

## TRANSCRIPT

### **GNSO Review Working Party Tuesday 8 December 2015 at 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

Attendance:

Avri Doria  
Chuck Gomes  
Jen Wolfe  
Rudi Vansnick  
Amr Elsadr  
David Maher  
Stephanie Perrin  
Apologies: Klaus Stoll

Staff:

Larisa Gurnick,  
Marika Konings  
Mary Wong  
Lars Hoffmann  
Glen de St Gery  
Charla Shambley  
Pamela Smith  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have now started. You may proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Operator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO working party call on the 8 of December, 2015. On the call today I have Chuck Gomes, David Maher, (Pamela Smith), Amr Elsadr, Stephanie Perrin Rudi Vansnick. We've received apologies from Klaus Stoll.

And from staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Lars Hoffman, (unintelligible), (Michelle) (unintelligible) and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription services. Thank you so much and over to you, Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa Gurnick. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody.

While we give Charla a chance to put up some documents I wanted to take us to several recommendations where at the end of last call there was some question as to what the intention was of the independent examiner in offering several recommendations, three if I remember it correctly. And the staff has circulated relevant portions of that text a couple of times I believe to the list.

So perhaps a good place to start would be to revisit those three recommendations and to see if all of you have any different opinions or thoughts on actions relative to those three recommendations. And then from there we could take a look at the entirety of the 36 recommendations and how they have been categorized to begin the process of prioritization.

Charla or Nathalie, if you would be able to please put on the screen the specifics of the three recommendations in question where there was some interest in revisiting the substance of those recommendations that would be really helpful?

Charla Shambley: Larisa, it's Charla. Just give me one second while I get the Excel doc loaded.

Larisa Gurnick: Very good, please bear with us, folks. Sorry about the delay. And I see that (Jen) is entering the room right now so please bear with us for one moment and we'll get those going.

(Jen): Hi, it's (Jen). I just joined.

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, (Jen). This is Larisa, thanks for joining. We were just bringing up on the screen the Excel spreadsheet that summarizes all the recommendations and all the work that the committee had done.

And while we were waiting for you I suggested that perhaps the group would like to take a look at the three recommendations that - at the last of - at the end of the last call it was determined that they needed a little more investigation and a look at the relevant portions of the Westlake report in order to decide how to proceed with those.

So we're about to take a look at those three and then go through the process of prioritization so with that I'll turn it over to you.

(Jen): Great, thank you, and my sincerest apologies. For some reason I did not get the email with the meeting invite so I'm very sorry about that and for being late.

So have there been - since you all had the opportunities to take a look in more detail at the report and the comments, as Larisa said, we have these three comments or recommendations, excuse me, to review.

I guess we can go ahead and start with Recommendation Number 21, which states that the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well represented in the policymaking process.

After having a chance to go in and review in more detail what other comments on this in terms of, you know, is this a do not implement? Is it something we think is already underway? Or we think it's a good recommendation and should go forward? Any comments? Yes, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I'll get it started. I think if we go to...

(Jen): Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: If we go to the comments column there for that one, I think a good question is asked there. How do you analyze trends in gTLDs? I'm not sure what that means or how we would do it.

Obviously the GNSO always has the responsibility to try and make sure the all impacted parties are represented and I suppose we could reinforce that and, you know, say, you know, that needs to be an ongoing effort. Obviously the first task is to identify the impacted parties and then to make best efforts to get them involved.

But this one - this whole recommendation is kind of vague in my opinion in terms of what it means.

(Jen): Thanks, Chuck. And I don't know if you all had a chance to look at the documents that Charla sent around. I guess it was on December 1 was when I got it. But she had sent the final report Section 6, and she actually highlighted it.

And I - I don't know, I think as I look at it, I mean there's a lot that's documented in terms of observations and I'm not completely sure how it correlates to the analysis of gTLD - of the trends of gTLDs. I feel like maybe that was misstated.

When you look at - they're talking a bit more about the prioritization of work and PDPs running. I don't know if anybody else has had a chance to look at it? Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Stephanie for the record - (Perrin) that is. I had commented on this that honestly one of the benefits of having such a broad multi-stakeholder organization is you're less likely than certain other organizations to not be aware of trends. Somebody's going to bring attention that we're missing policy. So the idea of spending money, call me a cheapskate but I don't like the idea of having to go out and do trends analysis to find out what's going on. So that would be my first point. I'm pretty sure it's going to bite us right there at ICANN where we sit because of the nature of the organization.

Secondly - not secondly - yes, for a note, there's lots of recommendations on (unintelligible). We already have a pretty full plate at the GNSO. So I don't think we need to be looking under rocks for things we've missed. We will barely be able to cope with what we've got ahead of us it seems to me. So I would definitely dump this one as far down the list as we could, thanks.

(Jen): Okay, thanks, Stephanie. So I think that's a vote for the thread of do not implement. Amr, do you have your hand up? Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks, (Jen). This is Amr. I guess I agree with everyone so far, I agree with Chuck, (Jen), and Stephanie. I just wanted to add that some of the relevant text in the final report by Westlake that was highlighted and sent to us is also a bit confusing. I mean some of it does make sense in terms of the large workload and the (unintelligible) number of volunteers and perhaps prioritization of PDPs may be something we might want to look into or maybe not.

But then there are other parts - the relevant text and I'm concerned that some of those may have had an impact and develop a recommendation, things about the GNSO involved in broader ICANN governance issues, budget administration, that sort of thing. Internet governance policy, I'm not even sure what that is. But my understanding is that the GNSO is not very necessarily involved in any of that. There are other parts of ICANN that may

be but it seems like some of the survey responses that Westlake received may have perhaps misled them into developing recommendation that is not really based on much fact and maybe that is why some of us are finding the recommendation itself to be confusing. Thanks.

(Jen): So do we think that we could mark this as a red, do not implement, with maybe just a comment that, you know, on our review and analysis we don't think that this particular recommendation is well phrased or correlates to what was in the report? Would that be a way to approach it? Rudi has a check. Amr, is that a new hand that you have up there?

Amr Elsadr: Sorry, that's an old hand.

(Jen): Okay, that's okay. Is there anybody who disagrees with marking this as a red, do not implement? Okay, well, if there's no other objection I think we can mark that one off and we can go ahead and move on to Recommendation 22.

Chuck Gomes: (Jen), this is Chuck. Before you move on we probably ought to give a little explanation as to why we recommend that and I think several people have made comments that maybe can be used to explain that. Maybe somebody can draft up, you know, a summary of some of the things that we just discussed and just put it around to the list as our rationale for that?

(Jen): Sure, absolutely. I mean I think we do want to make sure that we are - when we prepare our report to go forward that we have been clear on anything that we recommended not to be implemented as to why. But I think we have some good comments and just discussion of the way this is phrased doesn't really match up to what's in the report and to Stephanie's point, that this may not be appropriate at this point in time.

So - okay, so we will make sure that that gets circulated. And actually, I think, (Sharla), perhaps once we finish this conversation and that gets written up

that can be circulated that we can have any comments and then we can put this all into a final report that we'll be issuing. Okay.

Charla: That sounds - I'll circulate that.

(Jen): Thank you, thank you very much. So moving on to Recommendation 22, which reads the GNSO Council developed a competency-based framework which its members should utilize to identify development needs and opportunities.

Again, in that same document I was just referencing that Charla circulated, which is GNSO review final report Section 6, if you continue to scroll down the next section that's highlighted addresses this particular recommendation if any of you want to take a look at that. But any comments on, you know, how we would want to flag this particular recommendation? Any comments?

Is this something also that we think is unclear in the way that it's written? Or do you think that the explanation that's provided in the observations is sufficient? That maybe we could reword the recommendation? I think some of the - just if you haven't had a chance to look at some of the observations, the GNSO would benefit from actively encouraging technical operational expertise on the part of councilors, provide technical training to councilors without a technical background.

And then if you continue down into the analysis these seem to be building off of the BGC Recommendation 13 and improving upon that and some of the ATRT 2 recommendations. So that may be where this is coming from. And there's a final line in here, before the recommendation was that they consider robust training and develop program as critical - as a critical element in maintaining the effectiveness of GNSO Council. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, (Jen). This is Amr. Yes, reading the sections that were circulated again by staff - and thanks for those and the highlighted text, it made me

think that, you know, I wouldn't mind if GNSO councilors got some sort of training when they were beginning their terms, for example, to make sure they understand the GNSO operating procedures as well, that they understand the working group guidelines very well.

I mean the GNSO councilors are meant to manage the GNSO's policy development process so they do need to have some form of understanding on that. and so if this recommendation is geared more towards that and somehow developing a framework to understand what the needs are then - yes, I would probably like to take a look at it - a closer look at this and how it would be done. Yes, that's all, thanks.

(Jen): So Amr, if I'm hearing you correctly you're saying that if this is about training then maybe we agree with the intent but would rephrase the recommendation to be more clear. Is that - am I understanding you correctly?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, possibly. I would need to go over the text again. I'm sorry, I kind of brushed it and I would need to try to understand where exactly it is they are coming from to determine whether we do need to do some work on that text or not. But generally the sense - I do appreciate (unintelligible) got me thinking about what a GNSO councilor is supposed to be doing and what skill sets and experience they need to have and what could be provided to them as they start - begin their terms. And yes, so I'm just saying maybe we could look more into that, maybe we could rework the text and I'd be willing to help with that if the rest of the group agreed. Thanks.

(Jen): Okay, thanks, Amr. Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, with regard to training and in particular technical training, I don't think it's the GNSO Council's role to provide technical training. Training on GNSO procedures and so forth would be helpful and so forth although I would expect that the appointing bodies that elect counselors would make sure that their candidates are well versed in that. At the same time I'm not opposed to

providing some training or reinforcing that training but I don't think it's the council's role to provide any technical training.

For example, I don't think that somebody should be elected or appointed to the council who doesn't at least have a high level understanding of what the DNS is. Quite a few years ago the NomCom appointed somebody who didn't have a clue what the DNS was and so what happened was every time there was an issue regarding the DNS, which was fairly frequent, you know, it required a lot of backtracking and so forth.

So I don't think it's the GNSO Council to - responsibility to train people in the DNS. Now we don't need DNS experts on the Council but having a general knowledge of that is kind of a prerequisite for somebody should be put there, whether it's an appointment or an election.

So some training, yes, but not technical training I don't think.

Woman: (Jen), are you still there? We can't hear you.

(Jen): Sorry, sorry about that, my apologies. Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Stephanie Perrin for the record. As I recall this recommendation sounded more to me like it was kind of basic management skills training. The particular competencies of the individuals need to be brought up.

And it did seem to me that it's really up to constituencies and stakeholder groups not to put people forward that don't have the basic ability to be on the GNSO.

The training that I took last year preparatory to joining the council was useful but those of us who were government - and there were a couple of GAC reps there, felt that it was, you know, pretty well on the softer side of, you know,

how we all get along, which goodness knows might be useful at times. But I'm not sure that's what the GNSO should be training on either.

I would agree with Amr and Chuck I think that we need to understand the rules and the procedures and goodness knows that's complicated enough with how everything all fits together.

Personally myself I took the (Myson) summer school to get a little better on DNS stuff because I'm one of that group who has, you know, not the depth of technical training that I would like to have. And I thought that was really useful.

So maybe a more useful recommendation would be to have an inventory of available training that we can point people in should they choose to train themselves. But it's not really the responsibility of the GNSO to train people. They should have at least skills and - skills and attributes that would be useful.

And I hope that my policy background makes me more useful than I am on the obviously lacking technical side. But you know what I mean, that kind of thing should be a given, thanks.

(Jen): Thanks, Stephanie. So it sounds like there's some consensus here that - some type of orientation or training to the extent that it's about the policy or the procedure or how the protocols of the GNSO work to maybe incoming councilors would be appropriate but not technical training or not things that should be expected of somebody on the council.

Is that kind of what I'm hearing to where maybe this is something that we - I'm trying to look at what color. Maybe we would call this yellow with some modification to the language, we agree with the intent but we would like to change the language. Is that generally what I'm hearing from everyone? Rudi, did you have your hand up? No. Okay, so I'm seeing Chuck's.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I checked on the agree. I think that approach might work.

(Jen): Okay, so (Sharla), perhaps we could schedule - excuse me, we could flag - we could color code this as yellow and then on our comments suggest that this be revised to provide some clarity that this would not be technical training or the rudimentary training that we believe councilors should come to the table with but an orientation or some sort of, you know, supplemental training on GNSO protocols and procedures for, you know, incoming councilors.

And I think Stephanie commented that it may be great to also offer up resources for people who are trying to get involved perhaps to be able to self-study on some of the more technical issues.

Okay, anything - Amr, are you suggesting it shouldn't be yellow? Maybe it should be red or...

Amr Elsadr: Hi, this is Amr. No, I'm not suggesting that it shouldn't be yellow. I'm just saying that I'm not really sure that I understand the intent and - which is why I said maybe I would - I personally would like to go back and take a closer look at it.

But yes, if the group does believe that we do agree with the intent of the recommendation we just need to suggest a few modifications then sure, go ahead and mark it yellow, thanks.

(Jen): Well, and I think what we could do here too is if Charla documents this for us and recirculates it then you can take a few - you know, you can take some time to go back through the final report and then on list we can determine if everyone's in agreement or if there needs to be a change. Chuck, I see your hand's up, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, and I think Amr raises a good point, I'm not sure I understand the intent either when it says develop a competency-based framework. I'm not opposed to it being colored yellow but the intent really isn't that clear to me either. So I'm agreeing with Amr in that regard.

(Jen): No, I understand. I think we're all struggling with the way that they worded this recommendation and by looking at the background information I think that's how we arrived at this sort of idea of, you know, training or orientation.

So I think if we do mark it yellow we just need to be very clear in our notes what we have extracted in a report for this to mean and what we believe should go forward. And if as we circulate that we're not comfortable with it we could always change that to be, you know, a red that we don't think it makes sense as worded or we don't agree with the intent.

Okay. So moving on to Recommendation 36, which states when approving the formation of a PDP working group the GNSO council required that its membership represent as far as reasonable practicable the geographic, cultural, and gender diversity of the Internet as a whole.

Additionally that when approving GNSO policy the ICANN board explicitly satisfy itself that the GNSO undertook these actions when approving the formation of a PDP. So there's really two pieces to this and I know Charla sent out - if you pull up the document she sent that was Section 9, that's where this piece is highlighted.

I don't know if we want to break this into those two pieces so maybe if we start with the first piece. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, (Jen). Yes, I'm not going to - my comment right now is not - I don't really need to break up the two pieces of the recommendation. Yes, sure, there are two pieces to it and we probably need to address both. I just wanted

to say that the language in the final report that supports this recommendation is understandable.

It's a valid concern about perhaps a disparity that - in terms of diverse participation, GNSO processes. But still, I don't think that the text that has been provided adequately addresses the concerns that we have raised in terms of how would we define or how would ICANN define geographic, culture, and gender diversity of the Internet as a whole?

And that was really the - that was the concern at least for the first part of the recommendation and that is linked to the second part because the ICANN board would have to make a decision based on this determination.

So although the text they did provide is - I agree with it completely, I still don't feel that it's addresses the concern that we as a working party have raised regarding - defining these standards.

(Jen): How they've defined it. Right, right, no, and I think that's what we talked about on our last call too is that we're struggling with that particular issue. Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, it's worded poorly based on GNSO procedures because when the GNSO council approves the formation of a PDP working group they don't have - I don't know that they ever have the information about the makeup of the working group at that point. The basic procedures and so forth always encourage the diversity that they're shooting for here.

But they can't - I don't - the way things happen now I don't think this is achievable when they actually approve the formation of a working group. The group is actually formed afterwards. Now I think this is - what they're intending is more a check process after the working group has been formed although they don't say that rather than when the PDP working group is approved for formation.

And it's really the same thing for the board thing there. It's not to ensure that they undertook these actions when they approved the working group. Both parts seem to deal with after the working group is formed doing some sort of a check as to whether or not the membership is as diverse as possible.

Now even when that happens we all know that you're not going to achieve that every time. And so the wording as reasonable practicable is very important on this. But part of it is the timing.

I think that Westlake was looking more for a validation that this happens after the working group was formed and they probably fully didn't appreciate the fact that the steps that are taken to approve a working group. So anyway, hope that makes sense.

(Jen): Thank you, Chuck. Well, and I know that the way they worded this they also state that the GNSO require that its membership - and I think that we all know that, you know, some working groups, it's hard enough to get anybody to participate.

Others, you know, a lot of people want to be involved in but, you know, requiring that might mean that it's really hard to get, you know, people to participate.

So is there a sense that there's agreement with the overall - like, the intent of this to try to create, you know, diverse representation but we think it should be reworded? Are we leaning towards that or do we think that this is already being done in other ways? Or is this something we think really shouldn't be implemented as it's worded? Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I was worried about this recommendation.

It sounds a bit like - and I don't think it's clearly worded enough but it does say require and it reminded me of standard development groups I've been on where there was kind of a matrix formula you had to - this group, so many of that group, so many of the other group. And that's what I thought they were aiming for.

Now I think in our procedures we do need to review that a working group isn't - well, for instance, all intellectual property lawyers. You know, there has to be a balance among the stakeholder groups. But if we start requiring the framework given the current - I'm going back to the burnout situation again, going back to that I don't think we're going to get the worker bees we need for the work to be done.

So I think this needs to be reframed and possibly the way to do it is a - once the working group has been formulated is a quick review on the part of the GNSO to make sure that it is - and Rudi just made the point that it should be part of the charter.

Yes, but not a - not a sort of mandatory matrix because I think we're shooting ourselves in the foot given the current worker burnout, thanks.

(Jen): Thanks, Stephanie. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Stephanie said it very well, I think. It does need rewording. We need to reword it so that it corresponds to the process that the council goes through in terms of approving a PDP and then the process for forming a working group and so forth.

And I think what she suggested is very good in that once a working group is formed it would probably be good for the council to do a quick review or staff to report to the council in terms of the successfulness of having diverse representation and all stakeholders properly represented and so forth.

But she's right, you know, making it mandatory - let's use the inner register transfer policy which has done some very good work divided into four different PDPs. And that was not very representative from geographic, cultural - I don't know about gender. Gender may have been okay.

But it wasn't, it was mostly registrars and one or two registries and very few other people. And yet, they produced some good work that was ultimately reviewed by the broader community. And I think the results were good.

So yes, rewording is definitely needed here in both parts.

(Jen): Thanks, Chuck. So just to clarify, Chuck, do you feel like this could be yellow and then we rewrite the recommendation?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Jen): Or do you feel like this is already being done in other - I guess that's kind of my question. Is this, you know, aimed for diversity already being done in other places I guess that would be my question?

Chuck Gomes: Well, this is Chuck again. I don't know that it's already being done. Certainly the part about reviewing the makeup of the working group after the working group is formed is not being done.

I think there's always an intent and an objective to encourage diverse participation. So in that sense that's kind of being done, maybe more could be done there, I don't know. But the part about actually, you know, checking to see if the membership is as diverse as possible, I don't think that's happening.

(Jen): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yellow's fine for me.

(Jen): So maybe yellow and we just work on the language. Rudi, I see your hand's up, go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you, (Jen). Rudi (unintelligible) for the transcript. I think it's the duty of the chairs and co-chairs - working group to have a look into the participation - sorry. Although the participation in itself should not be just based on the fact that somebody from certain regions is present in the working group.

It's also a question of are they bringing in stuff that helps, having a good view on what that region is looking into for each of the topics we discuss? I think it's not just having names and then geographic regions represented. It's also the efforts done by each of them to really participate rather than being present in the list of participants.

(Jen): Thanks, Rudi. Any other comments? So it sounds like we had some consensus that we agree with the overall intent making it yellow but we want to revise this. I see Stephanie's note, maybe turning it into more of a checkpoint.

(Sharla), do you feel like you have enough to draft that and then we can circulate this - these three recommendations and our comments to the list? We can refine that and then from that point we would work on putting all of our responses together into a report from our group to the board. Is - does that work for everybody?

Any other comments on these recommendations or on anything else that's been done? So I think from a list standpoint what we want to do is just focus on these three, again, so that we can all feel very comfortable with the language so that - because we're working - you know, one is red and two is yellow so we can be very clear on our rationale and our proposed language.

And then once that's complete we will compile all of our color coding and recommendations, make sure everybody's comfortable with that and then we can prepare that to go to the OEC and the board. Does that work as next steps for everybody?

And Larisa, I know you probably covered this while I was late for the call but did you cover our timing? We're working towards that February meeting, right?

Larisa Gurnick: No, (Jen), hi, this is Larisa. No, I hadn't covered that but I just wanted to remind you and the group that one more step that we will talk about taking is prioritizing all the recommendations.

(Jen): Yes, okay. So why don't we finish up this piece and then we can - I think to a certain extent the color coding is going to help make that fairly obvious because we're going to see, obviously, reds are do not implement. You know, oranges are things that we think are already - you know, green is something we think move it forward.

So in a way I think the color coding will do that but I think we should come back and do another call and just verify that everybody's comfortable with the color coding in a way serving as a prioritization or if we think something should be called to the attention of the OEC as particularly a priority. We can be sure to do that.

And then I know, Larisa, we'll have an opportunity to complete our survey of Westlake. Is that something you need by a certain date?

Larisa Gurnick: No, there is not a particular deadline on that and as a matter of fact there is some thinking happening at the moment to figure out how to make that evaluation most productive so that it's not just evaluation of (unintelligible), that would be very important, but also feedback that would be important to

staff on the process and opportunities for us to make some improvements in future reviews.

So stay tuned, we'll come back with more information and updates on that.

(Jen): Okay, great. And I see Amr in the chat, you had had the question about council. I think we were targeting to try to get, you know, our conclusions to the council in January. Before it would go to the - the next OEC meeting is in February, which I think is what we're trying to stay on track with. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think we need to do more on prioritization than just the color coding because the bottom line is there's too many recommendations to all be worked on simultaneously.

And so I think it would be very helpful for the GNSO and the council in particular if we do provide some guidance in terms of which things we would put at a higher priority and so forth because all of these can't be worked on at once.

(Jen): No, absolutely, and I guess what I was thinking was the color coding will help because if something is orange we were saying it's already underway so that would sort of be set to the side. If it's red we're saying do not implement. So we'd pretty much be looking at what's either green or yellow. And so I absolutely agree, we could go in and prioritize those.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, we're on the same page then.

(Jen): Yes, absolutely, okay. Any other comments? Amr, I see you have something about the council. Are you concerned about the timing?

Amr Elsadr: Hi, thanks, (Jen). It's Amr, sorry it took me a minute to get off mute. I was just thinking that the GNSO council will also need to make a decision I think - if

I'm not mistaken will need to make a decision on the ccWG accountability recommendations sometime around January.

(Jen): So you're concerned that that's too much?

Amr Elsadr: I can't say right now. Hopefully - yes, I'm just noting - hopefully all the work will take place with the stakeholder groups and constituencies. So there should be less pressure on council but just thought - just that I'd bring it up. Council will need to be looking at both at the same time I guess.

(Jen): Okay, and it looks like Marika is saying the council tentatively has two meetings in January so we will do our best to keep this moving forward. So I think our next discussion is going to be on list like we said to revise the language on these three. And then we'll circulate everything.

And then I guess we're going to need another call to talk about priorities so we can send out another Doodle poll to try to get a call set on priorities. And then we will work on trying to get this to the GNSO council in January and then pending any other comments or concerns about our work off to the OEC by February. Mary, sorry, I just noticed that you had your hand up.

Mary Wong: Not at all, (Jen). And this is actually (unintelligible) different point more than admin point. But I think (unintelligible) proceed to finalize the recommendation, first to the council and then the OEC, staff just wanted to note that at least one (unintelligible) of the working party - and I believe that (unintelligible) may no longer be a member of the business constituency.

And hoping that (unintelligible) the others but it may be worth, (Jen), you notifying the council or at least contacting the business constituency councilors and leaders to make sure that, you know, they are or they feel that they are adequately represented and if not, then maybe to appoint another representative sooner rather than later.

(Jen): No, that's a great point, thank you for recognizing that. I will certainly reach out to them and make sure they're aware of that. (Ron) is still a part of the BC, correct?

Mary Wong: Yes, that's correct.

(Jen): Okay, great. And Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, one of the things that I think would be helpful when we do our prioritization work would be if we have as near complete as possible version of what we're going to be submitting because I think that will help us in terms of finalizing the priorities if we see what we're going to present for each recommendation.

So that's just a suggestion if that's possible to pull all the final comments together and so forth, not that we can't change them after that but I think that will also be helpful in addition to the color coding in terms of us establishing priorities.

(Jen): Sure, and I'm happy to take that on and work with Charla to work on getting something so that when we circulate it out to everybody we feel like we've got it in good shape so that we're commenting on what we think would be a final - close to a final product at least to move on.

So that's a great point. And Charla, we can offline maybe have a conversation about what that document looks like and how we get that prepared.

Charla: This is Charla, sounds good. I do have my hand up - just a quick question, when do we want the next call? Do we want it before the holidays or maybe the second week in January?

(Jen): Thoughts from the group? I know it's going to be hard to squeeze it in before the holidays but we could certainly try to get another call in next week if you'd like to or we can look at right after the first of the year. (Larisa)?

Larisa Gurnick: I was just going to - this is Larisa, I was just going to suggest that we concentrate working with (Jen) to transcribe all the thoughts and feedback into a document that everybody can review, perhaps use the rest of the time in December to kind of come up with individual ideas on prioritization and then we could come together in early January on the call to finalize that, that would still leave ample time to put this together.

(Jen): I think that will work and anything else - I think when we talk about these three recommendations we can do that via email and refine that. And then if we need to clean up anything there we can do that on the call in January.

So unless anybody disagrees let's plan on right after the first of the year.  
Amr, I see - is anybody else concerned about that timing?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, one of the things we need to be honest about is with the stuff that's going on with the ccWG accountability work we shouldn't be shocked if we're unable to meet our goals, especially if we want the council to look at it and so forth and even the board probably is going to be busy.

So I think we should continue to strive to meet the February target for getting it to the committee. But if that doesn't happen I don't think we should be shocked. It all depends really on how much consensus there is out of the gate on the ccWG recommendations. If there's some opposition to any elements so that there's not - you know, very strong support for the ccWG recommendations then we can - you know, it will impact our ability to get things done.

But let's keep shooting for what we're - what we have targeted and then - but not be shocked if there's some interference that happens.

(Jen): No, I think that that's a great comment, Chuck. Let's keep striving exactly but be prepared for what could come ahead. Okay, any other comments, concerns? Okay, Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: (Jen), this is Larisa. In speaking with the members of the organizational effectiveness committee a question has come up as to whether they should be expecting a letter from the working party regarding Recommendation 23. So I just wanted to revisit that question to get the latest thinking on that.

(Jen): I mean I think that was pretty unanimously marked as a red, do not implement. And I know there had been some work done on a letter. I don't know - do we need that if we're going to be suggesting that it's red?

I mean is it - I think the initial concern was that the OEC might act on this, you know, after Westlake presented and now that it's been very clear they're not going to act on this until we're able to provide our recommendations I don't know that there's that same concern but does anyone else have a concern about that?

Chuck Gomes: Do they need - this is Chuck. Do they need a letter? If they do I guess we can do one.

(Jen): That's what I guess I'm asking, I don't know that they - do they really need the letters exactly? If they don't need it then let's not waste energy creating or, you know, going back and forth on a letter when there's so much other work going on right now.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa, I do not think they need a letter. They just wanted to follow through on that and I explained the process that this group is undertaking and making recommendations. So I think that's perfectly acceptable.

(Jen): And I think we did mark, you know, our rationale on why we rejected that recommendation so I think that should be sufficient to address that and to let them know that we're working on getting, you know, a complete response to them. Amr, did you have something else? Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, (Jen). This is Amr. I was just going to say, I mean we don't think we need the letter to let the OEC know what our thoughts are on this recommendation. Like you said, we did mark it red.

I guess the only thing is whether we want to communicate to the OEC that this recommendation sort of at a - due to special circumstances concerning - and the discussion we had about it just - simply because it was the recommendation that we had seen for the first time in the final report.

So if we do want to point that out we can either point that out along with the color coding we provided or we could write a letter or we could choose not to so I just wanted to add that, thanks.

(Jen): No, thanks, Amr. And I think we do have notes captured on that and I think absolutely we should make sure that they're aware of why we flagged that as a red, do not implement, and raised the concern, of course, that it was provided at the final hour. Larisa, is that a new hand? Did you have something else to say?

Larisa Gurnick: No, sorry about that, old hand, thank you.

(Jen): No, I just wanted to make sure that we had everybody in. Okay, well, thank you all. We're right at the top of the hour. Thank you all so much. This is a very productive conversation.

I think we've done a lot of good work here to prioritize and refine these recommendations and provide some clarity that will hopefully take this, you

know - the work that was done here and turn it into something very productive.

So I thank you all for your time. We'll line up a call for early January. I'll work with Charla and staff to some of the background work so that our next call we can move through the documentation and be moving this forward.

Thank you to everybody and - yes, happy holidays to everyone and a happy new year. And I'll look forward to speaking with you after the first of the year. Thanks, that brings the call to a close.

END