

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Review Working Group  
23 February 2017 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-23feb17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p1wev5gj38q/>

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

**Attendees:**

**Members:**

Heath Dixon (RrSG Primary)  
Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)  
Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)  
Donna Austin (RySG Alternate)  
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)  
Avri Doria (NCSG alternate)  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP)  
Osvaldo Novoa (ISPCP)

**Participants:**

Renata Aquino Ribeiro (NCUC)

**Apologies:**

Lori Schulman  
Lawrence OlaWale-Roberts

**ICANN staff:**

Marika Konings  
Julie Hedlund  
Negar Farzinnia  
Berry Cobb  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings have now started. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Group Kickoff meeting on Thursday the 23rd of February, 2017. On the call today we have Heath Dixon, Sara Bockey, Jen Wolfe, Rafik Dammak, Osvaldo Novoa, Avri Doria and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. I have no listed apologies for today's meeting.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Negar Farzinnia, Berry Cobb and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this I'll turn it back over to her co-chair, Jen Wolfe. Please begin.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, and good morning, good afternoon everyone. Thank you so much for taking time out of your busy schedule to join us for our kickoff of the GNSO Review Implementation Working Group.

Our schedule today is to, as always we'll check in on any changes of statements of interest, just update everyone on the background and then move into how we're going to be working on each and every recommendation including potentially creating a charter or proposing a working group for some of those recommendations. We will also talk through, you know, our action items and our upcoming meetings scheduled at our timeline.

So first, before we move forward, are there any changes to any one statement of interest? Okay, seeing none let go ahead and move forward. So let me see, Julie, do you want me to try to advance or do you have it?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. This is Julie. I went ahead and advanced to the first of the...

Jen Wolfe: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: ...slides. And you can move them forward if you like...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Sure, sure, no sorry. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: No problem.

Jen Wolfe: So just to remind everyone, I think the last time we met was right before the Christmas and New Year's holiday and since that time the GNSO Council did approve the plan that we created and proposed and this was then put forth before the OEC and the Board and that was now approved so we are ready to move forward. Sorry, I think I just jumped through those two slides really quickly.

So where we are now is we are approved to move forward with the plan that was put in place. And just to remind everyone, the way that we approached our work was that we were going to start with Phase 1, which was where there is work already underway and that's what we'll be focusing on in our next couple of meetings. So there's 14 recommendations.

Once we work our way through those 14 recommendations, we'll move into the high priority. There are five recommendations there. That will be Phase 2. And that will probably be the – I would say the more heavy lifting kind of work that we have to do because those are high priority where work is not being done. So we'll probably take a little more time to dig through those recommendations.

And then finally, Phase 3 will be the medium and low priority recommendations. And we'll work our way through those in the final phase of our work.

The way we'll approach each of these is that we'll create a recommendation charter. And that process we could determine that a separate working group is needed or we could determine that there's some other way to go about that

work. But we've created a format and a template that we'll use to guide our work.

That looks like here what's on screen where you can see we'll have the recommendation team, the recommendation information, who would be the project sponsor, owner, background and then outlining the strategic alignments within the ICANN objectives.

We'll continue into the scope, description, what we see as the proposed way to move forward with that work, creating an option analysis and a proposed solution. So this is the format that we'll be working through. And I think we had talked through all of this before so I want to move through it relatively quickly, unless there's any questions, of course, please raise your hand.

And then finally on the recommendation charter will be key dependencies, risk identification, key performance indicators and what else would be necessary to proceed. Finally approvers, reviewers and any revision history.

So in order to move through all of this work for all of our recommendations, staff will start by creating a framework for us of the recommendation charter, and the identification form for each of the groups as we just showed you the template. And then our role as the working group will be to determine whether to address it as a full working group or whether we want to attack it in sub teams, whether we think the implementation plan for each recommendation should be attacked individually or as a group. And finally, to suggest changes to plans which staff could then integrate and approve into each plan.

So as we tackle these recommendations, those will be sort of our first question to address is can we do this as a full working group, do we need to pull into sub teams or what else might be needed.

We also, today, want to look at our meeting schedule looking next at the ICANN 58 meeting and then thereafter the timeframe in which we move

forward. And I think we've initially proposed a every two weeks as opposed to every week so that we try to get as many people to participate as possible.

Any questions on that? Let me just back up for a second. Any questions on our approach? Okay. So just as a reminder of our Phase 1 and our timeline, we have adjusted the timeline that we had originally proposed to begin with starting here essentially March 1 as opposed to I think we had started it back at the beginning of the year. So we've essentially adjusted where we are.

So you can see here we are looking forward to moving through these initial recommendations here by June. And I think we might be able to possibly even get through it faster than that. And then moving into the high priority recommendations overlapping here June -- or excuse me, March until the end of this year. So we will try to work our way through these initial ones as efficiently as we can so we can move on to the stronger ones.

And Julie was asking on -- or did we decide on this time? Is there a question -- oh, Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. Yes, actually, you know, one of the things that we do want to discuss on the call is when we want to set our next meeting. So just in response to Heath, you know, I think when we asked people to do the poll we considered, you know, whether or not this might be a recurring time. I also will note that probably in two weeks' time some people might actually be already traveling to the ICANN 58 in Copenhagen.

There is a meeting scheduled in Copenhagen. It will -- I said tentatively in the slides but that's now been confirmed on the schedule now that the schedule is published. So and one other thing I wanted to point out on the timeline, Jen, if you want to switch - we switched to the timeline for Phase 1 and 2.

I'll just note that we actually have Phases 1 and 2 running concurrently, which is something that we had noted in the report as well just because Phase 2,

those Phase 2 items will need more time whereas some of the things that are, you know, underway in, you know, it may be simply that we identify the work that's been done and say all right, yes, you know, this one looks good and should be pretty fast. Whereas you noted before, Jen, the Phase 2 items may require more work or definitely will require more work. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: No thanks, Julie. And that's exactly right and I think that's where we want to try to move relatively quickly through the Phase 1 where we know work is already underway. And I think having staff do some pre-work for us, since we know that work is already underway, will help us move relatively quickly. So we will definitely be mindful of that as we move forward.

Why don't we stop for just a moment on the schedule so that we can get any feedback on the proposed schedule? We had contemplated obviously the next meeting would be during the ICANN Copenhagen meeting, and I believe that was scheduled for – let me go back - four Wednesday, 15 March from 1515 to 1645 local time. So that would be the next meeting for this group.

Thereafter, we had proposed an every other week meeting time to move forward. Does that seem reasonable to anyone or any comments on the proposed timeframe for us to work? Julie, is that a new hand? Did you want to speak again?

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, hold hand.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, no just checking. See some people are typing. Any comments on the every other week proposal after the ICANN meeting, we'll pick up on the ICANN meeting and then perhaps after that we pick up again every other week? We've got a few people typing so I'm just going to hold on for a second. Okay so Heath is asking, "What does that mean to do both phases at the same time? In the first meeting will be agenda move through?"

Yes, I think that's the proposal, Heath, is to move through as many of the Phase 1 items to get the charter in place so that even if work is starting to be done on those charters we move through and create the charter for the high-priority items as quickly as we can get to those.

Donna has a conflict at the ICANN meeting. Sara, I'm good with every other week. Okay so he's proposing another time. So it sounds like every other week is good for everyone. Perhaps we need to send out another Doodle poll. I agree, meetings should be 60 minutes. Any other comments? Okay so I think what I'm seeing in the chat is that there is agreement to move forward with an every other week timeframe. There might be some preference for a different time of day. And we could send out another Doodle poll.

So, Julie, I think what I'm hearing is perhaps we send out another Doodle poll to start. If there's a meeting on 15 March, so maybe we would pick up again the week of March 27 and send out a Doodle poll. And certainly understand that there are going to be occasionally conflicts and we can pick up comments on-list. Any other comments? Okay.

Okay, seeing that our schedule has been set. Okay great, everybody is on board with that plan. And moving forward into our timeline, just going back to Heath's comment, did anybody have concerns about taking that approach that we would try to move through – you can see these green recommendations we'll try to get the charter created first and then that work might begin perhaps by some sub teams or some other way.

And we'll move into creating the charter for these higher recommendations – these higher priority recommendations as soon as possible so that because the work that it will take to implement those will take more time that we get that moving in this year. Any questions or comments about that?

Okay and then you can see we have actually charted out those medium and lower priority recommendations. That work has been slated all the way out

through 2018. I think it has been expressed that they would like to see us try to move a little bit faster than that. So we will certainly do everything we can to get through the faster.

Any other comments? Or if not we will move right into our Phase 1 recommendations. Julie, do you want to pull up the first one that we got to? So, Julie, do you want to pull up the charter or, Julie, do you want to jump in here?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. I thought maybe it might be helpful if you, you know, if folks agree that staff could just run through reminding people what is actually in Phase 1 and Phase 2 so that people kind of get a sense again of the scope of work and a sense of how things are grouped together.

And then I, you know, staff could bring up the first of the charters that staff has worked on, the charter for Recommendation 8, the first of the recommendations so that people can then get a sense of what goes into a charter and we can even start, you know, substantive discussion on that one if, you know, if folks wish to do that.

Jen Wolfe: That'd be great, Julie, if you want to go ahead and take us through the overview of Phase 1 that would be very helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Okay great. Thanks. All right, again, this is Julie Hedlund. And I hope everybody can hear me all right. So what you see on the screen in Adobe Connect is actually an extract from the implementation plan. I note Heath is asking, can we change slides proportion so it's all on screen? This is actually a multipage document, Heath, so we would not be able to see it all on screen unless it would be very, very tiny but I don't think that's actually possible.

I'll try to scroll as we move through each of the recommendations. I see a couple folks are typing so let me just see if -- I just want to make sure



everybody can see okay. Okay yes and thank you. Terri is noting that people can also just scroll themselves. And I'm waiting. Okay, nobody is typing now.

So I'll go ahead and work through these. So these – just as a reminder, these are in order of priority and they're also grouped according to category. So the first of the groupings is on PDP improvements effectiveness and implementation.

And Recommendation 8 was that the working group should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to the policy that they have developed. The working party noted that this is work that's already being done. It was actually one of the recommendations or encompassed in one of the recommendations in the – coming out of the Policy and Implementation Working Group and their final report.

That final report was approved by the Council. The recommendations and changes were approved by the Board as some of them involved changes to the bylaws, others involved changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures. When we get to the charter for that recommendation, we can, you know, talk through that, you know, the particular details of that item.

But just as an overview so you have a sense – and I do apologize, there's an emergency vehicle going by – has just gone by. Next recommendation was Recommendation 15 and you'll note as we go through here, some of these are grouped together if they have – if they, you know, can be implemented together.

This was that the GNSO continues current PDP improvement projects initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP. This was another one that was noted as already being done and, you know, that this should continue.

Recommendations 16 and 18, so these are grouped together; 16 was that a policy impact assessment, PIA, be included as a standard part of any policy

process. And Recommendation 18 that the GNSO Council evaluate post-implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis and that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve drafting and scope of PDP charters, facilitate effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time.

And so then there are some action items. So this one, as is noted that there could be changes to the PDP manual, they say guidelines here, but guidelines within the manual relating to post-implementation policy and guidelines for how implementation policy should be evaluated.

It may be, for instance, that this one also has been addressed by some of the recommendations and implementation of the Policy and Implementation Working Group recommendations as these are somewhat related to that. And you'll note here that in our implementation plan we actually did call out proposed implementation steps. So these can be considered then as we, you know, produce the charters for these recommendations.

And if any time anybody has any questions, you know, feel free to just, you know, raise your hand. I'm keeping an eye on the hands.

Recommendation 14 was GNSO further explores PDP chunking and examines each potential PDP for feasibility for breaking into the (unintelligible). And then this one, to a certain extent, is something that's already happening and we're indicating, you know, we can follow up and staff can indicate where this may be happening and also whether or not there's guidance concerning this in the PDP manual. I think there's also some guidance that came out of the – again, of the Policy and Implementation Working Group.

Recommendation 31 was that the GAC GNSO Consultation Group on GAC early engagement in the GNSO policy development process continue its two work streams as priority projects and as part of its work should consider how

the GAC could appoint a nonbinding, nonvoting liaison to the working group of each relevant GNSO PDP.

This is noted as being ongoing and again, you know, staff can help the working group here determine, you know, how much has been achieved in this area and what else needs to be done to implement.

So that is the first grouping related to PDP and improvements. And Heath has a question. Did you want to speak your question, Heath, or type it – I don't see you typing in the chat right at the moment. Heath, if you're trying to speak you may be on mute. I see you are typing. I'll wait and see – okay. Heath notes, "I think it's better if we answer the question later." Certainly no need to apologize, Heath, we will certainly allow plenty of time for questions.

Moving along to the next category of recommendations, this is on those related to the GNSO Council, stakeholder group and constituency appointments, members, membership, statements of interest, procedures and support.

Recommendation 33 here, and now is in the medium rather than high priority category, that stakeholder groups, constituencies and Nominating Committee in selecting their candidates for appointment to the GNSO Council should aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity participants as defined in ICANN Core Value 4.

And here was an indication that work was being done but there may need to be metrics in place so that we can determine, you know, how well this is being achieved.

Recommendations 24 and 25 have been grouped. And this has to do with stakeholder groups and constituencies adhering to their process for new constituencies and that the Board would, in assessing an application, satisfy that all parties have followed the published process subject to which the

default outcome is that a new constituency is admitted, that all applications for new constituencies including historical applications be published on the ICANN Website for full transparency, decision making.

And 25, that the GNSO Council commission the development of and implement guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new constituency. And it's noted then that some of this work is being done and indicated for each recommendation some areas, and also areas where there may need to be further implementation. And then there's some proposed implementation steps.

And again, I'm not going through all of these steps because we'll obviously be doing that once we have the charters for these. Recommendation 30, that the GNSO develop and implement a policy for the provision of administrative support for stakeholder groups and constituencies and that SGs and Cs annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of the administrative support.

Again, there has been a procedure for providing admin support and some evaluation of that support I think also is happening, but again, as part of the implementation of this, you know, we'll be looking at, say, for example, the GNSO toolkit, the pilot program and, you know, determining if there are additional measures that need to be taken to implement here.

And then finally, the last grouping is working group performance, participation, meeting tools, self-evaluation, outreach, volunteers and leadership. And here again, we have two recommendations grouped, 10 and 11. Ten is on developing criteria for working groups to engage a professional facilitator or moderator. And 11 that face to face – the face to face PDP working group pilot project be assessed when completed.

And then there may be, indeed, some overlap of this – these two recommendations with the previous recommendation that related to the pilot project as well. Just moving along to – make sure I didn't skip anything – to

13, that the GNSO evaluate and if appropriate pilot a technology solution to facilitate wider participation in working group consensus-based decision making.

Again, noted that some of this is happening. Working groups are using, for example, Google Docs to collaborate. That's actually being used extensively in the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group and of course further evaluation will be done there.

Nineteen, says as strategic manager rather than a policy body, the GNSO Council should continue to focus on ensuring that a working group has been properly constituted necessarily fulfill the terms of its charter and follow a due process.

And there is now a working group self-assessment that is part of the Working Group Guidelines and I think that there needs to be evaluation then on whether or not that's, you know, being fulfilled by working groups when they complete their work and whether or not that is also being reviewed, you know, by the Council as well.

So those encompass all of the recommendations in Phase 1. And so I'll pause here and that was really just a very quick review just so we have a sense of what's in Phase 1. And I see Heath has his question, which I'll read out then for the transcript and the recording.

This is a question from Heath Dixon, "For the ones where work remains to be done, do we decide what work is to be done at the charter stage or does the charter simply indicate the proposed implementation steps and then the people working on the recommendation decide the work? Trying to understand how much work and decision making needs to happen at the charter stage versus the working stage."

So, Jen, if you'd like I can take a stab at answering this question.

Jen Wolfe: Sure. Sure, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: So, thank you for your question, Heath. This is Julie Hedlund. I think the idea is to suggest in the charter the work that needs to be done. And I think this is something that staff can definitely, you know, assist with as staff sort of do the first draft of the charter. To a certain extent, some of the work in the implementation steps has been identified in the implementation plan and the steps that are in each of the recommendations. These then can be brought into the charters.

In some cases, the charter may simply say – point to here's what was done and, you know, suggest that this, you know, did, you know, is the implementation of that recommendation and then, you know, it could be as simple as the working group then as a whole looking at that charter and saying yes, we agree or maybe coming back with a few more questions. Staff does a little more work and then, you know, the working group says, yes, okay this one's been done and signs off on it.

In other cases, you know, where there is more work that needs to be done, staff could, you know, take the first cut at the charter indicating where, you know, as we noted in the plan, where additional work appears to be necessary and if the recommendation is a little more extensive as far as work that needs to be done it could be then that a small working group is formed to determine how best to address that work or it could be that the working group says to staff, you know, take these steps, X, Y and Z and, you know, report back to us when they're done.

There's a couple of different ways that we could approach it. But I think the idea is to try to scope out as much as possible in the charter so that we can see the scope of work and the implementation steps. And then it's also then that also then, you know, provides the – well, the charter – for the working

group, either the working group as a whole or for, you know, a smaller sub team if it's decided to do that.

And maybe, Jen, if I might suggest, this would be a good time to segue into the first of the charters that staff had filled out for Recommendation 8.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, absolutely.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Then I will go ahead and switch to that document. Okay. And again, this is Julie Hedlund, and I'll note that the document is unsynced so you can, you know, move through it yourself.

I'll note also that this format is not one that we created, you know, for this particular implementation plan; it already existed. It came out of the ATRT process. It is actually an implementation template. I'm sorry, there's a little bit of background noise here. It is actually an implementation template that is to be used, you know, for implementation of any recommendation.

So the idea within ICANN is to have a template to ensure that for all implementation efforts the approach is the same, the same, you know, details are included for each - the implementation of each recommendation regardless of what it is. So this is actually a form that had already been created and has already been used for other implementations.

But this is the first time, you know, of course that we are doing this with the GNSO review so, you know, we have a certain amount of leeway in how we complete this. And I have to say that, you know, this is certainly the first time I as staff has used this form so, you know, the working group could say there's not enough information here or we need more information there or this isn't clear. You know, this is really our opportunity to make sure that this form is as useful as possible, you know, for us, for recommendations.

So any questions before you move ahead? I'm not seeing any hands.

So the recommendation team, recommendation name, the name really in this case, you know, if we look at the actual recommendation, which is down in project/recommendation under strategic alignment, the recommendation, you know, that came out of the independent examiner's report was that working groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.

And so, you know, I name for this recommendation could be Working Group Implementation Role. The date of the draft is yesterday. The project sponsor is, I think, envisioned to be the GNSO Council. I mean, all these fall under the GNSO Council or under the GNSO. The GNSO Council would be the decision-making body along with this GNSO Review Working Group.

And so the GNSO Review Working Group, you know, could be conceived of as the project manager as opposed to say a specific person. That would be the staff suggestion. And I see that Heath has his hand up. Please go ahead, Heath. And, Heath, if you're speaking you may be on mute. Okay, I see Heath is typing.

Okay, yes, we unfortunately can't hear you, Heath. Terri is noting that your mic isn't active so you would need to activate your mic or we can dial out to you. Do you want to – okay. To activate your mic, Heath, on the top of the toolbar select the telephone icon and follow the prompts.

Heath Dixon: Is that working?

Julie Hedlund: That works. We can hear you.

Heath Dixon: Great. Sorry about the delay. My question is for things like project sponsor where the answer is going to be the same for each of these, should we leave those things out or, I guess what I'm trying to figure out is can we minimize the amount of work that it takes to put these together and the amount of



information that people have to read through when they're trying to understand what the charter is for each one.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you for your question, Heath. I guess I would defer to the working group are not. I mean, as far as how much work, I can say that obviously we are setting these up as a template so if it's the same, you know, if the only thing that needs to be changed is the recommendation name, that, you know, at least as, you know, staff to set up these forms, you know, for each of these recommendations would not be difficult.

But we, you know, could also leave that whole thing off or conceivably have it, I mean, it depends on also - and this is another question as far as how this group wants to work. But, you know, to a certain extent, you know, obviously there has to be a reporting out, you know, from this group, you know, to the Council to say we've looked at these recommendations and this is how, you know, we think they'll be addressed.

And it probably, I mean, this is something for the working group to decide by just thinking off the top of my head, you know, rather than waiting obviously until all of the Phase 1 is done and then coming to the Council and saying, hey, we did all these and here they are, you know.

Or, you know, in some cases it may even be that if the recommendation results in changes to say, the GNSO Operating Procedures there is also a process that has to be followed for that whereby those changes would have to go out for public comment and then the Operating Procedures would have to be approved by the Council. So there may also be a Council approval step.

So I guess what I'm saying is, you know, there's two options. We could leave the information off and simply include it in say, a batch of recommendations that we provide to the Council so that we are not, you know, so that we can show progress and show that, you know, we're completing these, you know, and, you know, perhaps even gaining a little bit of time.

You know, and these recommendations actually each have, as you saw in the slides, their own timeline. You know, some may take, you know, 30 days, some may take 60 days. And so, you know, once, you know, within, you know, say 30 days then we should be able to say here's the batch that we were supposed to have done in 30 days and, you know, here's where they stand.

So that was probably a longer more – longer answer than you really needed, Heath, sorry about that.

Heath Dixon: No, that's fine. I appreciate the detail. I guess my follow-up question then is, was it you that put this together or if the person who put this together on the phone because I'd be interested in hearing some perspective from whoever put this together on which of these - I know this wasn't - since this tool wasn't designed for this purpose, we're just seeing if it's one that will work, I'd be interested to hear from somebody who's gone through the process of filling it out to hear were there parts of it that didn't make sense or that were difficult to fill out, so if we could get some guidance from somebody who's been through this on what's useful here and what would be best to edit before we go forward with doing more of them.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you, Heath, for that question. Normally I would say, oh staff did that, you know, but in this instance it's much more helpful to be clear that, yes, it was indeed me who completed this first of the forms. And maybe it might be helpful if I talk through the different sections, I can also then, you know, explain, you know, whether or not I thought they were helpful.

I found it actually quite easy to fill out. I mean, it's – so maybe if you'd like I can just sort of talk through the form and then, you know, any questions that arise as far as whether or not something was useful or difficult to fill out, you know, maybe we could address that as they come up.

Heath Dixon: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: So there's the – we talked about there's the recommendation team. There's the recommendation background. We can talk about whether or not we want a lot of background. I mean, the background for all of the recommendations is that they arose from the, you know, the independent examiner's report and, you know, from the, you know, obviously from the feasibility and prioritization analysis that the working party did, and then, you know, the approval of the Council of the recommendations, the approval of them by the Board, etcetera.

This gets back to the question of how much background do we really need to include because, you know, we could conceivably just have a reference to the implementation plan, you know, or simply say that, you know, this is the Recommendation 8 that was adopted by the Council and approved by the Board.

So it's really up to this working group as to how much information that needs to be put in there. It really is going to be the same for all of the recommendations except for that, you know, this is Recommendation 8 or, you know, 12 or 15 or whatever, that would be really the only – the difference as far as, you know, where did these recommendations come from.

And actually I'd like, you know, maybe I can just open this up as a question if people have a sense of how much information they think would be useful to include there given that, you know, the Council is going to know where these are coming from, they're not just, you know, random recommendations that are being, you know, addressed by this working group.

And here is a comment from Heath. "The background of each of these is. This is the point I was trying to make with my first question a minute ago, to me where the information is the same for each and where it's already in the

plan seems unnecessary to repeat it all here.” And I think that’s a fair comment.

Jen and Wolf-Ulrich, I’m wondering if – oh, Jen, you have your hand up. Please go ahead. Good.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, no thanks, Julie. And, I mean, I agree particularly on these recommendations where there is the work already underway, I think we don't need to go in as much detail because we're – everybody's already agreed that this is work already underway and let's make this a bit more efficient and easy to move through.

Perhaps the ones, when we get into the high priority is where we might want to focus in on more detail. That's just how I would look at it. But I welcome everyone's comments.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. Any other comments from folks? Then perhaps what we can suggest as staff is that the information that is, you know, the same for all particularly for these Phase 1 things, you know, could then be, you know, extracted or, you know, I mean, it could be included when, you know, we present our, you know, findings to the Council. But just as, you know, just one time, right? And then, you know, the – and then the more detailed information for each of the recommendations would be the part, you know, obviously that would be different.

So we would not have to complete the information that's the same each time. We probably would still want to capture a date, you know, so we could probably change this one a little bit. I don't see why we couldn't. You know, so that, you know, we want to capture the date, we, you know, might want to capture some background if, as Jen noted, if it's a little bit different for a particular recommendation. But otherwise we could just move into the strategic alignment so, you know, this is going to change depending on the

recommendations as far as which objective in ICANN's strategic plan does the recommendation meet.

So for instance, one – in this instance, one of the objectives in the latest strategic plan, that is the plan from 2016 through 2020, is to promote ICANN's role in multi-stakeholder approach. From a staff perspective, this seemed closest to this, you know, particular recommendation. The idea is that the working group should have a role in implementation so we're really – the goal is to encourage community role in implementation.

I have to actually find out a little bit more about what's expected in the portfolio category. It wasn't immediately clear to me. This is, Heath, as you noted, this is an area where I wasn't quite sure what was supposed to go there. And I'll check with – I did not have a chance to check with my colleagues on that but I will do so. Those who have at least used this form, you know, would be able to let me know what goes in there.

And then of course the project/recommendation would be different for each recommendation so that is a statement of what this recommendation is, that working groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues relating to the policy they have developed.

And then the scope description, so the characteristics of the product or service that the project is to operationalize. Here, you know, for some of our recommendations there isn't necessarily going to be a product or a service, in this instance, for example. So there isn't something necessarily that's operationalized. But it is important to have a scope of the work, you know, what's going to be done, what's not going to be done. And this I think will be particularly important in some of the recommendations that are more detailed.

And I see here is a comment from Heath. Comment, "Also if there are areas in these documents that are N/A for all or most, seems like we should pull those out to streamline. The longer they are the more time they demand from

people trying to read them and understand what we are doing.” And that, again, is a very helpful comment. Thank you.

For example, if portfolio is something that we don't need to address under the strategic objectives, then perhaps that's something that simply just gets left out. And I will also consult with colleagues who've used these forms to determine just how crucial it is to have the exact same information even if it doesn't seem, you know, to try to complete the information even if it doesn't seem to be applicable. Yes, so Heath notes “Re portfolio, exactly.”

So into the description, we've stated the recommendation. So I suggest the status, and this is based on some of the – the research that staff did previously when the working party was actually looking at this recommendation. And this was the work that informed the working party's opinion that this was work that had already been undertaken.

And so staff had noted that the recommendation is covered in the final report of the Policy and Implementation Working Group that was adopted by the GNSO Council. That final report was published in June of 2015. And in particular, Recommendation Number 4 of this final report, it recommended that the PDP manual be modified to require the creation of an implementation review team and that team, of course, could include the working group members.

Following the adoption of the PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board, that change to the PDP manual was done and I'll move further down and show exactly what was included. And that was approved by – the change to the PDP manual was approved by the GNSO Council on the 24th of June, 2015 as version 3.0 and it was also – those revised Operating Procedures were including the PDP manual changes, were published on – also on the 24th of June, 2015.

And I see Marika is typing. But and so I'll pull those comments out once we see them. What is out of scope of the project, it wasn't immediately clear to me what we would say is, you know, is out of scope. So this may be – I think this is something that would be important to include where we have fairly complicated recommendations where, you know, we want to say well we're addressing this but it's not going to include that. You know, or maybe that – this other item is going to be addressed in – oh yes, so Marika is noting, so the proposed solution already happened, that may be worth making more clear.

Yes, I think that it could be made more clear in here that, yes, the proposed solution – this is where these – for work that's already done it would be helpful to get feedback from the working group as far as how we want to address this.

These – and maybe what we do is modify the way these forms are set up in these instances because the forms assume that you're creating a project, a charter for a project, you're going to follow through this project, you're going to propose a solution and, you know, and this is, you know, how that solution is going to get done. Right, so in Marika's instance it's not a proposed solution it's, you know, solution applied because in this case you go back and you look and it's like, well, okay, this thing happened. That's not going to be true of all the recommendations but it may be true of several of them.

I see, unfortunately Renata has to drop off the call. Thank you very much, Renata for joining.

Yes, so I think it would be helpful to modify the form to make it clearer that this is not a proposed solution, this is a solution that has already been applied in this instance at least because, you know, because of the – and this is something that the working group would, you know, need to agree. Does the working group agree that this is the solution to this recommendation? That would be an important question to look at as you review this charter.

So moving ahead then, you know, deliverables, the deliverable as identified was revised, GNSO Operating Procedures, option analysis where there's other solutions that were considered and not applied, none or none were deemed necessary to be considered.

And here where we say a proposed solution could be solution applied, so the new text that was included in PDP manual that was published on the 24th of June, stated the GNSO Council must direct the creation of an implementation review team to assist staff in developing the implementation details of the policy unless exceptional circumstances that the GNSO Council determines that an IRT is not required, e.g. if another IRT is in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations.

However, in such case the membership of the IRT will need to be reviewed to ensure that adequate expertise and representation is present to take on the implementation of the additional PDP recommendations. In its final report the PDP team should provide recommendations to the GNSO Council on whether an implementation review team should be established and any other recommendations deemed appropriate in relation to such an implementation review team.

So in this instance the working group would need to decide, you know, does this language address the goal to have working parties be involved in the implementation of a policy?

Here obviously any working group member and really any community member could join the implementation review team so it would be envisioned then that community could be involved in the implementation but that would be the decision the working group would need to make; what were the dependencies, you know, obviously the approval of the GNSO Operating Procedures revisions, which happened on 24 June, the publication of the



revised Operating Procedures also occurred on the 24 June, what were the risks not, you know, lack of approval would be a risk.

And, you know, what – key performance indicators again, KPIs may not be something that would be useful to all of the recommendations, although this is a key piece to include because the implementation plan makes it clear that we do need to capture metrics wherever possible so that there is a way to say, you know, this thing has been done. And that’s where we would, you know, we would look to perhaps identify some metrics.

And I see that Heath has a comment, which I will read off for the recording and the transcript. “For all of these we need to answer the question, ‘What else needs to be done after the proposed solution is implemented?’ Presumably, we should not need to do anything else, but the GNSO may need to monitor the report, periodically review and decide whether to make changes, etcetera. For ones where work is being done elsewhere the question is, do we trust those working groups to include follow up? Or do we want to interject our own follow up?”

Thank you, Heath, that’s a very helpful comment. And really the rest of this is just approvers and reviewers. Approval would be GNSO Council. Reviewers, this GNSO review working group. Revision history would capture any changes being made to this particular charter as all charters in ICANN have a – like a revision history section.

So that was a very quick run through of this. And I see are six minutes to the top of the hour. I’m going to stop talking and open up for questions and thank you all.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Well, I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up. Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Julie. Well, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, it's a great work, well, which you suggest here and you are doing. So my question here is just related to when can we expect, well, to have these charters in place, the other – for the other recommendations from your side? Because I understand well, you are the ones who are preparing us with those basic materials for the other recommendations. So what is – how can we go forward with that? That's my question.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. That's an excellent question. So the staff plan is to try to complete as many of these charters as quickly as possible really. I have, you know, spent some time reviewing, again, the recommendations as we did here. And even just looking at them again, can see several instances where, you know, we should be able to move quickly to identify what we need to have in the charter. We already did actually a fair amount of work in the implementation plan to identify implementation steps.

So I would say that staff would try to get as many of these done as possible to consider – to get them out to the working group prior to the meeting on the 15th of March so that there is some time to review and so that we could have a good working session at ICANN 58 in Copenhagen.

I'm not going to necessarily be able to say right at this moment how many of these I can get done by then but – staff can get done by then, but, you know, the idea is to try to get as many of these out there as possible so that we have a really substantive working session in Copenhagen.

And I see that we have a comment from Heath. "For all of these we need to," oh this is the one I already read, sorry, I read that. There are some new – okay, here's a new comment. "On the time to review point, I would be happy to see these roll out as ICANN staff completes the first draft rather than

waiting to get them in a batch. Be easier for me to review them one at a time.”  
Thank you, Heath, that’s extremely helpful and certainly staff can do that.

And certainly that’s the way they will be produced, one at a time, and so we certainly can release them to the list for review one at a time. And I see Wolf-Ulrich is agreeing with that.

Any further questions? Jen, anything that you want to add also?

Jen Wolfe: No, I think that would be most helpful if these can be rolling out and particularly between now and the next meeting, you know, to the extent that people feel like they're in good working order on these recommendations where there's work already underway, you know, they could probably be dispensed with relatively quickly which would allow us to move into the substantive work. So I think that would be most helpful.

And, you know, and again I think what we all want to do is answer the questions that Heath has raised which is, is there anything else that needs to be done, you know, or is there any other accountability mechanism? But otherwise if work is already being done and we feel like that decision, you know, let's move on so that we can get to those recommendations where there isn't work being done and our work, you know, is really, you know, very important and timely.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. Anything else that anybody wants to ask of staff?  
Jen, I'll turn things back to you then.

Jen Wolfe: Sure, thanks, Julie. Thanks very much. I know that's a lot of work and we appreciate all the work. And I know these beginning calls it's always, you know, a bit difficult to get through all of these details, but I think once we get on a roll and we get into a rhythm it will move a lot faster. So thank you for all of the pre-work, Julie, and taking us through that, that was extremely helpful.

Thank you to all of you for joining. We are about at the top of the hour. Our next meeting is scheduled to be at the ICANN 58 meeting on March 15. I think we've determined in this call that we would then start an every other week cycle, that staff will send out a Doodle poll to check on the time because I think there were some concerns about this particular time. I'm realizing some of you are on the West Coast of the US and this is, you know, very early in the morning. So perhaps we can try to find a time that is a little better for everyone across all the time zones. I know that's difficult but hopefully we can try to accommodate everyone. And then continue to move forward.

And I encourage everyone as these charters are circulated on-list, please do read them, comment on them because we may be able to get a lot done on the list in between our meetings so that we can save our time on calls for where we really need to have discussion.

So unless there's any further comments, thank you all so very much. I appreciate your time. And have a great remainder of your day or the next day. Thanks to everyone.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Jen. Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Thanks, everyone. Have a great day.

Jen Wolfe: You too.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. (Gayle), the operator, if you could please stop all recordings. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END