "In its comments in the public forum," maybe I'll make it a little larger for all of you there, "the GNSO Council noted – the GNSO Council understands the need for ICANN to consider areas where cost savings can be achieved and we applaud ICANN for the changing philosophy in providing for more responsive budget management. However, we were surprised at the recent announcement of cost savings was made absent any consultation with the community and contained no detailed rationale for the core activities such as the Community Regional Outreach Program were discontinued without prior community input and/or notification."

"Without commenting specifically on any particular program, we do note that drastic cuts were made in the proposed budget without consultation to

programs that were previously considered core,” quote unquote. “Going forward the Council – GNSO Council respectfully requests an opportunity to provide input in advance of any future proposed discontinuation of programs related to the management, operation of policy development processes.”

So we did add that text in relating to the – this outreach participation program. Any questions?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich, yes. Sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So I don't have a specific question here. I think well, this is good thing, so and it reflects, you know, the position of the GNSO as a whole. That was from the GNSO Council, but so we have also discussions in our constituency and that is also with us. Okay that's my comment.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. I'll go to the next change. Right, so this was – it was requested to make the language under stakeholder group and constituency outreach more neutral with respect to how dues may be used for outreach by some constituencies. So I'll read the next text. “Some constituencies, such as the BC, may use dues,” and here's a link then to the dues, “for outreach events, printing etcetera, that is not covered by ICANN. For example, see the latest BC newsletter from March 2018,” and then there's a link to that. So that is just an example of how, you know, dues are, you know, or how a constituency or stakeholder group may use its own funds to also support outreach.

And, Wolf-Ulrich, I think that was the specific request from you to change the language there.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks very much. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So that's fully reflecting what I was commenting last time. Thanks very much.

Lori Schulman: Hi, it's Lori. Good morning.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: I apologize...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead. Hi, Lori. Welcome.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I'm sorry, I lost track of the time this morning. So hello.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Hello. Are you also able to join WebEx? I don't see you in the room.

Lori Schulman: Julie, I'm going to try that right now because I just literally got on – I just wanted to get on quick so I used the phone but I'm going to try WebEx right now.

Julie Hedlund: Excellent. Thank you so much.

Lori Schulman: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Okay and then moving on, so just to summarize where we stand, we don't have a working group determination here yet, and I think that's something that we would want to discuss. Just to go back and remind us of the recommendations here and we can think about what the working group might want to say.

We have three recommendations that the GNSO develop metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO working groups; Recommendation 2, that the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP working groups given the vital role volunteers play in working groups and policy development; and Recommendation 3, that the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups.

And I'll just move, again, to remind us of the section on where we talk about each of these recommendations. So moving to the first one, some suggested metrics, we – it was suggested, and this was a staff suggestion to identify fellows who are members of stakeholder groups and constituencies and participate in working groups and track the numbers annually and track newcomers who apply for and participate in the fellows program.

And I think actually this is already done and it's – I was going to see if I could find some examples of this as well. If we think that that's a useful metric. And then, 4, gather statistics from stakeholder groups and constituencies or membership numbers annually including engagement level of activity sustainability for example, gather statistics from members' attendance and participating in working groups via the attendance statistics gathered for working groups.

So let me stop there and just ask if those, you know, since there is part of this recommendation is to gather metrics and I'll note that in some of the discussions that I saw relating to the FY'19 ICANN budget there were also calls for – from some, you know, some community members asking for metrics or statistics to show the – that, you know, the effectiveness of the outreach program.

So let me ask whether or not these – like useful recommendations or suggestions or whether we should be suggesting something different with respect to metrics.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So do we have a queue here so – so I would like to comment on that. Are there others as well...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...who would like to comment?

Julie Hedlund: Right now we have no queue. I have – I see no hands up so go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So I think that is helpful also so, you know, the suggestions for the metrics. I wonder, so when I was reading that so I was thinking about that we may have a – how to say that, a split approach, well, with regards to the different outreach activities. So especially, for example, the fellowship program, there is an ongoing, I think it's not a public comment but it's a kind of request from the, I don't know who – we should comment on the fellowship program and with regards to metrics as well of the effectiveness of this program.

The first question is I wonder whether this is, you know, done in, you know, in separate way for other programs as well for CROP, for example, and for others. And then I would like to see that we make a kind of reference or do a kind of reference to these ongoing activities because maybe there are some metrics input for metrics, you know, to these kind of questions or questionnaires or surveys what's going on there which could be used also in the future. So that's my comment on this. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And again this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And I don't see any other hands up in the attendee room at this moment. So I'll comment

on that. I do think, and staff will do some research here, but I do think with respect to fellows that there are metrics that are collected. I've actually been involved in – as an evaluator in the program and worked closely with (Sira Nushu) who runs it and I do know that they do I think quite a bit of tracking.

So I don't know that it's posted somewhere for a reference but let me go back to her and find out what is collected and gathered and if we might – if we cannot reference it perhaps if we might be able to include it at least here as an appendix. So I'll check on that. And with respect to...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...CROP...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: ...I will also – staff will also check on whether or not there are metrics associated with that. I have not seen any link to any metrics. I do know that there has been a call for metrics related to CROP to determine the effectiveness. It was up until I think – excuse me – up until this year I think it was a pilot program and I would imagine that there would be some kind of evaluation associated with that. So staff will go ahead and research that as well.

I guess the third item is with respect to stakeholder groups and constituencies on member numbers and – membership numbers and so on, I don't know if you know from your constituency, Wolf-Ulrich, if there is any gathering of statistics on membership or activity levels. I don't think we – I don't think staff is collecting that separately. We certainly can check with the stakeholder groups and constituencies and see if there are any metrics that they are collecting, you know, if they would all resist of course then we want to point to that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thanks, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well to the first one, with regards to the fellowship program, I make reference to the ongoing present review. There is a community consultation process to review current fellowship program, just had the document with me, and is – and the first question of that is, you know, to the community, well to answer is, “What does your group believe should be the objective of the fellowship program?” Next question, “How would the success of this objective be measured?”

So here is questions with regards to metrics. So that’s what I’m referring to is, you know, answers now I expect to coming in so if there are answers, you know, new to us or it could be added, you know, to that what we are doing so please take an eye on that. That’s what I would like to have the reference – cross reference to.

With regards to the second – to the third one, statistics, yes, we do, you know, we have a – so especially Chantelle is doing not a statistic in that sense which means, you know, that we make references at for example under which circumstances new members came up, but so we have a statistic and we have – I’m sure the dates where new members came in available so that we can make reference to that. And sometimes as well it may – it could be done, I’m sure, because we had outreach programs over the last years every – every annual general meeting, specific ISPs outreach so we could follow up in the – looking, you know, after that meetings, that events, you know, how was that – what was the impact on membership, for example. That could be done. And I’m sure others could do it as well.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

Lori Schulman: This is Lori. I can't figure out how to get into the queue. I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Lori, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: That's okay...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes, you have to look in – sorry this is Julie Hedlund from staff...

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: ...tiny little hand that looks like a paw. Oh I did it.

Julie Hedlund: There your hand is up, okay. Okay, so that – so there is a queue, Wolf-Ulrich, we have Rafik and then Lori.

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Okay, first Rafik. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: ...questionnaire and they are asking for input from the different SO and ACs and stakeholder group and constituency. I'm not sure there is metrics. Maybe we kind of – I'm not sure if we – we have the same understanding about the metrics. My – what I know is that they had before some report or survey and what they give usually is just demographic information like country, age, or affiliation, so on. But I think when we talk about metrics we need also to talk about goals, so you can measure what you are doing exactly and if you are reaching the objective that you set in the beginning.

And I think this is one of the problem with the fellowship program and there is no real kind of objective to measure, just like, you know, they only give how many fellows came and so on, that's – I don't think that's quite what we're looking for, but anyway.

For membership stats for NCSG and NCUC, we know the – how to say – we keep information about the country and also the category as individual and organization and in the last years we also have the idea when they just – they joined so we can see the growth of the membership for the last five years, something like that. And so we have kind of the list membership is updated in time automatically from the database so we can see also the – how to say – the distribution within the region.

So between the – in region so we can see how – if some of them are lagging or not. But yes, so we have this kind of information. And I think there is now, I'm not sure what is it exactly, I can ask but there is a page with update stats and the list of – public list of membership. This is for NCSG and NCUC.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay, thanks very much, Rafik, for this input. I think Lori, yes, the next one is Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, thank you. I want to echo some of what Rafik said about how constituencies may or may not be keeping records. And I'm also concerned with a lot of this talk about metrics, two things, one is administrative burden and in this time of reduced costs if there are more administrative burdens placed either on staff or constituency members I think that could be concerning. And I'm not sure how you balance the need for information with understanding that right now there is a lot of limitations on volunteer time and it sounds like staff as well, that things are being stretched.

So I just – I would caution that whatever we recommend and decide to do at least note or take into account the issue that – the issue ICANN is having with volunteer fatigue and a reduced budget. And there's some reality in today's ICANN that I don't think were here four years ago or if they were they weren't acknowledged. That's one point.

My second point is some of these questions about metrics of engagement are being asked by ICANN's engagement team, like for example, Chris Mondini's team has put together like a North American Engagement Advisory Council, for lack of a better word, I don't know what he's calling it. But several of us who are in the leadership have been asked – in North America – have been asked to engage to explain what we're doing to promote engagement, how we're trying to manage this issue of once we get people into ICANN having them stay in ICANN and contribute on an ongoing basis.

So these questions that we're asking internally here to Wolf-Ulrich's point about coordinating with other efforts, I know that Mondini is doing something. So I'd like that also to be reflected and acknowledged in anything that we're doing.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Lori. That's very helpful. Yes, I know of the activity from Chris which started and we had meetings as well in Puerto Rico. So well this is very helpful so I wonder how we can do – bridge this you know, because we are talking about of different levels of, you know, of activities and timelines maybe as well. So the question here is, I understand, so there are some suggestions which staff put here in and the question is could we accept it for the – for the working group determination for example, and well, also make, let me say, reference in our determination to those activities, to those ongoing activities that they should be taken into account by, yes, by blah, blah, blah, for example, developing, well, making reference to recommendation for the GNSO, well, to develop metrics and so on.

I'm not sure how we proceed in that. And I would like – I would be happy, well, if there are some suggestions to that as well, Lori, Julie, from staff point of view what do you think if you have an overview of all these activities how we could deal with that?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So I think I'm hearing a couple of things that we can bring together that are ongoing efforts that we

can point to rather than trying to invent, you know, sort of new procedures, new administrative tasks and so on, you know, noting what Lori has said that, yes, volunteers are stretched and staff as well. And if there are already efforts to collect data we should be using those and bringing those together.

I'll just note one thing, I think I'll check again but I think the outreach that – and the metrics that GSC is seeking for Chris Mondini for North America is a little bit different than what we're looking for in this recommendation. I don't think it's necessarily specific to, you know, GNSO working group participation and policy development so it may not be necessarily useful to tie into that.

But certainly I would say the fellow's consultation, and thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for reminding us of that, that is something that will produce some data. We can certainly point to that and the results of that consultation. We can point to – we can point to any metrics that are currently being collected with respect to the fellows, we can look to see if there are metrics that have been collected with respect to CROP, and then also we as staff can get in touch with support staff for the stakeholder groups and constituencies and then be able to reference the metrics that are already being gathered there. So we hope then at least, you know, the goal would be to try to not recommend new steps but to gather together references to the activities that are already ongoing.

Does that sound like a good approach Wolf-Ulrich and all of the rest of the folks on the phone?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, thanks Julie. So I wonder, well, whether you could start for the next time what circulate a draft of this determination, well taking into consideration what we have discussed so far, so and the last points, that would be helpful I think so and that would be good to have for circulation and when – either the next time or our next meeting that we talk about or we exchange views on the list in between.

Julie Hedlund: And thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund again from staff. We'll definitely do that and try to get these information out so, you know, in advance of the next meeting with time for people to review on the list as well. And then just to note that we do have some other language in here suggestions from staff on whether to develop and fund more targeted programs.

I think that question is probably predicated on some of the metrics that are being got so once we gather the metrics let's see if we, staff, if we can use those to inform Item 4 here on whether to develop more targeted programs because those things seem to be related.

And then on 5, how best to reduce or remove cost barriers, we've got some language here indicating that, you know, that there are low cost and no cost options for members and observers to participate as well as recordings and transcripts for access and meetings at ICANN that have transcription and translation of transcripts and then opportunities via the Next Gen and fellows program. So there's some suggestions there for the working group to look at as well.

But since we're revisiting this charter let us, as staff, go and take – I'm sorry – address the action items and then get a revised version of the charter out and also ask for any comments on these other sections as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thanks very much, Julie. I think that is a good way – step forward. The last – my last comment on this is I know as we are just in the situation to comment on the fellowship program, and we were thinking about, you know, by commenting that from our point of view, you know, the fellowship may be as it may have as a target, let me say, in two steps. The first one is at first, well, to get acquainted with ICANN and the second one is, well, to make people or put people in and volunteers in the position well to cooperate on actively in working groups.

To my knowledge, people coming in to the fellowship program are of different or have a different – different approach to this because they come from not only from different countries but from various levels of knowledge with regards to the Internet and ICANN-related activities. So maybe some of them are easier well to catch for active cooperation than others. So and this question, well, this is a question with regarding the fellowship program specifically but it's related to the question here how to make people active in working groups here in the GNSO working groups, so this is related together.

I'm sure you will take care of that and, well, reflect that also in the comment and I think that's a good way to do. Are there any other comments from others to this specifically recommendations at the time being?

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich, we have two hands up. We have Rafik and Lori.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Rafik again and then Lori please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Just a kind of – so since we talked about the fellowship are we kind of trying to (unintelligible) consultation process? In fact it's a long process, they started with a questionnaire.

Are we aiming to kind of engage I think the people in the, not sure of this consultation, forget, it's one of the division I guess it's (unintelligible) are we trying to engage with them about this implementation work and so we can give them input from our perspective, from the GNSO so we can use this opportunity now to influence their consultation and so they can include our comments regarding the metrics bringing more people to PDP working group and so on, so is this something that the staff liaise and help us to do that? So just asking here on how we can proceed since we are talking about the implementation and about the fellowship program in particular.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, good idea, so let's think about, well, whether in which way it should be done, you know, the only – we have different parts, the one is, you know,

which is what comes from ICANN Org and it gives them input, well, from – with regards to these ideas and then the other thing is well, to the fellowship program itself and when they come together at ICANN meetings well to convey this information, this is then – would be a bridge between the GNSO program and the fellowship program to do.

I wonder how that is feasible, but maybe, Julie, well you could take this idea into consideration and maybe there is something which could be done in this respect. Okay, thanks...

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. And Lori was waiting.

Julie Hedlund: Lori's hand is now down, I don't see her hand. Lori, are you still wanting to make a comment?

Lori Schulman: Yes, I just wanted to emphasize with seeing what's going on in the chat so it's also recorded of – about Rafik's suggestion a few minutes back about making sure we have metrics tied to objectives. I think that's the critical piece. Metrics for metrics sake can be either misused or just not helpful to begin with so I think that's critical. I don't want to let that pass without really putting like a fine point underneath or a bold and an underline or whatever is needed to understand because the trends that I'm noticing now in organizations is that they keep saying we need to be data-driven, metrics-based, data-driven, data-driven without understanding what is actually being looked for and whether or not what's being looked for is feasible from a record keeping perspective and from an objective perspective. It's both.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thanks, Lori. So we put this into consideration and, please, Julie, then firstly well up to you and staff, well, to make a – to just to draft first

determination including these thoughts. And so I think then we should close this discussion for today for this recommendation and move over to the next one so which is also not easy to discuss. The next one is about the recommendation, which one for that, it was about the language barriers and the costs related and these things, well, if I understand that correctly. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So this is – the two recommendations relating to translation and transcription. Recommendation 7 is that stakeholder groups and constituencies engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English as a means to overcoming language barriers. And Recommendation 12, that ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real time transcription service in audio conferences for working group meetings.

And we had discussed these recommendations previously, on this particular charter, and so I'll move to the changes that were requested and where we've added additional information. So one of the items that we were requested to look into was translation of documents as an option as an alternative to transcription, given that there is a fairly high cost associated with transcription and particularly real time transcription.

And so I will note then we've added some new language as an alternative or a complement to transcription, working groups may request a translation of key documents. Note that one of ICANN's guiding principles for translation – sorry for the – I see there's a typo here – is to maximize as much as possible within budgetary constraints the work of ICANN policy development, strategic operational planning and supporting information for all should provide non-English fluent stakeholders equal access to influence and anticipate in the development process as fluent English speakers presently do.

Now one of the things that staff did here was we actually captured all of the services, the translation services that are provided as an appendix to this document so I'll just move that – move to that. This is actually just pulled from

the ICANN site. And it talks about basically all of the various – the framework for translation and you know, how translation is done within ICANN and some of the key elements with respect to say, outreach and then strategic policy documents and how those are handled, that's here as well.

And then some of the tools that are used for translation both machine tools, Google and also obviously human translation as well. So I won't go through all of this but – and then the various languages that are used. But I thought that this would be an important reference to have as an appendix. And then I'll just go back to that item that we added just that this is a relatively low cost option which when we talk about cost we'll talk about that as well.

But the other – the other aspect that we added here has to do with stakeholder group and constituency engagement, that's Recommendation 7, and so one of the services that language services offers is that translation – in its translation framework policy documents and information that covers issue papers, policy drafts, final reports and other similar documentation and also comments listed from constituencies or communities related to policy development, working group charters and mandates. And the emphasis was added there.

So there are already services that ICANN provides with respect to policy documents but also with respect to comments and documents from constituencies and stakeholder groups and in the community as well. And then you'll just see the framework here, I won't read through all of this, with respect to how those services are provided. And then another option provided by ICANN's language services to aid in participation by non-English speakers is the transcript from the call or session via auto-transcription.

And this service – audio transcription – this service is provided after the fact and the procedure is for staff to submit the audio file to language services and they'll process and provide a transcript within 24 hours. And this is 100% accurate to the audio. So this is another relatively low cost option for – to get

a fairly rapid translation of the transcription of a meeting for non-English speakers so that is noted as well.

And then the request was to provide some costs with respect to teleconference interpretation and real time transcription, noting that these are quite high. And Wolf-Ulrich, I have to thank you very much for the analysis that you provided which staff found quite helpful. And we've actually included it here as an example of cost. While noting, and I think Marika had raised his as well, is that other factors do need to be considered such as additional phone line, change of phone provider as Verizon can't accommodate interpretation, longer working group meetings as interventions and other languages will need to be translated back to English as well as additional staff support to set up and arrange interpreted calls. So we've provided this information on costs.

And then we also have – staff have also suggested some possible language with respect to working group determination, so with respect to Recommendation 7, we suggest perhaps that the working group to note that Recommendation – that that recommendation may be addressed by stakeholder groups and constituencies requesting the ICANN language services for key documents relating to policy and outreach be translated within the parameters of ICANN's annual budget.

And then with respect to 12, Recommendation 12, the working group – we could say the working group has assessed the feasibility of providing real time RTT services in audio conferences for working group meetings to be both expensive as well as inadequate for addressing engagement as RTT is only provided in English, instead, working groups should be allowed the option of teleconference interpretation but with the understanding that the goal would be to use these services for those working groups where there is a clear demand for interpretation.

In addition, working groups should consider translating transcript, again, only if there is identified demand for this service. And then the working group determined that the available services and options are sufficient to fulfill these recommendations recognizing that demand and justification is required as budget constraints apply. So that was quite a bit of new information so I'll stop there and see if there are any questions or comments. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thank you, Julie. Well the question here to the audience, do we have any hands raised?

Julie Hedlund: There are no hands raised at the moment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: At the moment. So let me start with this, thanks Julie, well I think it's really comprehensive, well the analysis, what is – what kinds of services are available and what could be done. I'm wondering a little bit so because, you know, if we look at the recommendation, I'm referencing Recommendation 12, I think it is with regards to the feasibility of providing real time transcription service, so it should be clear so that we are mainly talking about and providing advice here with regards to this recommendation.

All the other things with regard to translation and transcription service, after the fact and or translation service after the fact and these kind of things are at once, you know, which we have taken into consideration, but the major – the major focus is on the – on what is in the recommendation. So that is my first request here to the group and if that is accepted in that way it should be also, you know, provided in this way.

What I would like to say is with regards to that, that if you look, for example, to the matrix I have developed, you know, just because well it's just a case study, it could be other cases and I'm very welcome also the comments from Marika to that, but it looks like, you know, in total okay, there's a big number, but if you just look to the transcription costs of that, this makes just 1/5, you

know, 20% of these total costs. So that may be give you a different view with regards to what is in the recommendation and ask for. So if you put that in the right, you know, in the right way and to communicate that in the right way. So this is the comment just to the format here.

Yes, well this is my first comment so if there are any questions with regards to that or any other comments please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund. I don't see any hands raised at this point.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, then my question Julie, to staff in this way, could that be done in that way, you know, I understand that there is no objection to do that kind of way but we really focus on that and I understand also in Recommendation 12, you know, the assessment – the determination of that. That – the determination there, you know, working groups should be allowed the option of teleconference interpretation and the budget understanding that the goal would be to use these services for those working groups where there is a clear demand for interpretation.

What is behind all this? You know, you could also think about different cases. You could think about, okay, let this depend on the item which is dealt with, really depend on the composition of the group itself if you see, okay, there are members from – which are not mainly English but there are a significant number also of, I believe, French speaking or Spanish speaking people so let's ask for this kind of interpretation. How should we deal with that?

I would like to have it as flexible as possible, I think that's the best way to do so if people see okay, this meeting we have a demand for Russian language for example because there will be Russian people available, then let's do it. I understand on the other hand that this flexibility needs planning as well. It's not just to do it on the – on site, you know.

So I wonder whether we should a little bit distinguish between those various cases other than just saying okay, we should allow working groups to do so, maybe we can add a sentence saying okay, but this has to be then investigated in detail with regards to Item Number 1 maybe, composition of the group, the item itself and maybe also be the number of languages and these things, that would be a little bit – give, you know, the GNSO a little bit more direction and where to go and think about. So that would be my recommendation, my advice in this sense, well. Any comment to that? Any idea, any better ideas?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I don't see any hands up in the room. There's a few comments in the chat. I'm just trying to see, let's see, I'm just trying to see what we can pull out. Not – okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so go ahead. Sorry, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, this is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, Julie, well, I would like to suggest the following that we go back with this draft recommendations and the staff determination and if there are comments from people, you know, just to some of these items so let's do it and feedback to the list, yes, I will do it myself as well immediately because I have to travel from tomorrow on and before the next meeting should be so that we have, well, something which reflects, you know, our discussion here. And then let's try well to finalize it by next time. Is that accepted or not objected?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I don't see any objections or hands up so we'll certainly take that as an action for staff to go ahead and capture any changes from today and pointing people to the determinations and asking for comments on those and thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for any comments that you can send as well.

And just noting that our next meeting will be in two weeks. I don't have my calendar out in front of me but we'll send an invite out for that as well and it would be at this same time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks very much. Well I see the next meeting is on 12 April. So that would be good. So I think also we have to close right now this meeting so because we are at the top of the hour. Is there anything regarding AOB?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Julie Hedlund from staff. There is nothing that I have seen with respect to AOB. We'll also pick up Recommendations 20 and 21 next time, time permitting, and I don't see any hands up or anything in the room so just want to thank you all for joining and thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich, for chairing the call. And I hope for those who are celebrating the holidays that you have a very nice holiday and a good weekend.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you as well and thank you all for participating and have a good time. Thank you and good-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, everyone. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END