ICANN Transcription
GNSO Review Working Party
Wednesday 03 February 2016 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Review Working Party call on the Wednesday 03 February 2016 at 19:00 UTC. 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:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-03feb16-en.mp3

Attendance:
Chuck Gomes
David Maher (PIR)
Jen Wolfe

Apologies:
Rudi Vansnick
Stephanie Perrin

Staff:
Larisa Gurnick
Charla Shambley
Marika Konings
Michelle DeSmyter

Coordinator: Recording started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party call on 3 February at 1900 UTC.

On the call today we have Jen Wolfe, Chuck Gomes, David Maher. We do have apologies from Rudi Vansnick and Stephanie Perrin.

And from ICANN staff we have Marika Konings, Larisa Gurnck, Charla Shambley and myself Michelle DeSmyter.

I would like to remind you all too please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes thank you, and over to you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks very much. And thanks for talking David for taking the time to participate today. We really appreciate it.

I think this will be probably the last of these review working party calls to just finalize our report, get it redistributed out to everybody and then on to the council.

And David I saw you're not on the phone. So I'll try to watch the chat very carefully to make sure we get your comments or questions incorporated.

So just from a timing standpoint where we are right now is we are in the process of completing the Excel spreadsheet that we'll put up here on the screen in just a moment.

And we can talk through any final changes or comments. And then talk through what we want this to look like when we present it to council.

And the goal is to have this ready to present to council by February 8 I think is our deadline to get it to council for its February 18 meeting.

And assuming it was approved then it would go to the OEC for discussion in March and then on to your board meeting in June for any action and a final report, so any questions just about our timeframe or where we are from a procedural or logistics standpoint?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I don't have a question but considering it's the third it seems to me we need to end this call with something that we submit to the list...

Jen Wolfe: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: ...for any reaction to with a deadline so that we can meet the February 8 target.

Jen Wolfe: Right. And Marika correct me if I'm wrong do we just - do we need to have the report by the eighth or do we just need to say we'll be ready to present on the 0 at the next council meeting?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. It depends a bit on what you're looking for because for the council to formally adopt it we'll need to prepare as well a motion.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...and for that, you know, the deadline...

Jen Wolfe: You would have to have it.

Marika Konings: ...is the eighth.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Marika Konings: And - right. But if, you know, if adoption could also have an in Marrakesh of course, you know, maybe the February meeting could then serve as a then presentation of, you know, the findings or the recommendations of the working party with Marrakesh then being the formal adoption by the council of those.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay so Chuck what's your - do you feel like if we're able to submit something to the list and ask for a quick turnaround time then we could shoot

for the February GNSO meeting? And if not if we can't get - if there's pushback on getting approval in time then we wait until March?

Chuck Gomes: Well I - this is Chuck -- thanks for the question Jen. I - my recommendation would be after this call today depending on what progress -- I think we could make good progress today -- we send out what we propose those few of us on the call as a final report. And...

Jen Wolfe: With the motion.

Chuck Gomes: ...just state if there are no objections by February 7...

Jen Wolfe: We're going to submit it, okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...we will go ahead and submit the report to the council.

Jen Wolfe: I think...

Chuck Gomes: Now if somebody objects and wants more time we can react and readjust. But if they don't I would just I mean bottom line is the participation has almost disappeared except for the really good people like David, and I and Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Right. No and thank you to both of you. I know and there's, you know, we're competing with some really, you know, hot issues right now...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: ...obviously going on. Understandably...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: ...people are trying - have to pick and choose where they dedicate their time.

And, you know, we could say it's just because we're doing such a great job they feel like we're on track. So...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: ...that would be the other way to look at it.

So okay well so moving on then let's take that approach that we can, you know, we've got a small group today, you know, let's try to dig in and feel like we've reached a point that we have something that's ready to present and that can get circulated right away with exactly as you proposed.

But if there's no objection we'll submit it with a motion by February 8. And if there is any concern or an objection we'll react to that at that time.

So I think our proposed approach has been to take, you know, this work that we've been doing and really just consolidate it into, you know, what the recommendations are, what our response and recommendations are for each of these recommendations.

And I think yes they're pulling up the spreadsheet right now. And I don't know if you guys have it open on your computer as well? I'm looking at it on my computer.

But, you know, if you recall we broke these down into, you know, a color coded system where we had, you know, green which was where we were suggesting that we adopt the recommendation, and orange where we were in agreement but we had, you know, notes that work was underway already so maybe it doesn't need formal action as they move forward.

Yellow, where we agreed with the intent but we wanted to modify the language. And then our reds that were just a straight out do not implement.

And what we've been trying to do is provide our comments and notes from the GNSO working - the review working party so that when the OEC ultimately gets this and they take this they have all of that information that they can take into consideration as they decide what to do with each one of these recommendations.

So my question to you all today is do you feel like this is an appropriate way to present this? Do you feel like we need to extract it and put it into, you know, a word document or something that looks a little maybe a little more typical of what they might see in a final report?

Do you think it should be and then a two part do you think it should be in order of kind of our color coding or put it back in sequential order with, you know, a column that states, you know, we suggest adoption?

Chuck Gomes: Let me ask...

Jen Wolfe: Go ahead. This is you so go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. So let me ask a question first of all did - has a decision been made whether we're going to send it to the council before the OEC, or send it to them simultaneously, or send it to the OEC first? I don't...

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...recall whether we ever finalized that?

Jen Wolfe: That was. So council would like to review it and approve it essentially before we send it to the OEC. And I know Marika your hand's up. Did you want to comment on that?

Marika Konings: Not on the OEC part. More on...

Jen Wolfe: Oh okay.

Marika Konings: ...the format of...

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Well go ahead then. Go ahead just while we're on the topic.

Marika Konings: You know, my suggestion will be that the document is at least accompanied by a kind of introduction or executive summary that kind of outlines, you know, what do - review working, you know, how to read the document?

                  And maybe some of the highlights and especially for example where the group is recommending not to implement, you know, to call those things out so that, you know, the council can see the snapshot, you know, what it's actually looking at instead of maybe having to go through all the details in the document.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Marika Konings: That would just be my suggestion.

Jen Wolfe: Do you think it was helpful for people to see this sort of working spreadsheet as well or should we not even bother? Should we just do the - give them the summary?

Marika Konings: Well it probably depends as well what you're going to submit to the OEI because if you're going to submit the whole spreadsheet which I personally think is very useful because it does provide...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...the company picture.

                  I think then that should...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...also be a part of what the council would adopt basically.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. And Chuck back to your point. Did you have any concerns about that? I think that was the response...

Chuck Gomes: No I'm...

Jen Wolfe: ...you got from council...

Chuck Gomes: ...yes this is Chuck. I'm fine with doing it that way.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I was just I didn't know that the decision has been made. And I think that's a good idea actually. So that's helpful.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I just wanted to know that.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Well so then let's take this approach is that we want to complete our comments and all of the responses on each of these recommendations on our call here today.

                  And then I can get with Charla. And we can work on an executive summary, and an overview, and maybe just calling out, you know, any specific issues particularly the do not implement.

                  And we'll work on getting that out as quickly as possible to everybody to review so that when we put it on the list it's in its final format. (Larissa)?

Larisa Gurnick: Hi. This is Larisa.. I just wanted to remind everyone about the need to prioritize the recommendations. So...

Chuck Gomes: Yes and (Larissa) this is Chuck. I assume that we would include the prioritizations. In the input I gave I suggested in some cases some changes sometimes about priority sometimes about other things.

So I assume we're going to go through those today because I'm not trying to drive the train here. I just would like to know if other people agree.

And since its David, and Jen, and I from the working group and staff I - even just feedback from all of you I think would be helpful to make me feel better - and again disagree if you think I missed it so...

Larisa Gurnick: Sure. Jen this is Larisa again. I just wanted to add one other component. One of the process improvements from various reviews that are under consideration and discussion and certainly something that's on OEC's radar is being a little more clear and explicit perhaps about what would constitute a good outcome and having that agreement up front, you know, what would look good three years from now, or two years from now as the improvement is implemented and how would that be measured?

I just wanted to highlight that for this group because certainly as you all go through this process anything that can be done to suggest how to measure success will really make quite a bit of progress toward not just implementation but the ultimate evaluation of whether these things worked or not for the next cycle.

Jen Wolfe: So (Larissa) are you suggesting that, that is an additional column or just incorporate it into the comments?

Larisa Gurnick: Certainly the format can be, you know, whatever is easiest. We could add it as a column. But perhaps once the prioritization is in place and that would help us focus on, you know, certain recommendations over certain others based on our priorities to give some thought as to what a successful implementation would look like.

So I guess my point is more substance than how to...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: ...input it. But and we would certainly be happy to support that through adding another column or whatever might make sense.

But in terms of just providing some guidance on how to measure what would be a successful implementation I know would be really useful for those that will be implementing it for OEC, who will be overseeing it, and, you know, ultimately for reporting what we can measure how effective it's been.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. All right well let's incorporate that as we talk through this today. So Chuck I do have your comments here in front of me.

I know Charla circulated those. So David hopefully you have those as well if not let us know and we can circulate that.

What we have in front of you is the spreadsheet. And if you actually have the spreadsheet you might want to have it open so you can make it bigger as you need to.

But there's actually three tabs on the spreadsheet. And the one we have up is the prioritization that we have used based upon how everything has been ranked along the way.

So you can see that, you know, it's all green right up top because these are ranked in terms of what everybody agreed with and suggested as adopting the recommendation.

And Charla please correct me if I'm wrong but the way the prioritization has worked was based on upon the survey we were determined what was hard, or easy, or cost so that those things that were basically easy or low cost aligned with the strategic direction those things come up top and then they work their way down.

And if you can scroll down on the screen for just a second just so everybody can see for context, you know, obviously the green that we agree with has been prioritized.

And then below that are the orange where we think that these are things that we agree with but there's already activity occurring. So those obviously would come lower because that work is already being done.

And then down below that are these yellows where we agree with the intent but we think these - that more work needs to be done in refining the recommendation.

And then of course finally down at the bottom are the reds which are they do not implements. So that's how this prioritization has been structured.

I guess, you know, to start, you know, are you comfortable with that way of prioritizing? Do we want to just chunk these into let's talk about the greens, and then the orange and then the yellow today? Is that okay? Chuck does that work for you?

Chuck Gomes: That's fine for me. This is Chuck.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay so what we have up top is the GNSO record in regularly publish statistics on working group participation.

               This was pretty straightforward. I think that's obviously why it's up top, prioritize it, it's easy to implement low cost.

               Do we feel like any comments -- and Chuck I'll reference your - I've got yours -- I think your first one up here was Recommendation Number 2 which is down a little bit on the list here.

               But anything that we think we need to state? And Larisa in terms of what the outcome is I, you know, I'm not sure there's anything more than actually doing this right? Is there anything more that we would need that actually these things become published?

Larisa Gurnick: This is (Larissa). Jen you're right. This one is easy.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: It's either a checkmark yes or no I would think.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, okay. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And which one are we talking about?

Jen Wolfe: So this is right up on the very top the Recommendation Number 6 to publish...

Chuck Gomes: Oh 6.

Jen Wolfe: ...the statistics...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jen Wolfe: ...about working group participation. I mean that's pretty straightforward I think.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. I just...

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...so I can follow that. Okay.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. So then the next one in terms of prioritization was GNSO Council members, executive committee members of SGs and Cs, and members of working groups complete and maintain a current comprehensive SOI on the GNSO Web site where individuals represent bodies or clients.

                 This information is to be posted if not posted because of client confidentiality, the participants' interest, or position must be disclosed.

                 This was another one that I think is fairly straightforward. You know, perhaps an outcome is, you know, maybe a more regular review of the SOIs to ensure, you know, they're up to date or consistent.

                 I don't think there was any big controversy over this one. Are you guys comfortable with where this is in the ranking and what we would be expecting?

Chuck Gomes: If I didn't have a comment on it I was comfortable.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay well with that maybe I'll move just a little bit faster. And David please, please jump in or let me see in the chat if there's one that you want to hit on.

So the first one you had Chuck is if we actually scroll down to Recommendation Number 2 which was 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 you had made a note - is that the one that you had?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's the one I had. So I thought it's hard to implement that rather than medium but I'm open to discussion on that.

So, you know, I'm not going to hold out if most people think its medium. And it's kind of subjected anyway. But I didn't - I thought that was a fairly hard one to implement.

And I also thought that the cost of implementing it would be high instead of medium. And then the third thing I thought priority of medium instead of high but that's just my own personal opinion. So I don't know. We can talk about all three of those.

Jen Wolfe: Yes sure. So you think this one first so first from a priority standpoint you think do you think this should be ranked - I mean so first of all I think everybody agreed with this recommendation. So it stays in kind of our green category here.

Within the prioritization in the green category do you think this should be moved up? Was that - that was the first part of what you said? You think it's important.

Chuck Gomes: Well I said yes that it's a higher priority than just medium priority. I thought this was a high priority.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. I mean I think I agree. I mean I think it's an important issue. I think you're right to the point that it's, you know, again it depends upon what are you going to do with this right?

Like does it cost - if you're just going to put out more communications or Webinars that probably doesn't cost a lot.

If you're going to really go out and try to recruit people then that could cost more and be more difficult right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And I guess that's where I was concerned. I think, you know, we've done Webinars, we've done outreach if we're really going to take this one seriously I think it will be harder and more costly.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But, you know, so I mean if we're just going to keep doing the same stuff we've done I agree with you it's not very costly and it's not very hard. But I don't think that would fulfill the recommendation or at least attempt to in a serious way.

Jen Wolfe: Well so maybe we change this, you know, to move it up on our list in terms of priority. Because I mean we've consistently heard this from everyone that, you know, we need more volunteers, that people are burned out, that it takes time to get volunteers, you know, integrated into ICANN and to understand what's going on so that they can meaningfully participate.

And so maybe what we have here is a comment is that we think that a better and a more detailed program should be developed.

And I know the comment has always been not necessarily meaning more financial or travel support but really a stronger, you know, volunteer drive that has some metrics.

You know, and to Larisa's question on what is the outcome? I mean maybe there is, you know, a process put in place to actually create some metrics of how many more volunteers do we get because of this initiative?

You know, can we get more people actively participating in working groups, you know, beyond above and beyond maybe just attending a ICANN meeting like actually getting people to participate including attending the working group meetings.

Chuck Gomes: And we need to -- this is Chuck again -- and I think we, you know, as far as metrics go it'll be really helpful to find out from new people that participate what was most influential in helping them get on board?

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And see if anything we did affected them or just they got interested, you know...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...that'll help us in the long term in terms of what best things can we do that really do increase the numbers? And some things may not have any impact at all and we can drop those, things like that.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. So why don't we plan and Charla I don't know if you'll be able to do this on the spreadsheet for us after the call, I'm making some notes here as we talk.

But - so we're going to take this Recommendation 2 and move it up higher on the list and add in a comment, you know, that there should be a more in depth program, really set some metrics, and survey people on, you know, what helps them get more engaged so that we can - and that the outcome to

(Larissa)'s point the outcome would be measured by, you know, those actually quantitative results and the survey.

Charla Shambley: This is Charla. I can add that to the chart.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Thank you.

Charla Shambley: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: So Chuck I'm going to work off of your list since it's just a few of us on the call. And David again please jump in and I'll watch the chat carefully here but your next one was Recommendation Number 5 which...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes do you want me to - when we come to them just talk to them or do you want do it?

Jen Wolfe: Sure. Yes, why don't you go ahead? Yes, so Recommendation Number 5 is in the green as well. So please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So we really don't show a priority on this one okay? And I don't think that's helpful to the - and maybe that's the best we can do but we show low, medium high.

And I think if we can even just the few of us on this call agree to a priority it's more helpful. My choice would be medium just because of the split from low to - high and the results we got within the working - or the working party.

So that's really the only thing - only my comment. If I'm a counselor and I see a low, medium high okay that didn't help me at all.

And maybe we can't be more helpful than that and if that's the case that's the case. But I would suggest a medium priority on this one.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Larisa is that a new hand you have up there?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes it is. Hi. This is Larisa. I think the priority column that was inserted was with the anticipation that this call priorities would be set after you were all settled on the green, orange, yellow and the red.

                   So I think the initial survey of the group, you know, through a Survey Monkey to indicate priority is what you are seeing in that spreadsheet.

                   But there has not been a group discussion such as Chuck which you are taking us through right now to determine what's a higher priority than something else.
                   So that was the intention. And that would still happen it just hasn't happened yet. I hope that, that helps.

Jen Wolfe: So just so I'm clear because I - it was my - and if I'm misunderstood I apologize. But the way that these were ordered right now was based upon the input that we had received right?

                   So number six Recommendation 6 was given the top priority in the green category, is that correct or did I misunderstand?

Charla Shambley: I can answer that. This is Charla. So I took each of the responses out of the Survey Monkey. And whatever met the criteria so for example the first column is ease of implementation.

                   If that was marked as easy then that was sort of a flag that, you know, I can push that one through. So I went through and did that with all of the categories. And then over on the far right column you can see I gave it an initial score so Recommendation 6 met all of the easy qualifications. So it was ranked with a six.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Charla Shambley: On the next level down the next recommendation met all six of those criteria.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Charla Shambley: So that's how I flagged these and ranked them according to that criteria, does that make sense?

Chuck Gomes: Charla are you -- this is Chuck -- are you talking about priority? You based priority on the other rankings or when you say you ranked it a six what do you mean?

Charla Shambley: Okay. So was it...

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's the initial score.

Charla Shambley: ...(unintelligible) a low cost, was it - does it align with a strategic direction? Did it impact another group or was there additional information required in the high priority?

Whatever met - whatever the answers were that met the easiest implementation. So low - easy to implement, low cost it yes it aligned with the strategic direction.

No it did not impact another group. Was additional required information required, no? And it had a high priority that met all of those. Number six met all of those criteria. So I ranked that, that it had six of those prior criteria met.

Chuck Gomes: So we need to...

((Crosstalk))

Charla Shambley: Conflict if it wasn't easy to implement or if it had a high cost those are going to be harder to implement. So those had...

((Crosstalk))

Charla Shambley: ...a lower rank.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. And I think it's - that's very helpful. And I think that we need to explain exactly how that score was calculated otherwise the score is not going to be very meaningful.

Charla Shambley: Right but...

Chuck Gomes: But one thing that I don't think works. I don't think that we can base priority that way though.

Larisa Gurnick: This is (Larissa) Chuck. That was precisely my point that this was just a mechanical way to order these to make the discussion easier. But it was never intended as the ultimate priority. This was just...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: ...a mechanism to organize those.

For example you could decide that just because something is easy to implement it - that's not a good enough criteria that it should be implemented.

So you could turn this upside down if you wanted to and say we should as top priority we should tackle the really difficult things first and maybe limit it to three of those difficult things. So that's all up for discussion still. This was just a mechanism to reflect it for ease of discussion.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I've got that. That's very good information. So I suggest that by the way I'm fine with the way that initial score is calculated as long as it's explained. But I don't think that, that score necessarily determines the priority.

Jen Wolfe: No. And I think the problem with saying priority is that can be interpreted in a couple of ways right? I mean priority can mean what we think you should tackle first because it's easier and less expensive as we just said or this is really the most pressing recommendation we have for the GNSO as a whole.

So maybe we should define here what we want to prioritize because the problem that I see is, you know, we've got, you know, 30, 36 recommendations here.

You know, and to try to prioritize each and every one of them it's hard right because I think a lot of things we've determined these make sense they should go forward.

But then are we trying to prioritize within that category or do we want to pick may be our top five that we think these are the most priority recommendations that we see to benefit the GNSO?

Does that make any sense to maybe try to - because if we try to prioritize each one of these I think we're going to be good - it just gets a little more confusing?

I feel like at least seeing as a block people agree with this and we think that they should go forward as an important way to present some of this information.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jen. And let me comment. Let's keep in mind that the priorities are just high, medium low. They're very broad.

If I'm let's say - and I would assume that probably once the OEC has looked at it and even maybe the council when they first look at it just because you have ten things that are prioritized high doesn't mean you're going to do all ten of those.

And deciding what to implement and when I think, you know, probably it makes sense if I was on the council for example I would want to look at all of the high ones first if there's agreement that, that really are high. And that can be changed by the GNSO later okay? These are just the working party recommendations.

So the - I don't think we have to get to fine on the priorities. If we - but if I have a bunch of them that are prioritize high I think I'd want to look at those first.

Now some of them may be impractical because they're very expensive and there's not budget for them. Okay so that at least temporarily falls out until there is budget.

Well some of them certainly the high ones that are easy and not too costly are probably no brainers.

So I think what we're doing is okay. And will be helpful so some of the high ones may not be practical to implement right away even though they're high.

And that's going to have to - those kinds of decisions are going to have to be made looking at the total picture budget, and resources, and everything other things going on, et cetera.

But I don't think we can do too much more as a working party than that. But I think it's still helpful. So that...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...councilors or can look at it and say okay where do we go from here?

And that - I shared how I would approach that if I was...

Jen Wolfe: No. That makes sense. And I guess I was thinking that we were actually trying to rank them in order and try to go through and have number one to 36. I think if...

Chuck Gomes: I don't think we can. I think that's impossible.

Jen Wolfe: I think that would be impossible. That's what I was trying to process how do we do that? But we do have the column where we have already ranked, you know, high, you know, medium or low.

So maybe what we can do here is let's go through the ones that you had noted Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jen Wolfe: ...and so if we want to change those like we had just talked about, you know, on Recommendation 2 changing that too high so we can note that. And then anything else that we want to change while we're talking here today we can change that.

And then perhaps what we can do as a way to organize the spreadsheet is we keep the color coding in place but then we actually sort it by whether it's high, medium or low so that when extended out they can see the color coding so they know there was agreement or there's work underway they understand that piece and we can explain that in the executive summary but then it's also ranked in order by whether we saw it as a high, medium or low priority.

Chuck Gomes: And we may want to also sort within the highs by another criteria. And maybe that's where that score comes in.

Jen Wolfe: Right, right okay.

Chuck Gomes: You know, rank them first - sort them first by starting with high down to low priority. And within each of those categories then maybe sort them by the score.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, all right.

Chuck Gomes: I mean there may be - there's other ways to sort it. So I'm just throwing that out. So please comment.

Jen Wolfe: No, no, no I think that works. So just to recap with this in mind Chuck as we go back to your Recommendation 2 we're raking that one as a priority of high on the metrics.

Chuck Gomes: Hold on...

Jen Wolfe: Let me make sure that was right.

Chuck Gomes: Now I suggest well my suggestion was that we rank it as a medium but that's just...

Jen Wolfe: Oh I'm sorry. I'm sorry I read that wrong. Okay we're going to change that you medium. Okay sorry.

Chuck Gomes: If nobody objects that's my recommendation. But if somebody objects I have no problem with that.

Jen Wolfe: I don't object. I think that works.

Larisa Gurnick: And Jen this is Larisa.

Chuck Gomes: And the same thing with cost. I thought cost was high instead of medium. If we could...

Larisa Gurnick: I'm sorry which one are we on right now?

Chuck Gomes: For the people that are on the call it would be really helpful if in the revised spreadsheet we mark the items that were changed so that they stand out.

Jen Wolfe: That would be - that's a good idea.

Chuck Gomes: Maybe doing a - if for example on number two if for cost we did a strike through font of a medium and then had high there may be with some color coding too just to make it stand out.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I - anything to make it easy because obviously people haven't had a lot of time to focus on this...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...and the easier we can make it on them to see what was done the more likelihood that they will respond.

Jen Wolfe: No. I agree. And Charla I'll get with you and we can talk through some logistics here once we get through all of this. Larisa you were trying to jump in. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: No I just wanted to - thank you Jen. This is Larisa. I just wanted to clarify which item which recommendation you were talking about. I think it was number two and it should be high priority correct?

Jen Wolfe: No. We're going to change it to medium. On the priority column change that to medium. It was set at high.

Chuck Gomes: And I suggested changing cost too high and ease too hard. And again these are just my suggestions. And I'm not demanding that my thinking should prevail.

Jen Wolfe: No. I think you're right. I think it is on that one if it is to actually create a more meaningful program then maybe what's being done today that is going to take some work right?

               Somebody has to think about what does it take to do that and to really do outreach and to measure if it works?

               You know, and the cost, you know, to - that could be higher then what's been done. And I agree I think it's a medium priority as well given some...

Chuck Gomes: And I like -- this is Chuck again -- I like the comment you suggested when we were talking about this that we do think that a more extensive effort on this rather than - is called for here if we really want to make an impact. And then just doing what's already being done.

Jen Wolfe: Absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: That was a good comment to add in my opinion.

Jen Wolfe: Yes absolutely because if we just keep doing the same thing it's not going to change anything.

               Okay so let's move Chuck down your list then on to Recommendation Number 5. Do you want to go ahead and just address that one now, now that we're...

Chuck Gomes: Sure. So my only point here is let's pick one low, medium high. Since there was a spread from a mathematical point of view medium makes sense right?

And I personally don't have any trouble with showing a medium priority on this. It seems that seems okay.

Jen Wolfe: I agree. I think that's right. Okay. And then the next one was Number 10...

Chuck Gomes: Number 10, okay so...

Jen Wolfe: ...which is down in the orange I think.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. So that one is - and when I made these suggestions I didn't even care whether they were green, orange, yellow whatever okay?

Because the - regardless of which of those categories would the data in each one of those columns still probably have some value.

So on this one - and obviously if we change some of these things we're going to have to change that score at the end. So I assume that would happen as well.

So this one is that during each working groups' assessment new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered.

The - it doesn't - that seems pretty easy to do to me. And it doesn't seem like it would cost very much to do that.

So I thought ease of implementation should be easy instead of high and - unless I'm missing something. And then should - and I think that the cost should be low instead of medium on this one.

I have no idea why nearly half of our group chose do not implement. It seems fairly useful and easy to do. So it's too bad more people aren't on the call that could respond to that. That just didn't make sense to me at all.

And I would suggest a priority of medium. The - and I wouldn't object to a higher priority but that's just - that was just my opinion.

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa.

Jen Wolfe: Go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: I think we might not be aligned here. If we're talking about Recommendation 10 is that not that the GNSO Council develop criteria for working groups to engage a professional facilitator, moderator in certain situations?

Chuck Gomes: Oh I misstated that didn't I? I think you're right.

Jen Wolfe: That's what I was just looking at. I was just...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: I was confused there myself yes.

Larisa Gurnick: If you use Number 10 with the recommendation that was five. I think we passed - I think at five we were done with and we moved on to ten which is why it's in the orange category. So I hope that, that clarifies things for you.

Chuck Gomes: Well okay you're correct. And - but I still don't think this is very difficult to do.

Jen Wolfe: Oh this - so now we're talking about using a professional facilitator?

Chuck Gomes: No. All we're talking all about is developing criteria for when you would use a facilitator. That's not very hard to do is it?

Jen Wolfe: To develop the criteria.

Chuck Gomes: And not very costly. I mean we kind of - we could probably on this call come up with some criteria pretty quickly.

Jen Wolfe: Right, right.

Chuck Gomes: Unless I'm missing something.

Jen Wolfe: Right. I'm sure that's one people might be looking at it as actually, you know, hiring a mediator or...

Chuck Gomes: Yes right.

Jen Wolfe: Right. It's a language issue right? So we're saying it's the only thing this is recommending is create the criteria for when that could be used that is very easy and you're right a small group of people could create some criteria and send that out to the community.

                If you're talking about actually creating a budget and hiring people, you know, I think that is - that's maybe what people are thinking as they read that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That may answer my question about why so many said don't do it, you know, so...

Jen Wolfe: Well and I think there was some discussion that is this is part of the PDP Improvement Working Group right or some other work that's already being done which is why it got flagged orange.

                So you think it should be ranked priority high? And maybe we just make it...

Chuck Gomes: Well I'm okay with medium. But I wouldn't - I don't object to it being ranked high. I just, you know, the only reason I would go medium probably is it's a smaller subset of cases where you're going to involve a mediator so it wouldn't have as broad of an application but it's still useful.

So again I would go medium or high on priority. I suggested medium but I'm not stuck on that. But I definitely think it's easy to implement and not and below cost.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. And I know Marika you have your hand up. I know you've been working on this as well. Go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to confirm that I did we already have a pilot program running for the last two years that looks at, you know, facilitated PDP face to face working group meetings.

And for that, you know, we did establish some criteria not specifically when to be able to use a facilitator but for some of the other (unintelligible).

We're in the process of developing a kind of evaluation from, you know, of that experience today which, you know, could easily feed into this specific recommendation of developing broader criteria.

Jen Wolfe: And maybe what we need to do is make a note of that too. I think that maybe that would be helpful. Because I think to Chuck's point, you know, developing criteria is not that difficult, you know, so maybe we just make a note that we agree developing criteria. But again note that work is already being done in this regard.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. This is Chuck. And the work being done like Marika said it's going to help this make it...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...even, you know, easier possibly.

Jen Wolfe: Right. And so why don't we just, you know, in the interest of kind of keeping it neutral on this one why don't we put a priority of medium that way in case we have less likelihood of if somebody really felt strongly that this just shouldn't be done that way we haven't gone too far the other way.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. So Chuck, why don't you move on? Your next one was Recommendation...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jen Wolfe: ...13.

Chuck Gomes: So 13 is that the GNSO Council evaluate and if appropriate pilot a technology solution such as (Lunio) or similar to facilitate wider participation in working group consensus based decision making.

                The only problem I have with that recommendation it says that the GNSO Council. I don't know if the council needs to do that but that's beside the point I guess.

                The priority that we show is either low or a medium. Again I think it's better to be specific. That'll also help in our sorting if we sort by priority first.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So I thought, you know, medium is okay. And I explained that with some percentages there. So survey results were 40% low, 40% medium, 10% high

and 10% do not implement. I don't know medium probably from a mathematical point of view is okay there.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. I agree. All right so let's change that one to medium.

Chuck Gomes: So going on to 19 that strategic manager rather than a policy body. The GNSO Council should continue to focus on ensuring that a working group has been properly constituted, has thoroughly fulfilled terms of its charter and has followed due process.

Well this is of course just suggesting that the council continue doing what it's already supposed to be doing.

Jen Wolfe: What it's doing right, right.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: I think that one is green, one way or the other yes.

Chuck Gomes: So now - so I thought it should be color coded orange instead of green.

Jen Wolfe: You know, that's a great point. I mean I think everybody just kind of said we're in agreement, that makes sense. But I think that's an excellent point Chuck. That's already being done. And so...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, no they may not be doing it as well as they should be.

Jen Wolfe: Right but there's - that is what they're intending to do or attempting to do.

Chuck Gomes: Yes right.

Jen Wolfe: I think that's a good point. I think we should change that to orange. And because it was ranked a low priority which is what I think it should be because that's trying to do something that wasn't going to happen.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I didn't have any concern about that.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay so moving on...

Chuck Gomes: So 21?

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: The 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.

As you probably recall this is one I had a lot of trouble with. And so I support the decision not to implement it. But I do wonder what we should put in the priority column?

Currently we show do not implement as a priority. Should we put NA in the priority column instead of low because if we're recommending...

Jen Wolfe: Oh I see. I see what you're saying.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know, you know...

Jen Wolfe: But you mean so for all the ones that we say do not implement it doesn't...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. If we don't implement...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...if we're recommending do not implement you don't really need a priority.

Jen Wolfe: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: Now they may disagree with us and say that it should be implemented in which case they would need a priority. So you could see like I can argue a couple of different...

Jen Wolfe: You like to argue your point against yourself.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's right.

Jen Wolfe: Well but I mean you're right to a point. What we are saying, you know, as the community as we reviewed these independent recommendations is that we think these three should not be implemented and therefore we did not rank them because we do not think they should be implemented.

                 So I mean I think that stands on its face, you know, up to a point. It's - I mean if they decide it should be implemented then they're basically saying okay we're - we hear what you've said but we're not going to take that into consideration. And so...

Chuck Gomes: And so in that case it would be helpful probably to have that low there. But - and I suspect that, that would be the case for all of them that we say do not implement that if they disagree with us that we would rank them as a low priority.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So I'm okay with that, okay? This was more of a question for us to discuss. And I think I'm kind of convincing myself go ahead and leave the low there. We might put NA/low or something like that.

Jen Wolfe: Yes. We could do that. I mean I think whatever it is these three need to be at the very bottom of the list that we've clearly stated as a community everybody has been in agreement on these three that it shouldn't be implemented and we have, you know, rationale as to why provided.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, all right.

Chuck Gomes: So 23?

Jen Wolfe: Yes. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: In order to support ICANN's multi-stakeholder model all constituencies should have seats on the GNSO Council allocated equally. I think this is the same thing. So I suggest that we just do the same thing as 21.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Twenty four the council and the SGs and Cs adhere to the published process for applications for new constituencies.

And that the board ICANN Board in assessing an application and so on -- I won't read the whole thing -- I - so I asked the question should the ease of implementation be hard instead of medium?

I don't know but I throw that out. And I would respect anything any of you say on that. It might be kind of hard to do. And it's another one where we need to pick a priority and again probably medium fits the bill...

Jen Wolfe: I think you're right.

Chuck Gomes: ...on that one.

Jen Wolfe: Yes. I think since we've got, you know, disparate answers let's go in the middle on that one and say medium. And...

Chuck Gomes: I don't know what do you think on the - on ease of implementation?

Jen Wolfe: I think it's going to be hard to do.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not opposed to medium but...

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...but I think it can be kind of hard.

Jen Wolfe: I think it's probably somewhere between medium and hard. But I think it's going to be harder than people think too - I mean it's just such a controversial issue, so okay. Do you want to change ease of implementation too hard?

Chuck Gomes: I'm - let me let you guys decide on that because I can go either way.

Jen Wolfe: David any thoughts on that hard, medium in terms of implementation?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, let David decide this one.

Jen Wolfe: Yes. We're going to let him...

Chuck Gomes: He's typing hard.

Jen Wolfe: Hard, you're right.

Chuck Gomes: Hard it is.

Jen Wolfe: (Unintelligible) everybody says it's hard. And are you okay with the priority of medium? Okay all right so that's what we'll do on that one. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So let's see.

Jen Wolfe: All right.

Chuck Gomes: Let me get back over to my little table there...

Jen Wolfe: I know.

Chuck Gomes: ...28 is that right, 28 next?

Jen Wolfe: Twenty eights next.

Chuck Gomes: So revising the operating procedures...

Jen Wolfe: Is a low priority...

Chuck Gomes: The sanctions is the hard part...

Jen Wolfe: ...it was green everybody agreed.

Chuck Gomes: ...the - doing the procedures was nothing right? Marika you guys can do that very quickly. So what - but when you start talking about sanctions that's not easy, it's hard.

Jen Wolfe: So again I would pick medium instead of I think that the procedures parts easy. The sanctions part is hard.

So maybe we pick medium as a - since the group said easy medium, you know, a range from easy to medium I would at least move - bump it up to medium.

And are you good with the low priority? I think this was - that was we have a lot of comments on this one.

Chuck Gomes: Well I'm okay with that because the sanctions part. You know I think that's going to be hard, very hard.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And I think there's other things we can get done before we're going to be able to determine what sanctions.

Because sanctions not only do you have to figure out what they are but you have to figure out how you implement them.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: It's going to be kind of hard.

Jen Wolfe: Right. And Marika did you have something on that point?

Marika Konings: Yes I just want to add changing GNSO operating procedure is not a difficult thing but it does require a 21 day public comment period before we can publish the changes.

And just want to know that I fully agree with Chuck because, you're looking at a provision it's not only indeed, you know, sanctions but also, you know, who's going to be respond to actually verifying that there's no compliance and then enforcing sanctions.

So I think indeed it's a, you know, easier said than probably done in practice.

Jen Wolfe: Right. Okay.

So let's change the ease of implementation to medium and keep the priority at low on that one okay, and then moving on to Number 29.

Chuck Gomes: Twenty-nine, so this one that the statement of interest includes the total number of years that person has held leadership positions.

Again this is just one where we show a low medium and I just think we ought to pick one.

And based on the numbers again it seems like medium works okay. But I - again I'm not rigid on that.

Jen Wolfe: I think we could keep medium. You know, again you know I see it too is if they look at these and they do rank these and I mean these are such easy things to do which is why it's green, you know, to say, "Okay you need to put this on your SOI." That's not difficult. So why don't we put that at medium?

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure it's going to make a huge difference putting that...

Jen Wolfe: Yes right, no.

Chuck Gomes: ...on there but it would give a - give some data points so.

Jen Wolfe: Well I think the thing that probably resonates with is the observation that there are people who kind of rotate leadership roles.

You know, of course some people say that's because there aren't enough other leaders.

But, you know, if somebody's been consistently in a leadership role for so many years, you know, that may be helpful for people to know so...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Should I go on to 31?

Jen Wolfe: Go right ahead. Go on to 31.

Chuck Gomes: This is another one of those on priorities that I suggested picking medium rather than showing low medium. And I don't object if the rest of you think it should be low so but we ought to pick one.

Jen Wolfe: Right. And this is one again where we thought it was already being done? Oh wait I'm looking at the wrong thing. I'm sorry. Let me check this.

Yes this work is already being done. So what do we think? Do we want to just say medium since that would be sort of the middle of the road it's already being done?

Chuck Gomes: That's what I suggested that ICANN go with the flow.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay. So let's do that on 31 we'll go with medium. And then...

Chuck Gomes: So 32 that ICANN define cultural diversity possibly by using birth language and regularly publish this along with geographic gender age groups at least for the GNSO council SGCs and working groups. And so this is another one. This is the...

Jen Wolfe: This is the do not implement.

Chuck Gomes: The ENA versus a low priority and...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...and maybe we put both so we've already kind of decided...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...that one right?

Jen Wolfe: Okay yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thirty-three that stakeholder groups and constituencies and the Noncom are selecting their candidates for appointments to the GNSO council should aim to increase the geographic gender and culture diversity of those participants as defined in the ICANN value core four.

                 This is a color coding one again because I think they do that to a degree already. So I think it's an orange instead of a green.

                 And then as far as ease of implementation as you'll see these are hard so there's an easy compromise on that one, a medium. But that...

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That's just...

Jen Wolfe: Yes I guess that's - the only question I have is is that done everywhere? I mean do you feel like that's happening in the stakeholder groups in the constituencies they're talking about, you know, and maybe staff if you can help on that? Do you feel like they are actually taking that into consideration or is this something that was, you know, a new...

Chuck Gomes: Well while staffs thinking this is Chuck. I know we do it in the Registry Stakeholder Group not so much cultural diversity because that isn't well-defined.

But we definitely do geographic. And we - I don't know that we specifically seek out gender diversity but we do it when we can.

And there's pretty good gender diversity in terms of the leadership and the council representatives, you know?

But I can't...

Larisa Gurnick: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...I can't speak for others.

Larisa Gurnick: I don't have an answer as to whether it's being done consistently but I wanted to flag a possible outcome here could be publishing certain statistics so that this information could be more visible and transparent.

Chuck Gomes: That's a pretty good idea.

Jen Wolfe: That's a great idea, absolutely. I think to some extent that's done too you're right. But I mean yes, so Chuck do you feel like this should be orange just so it gets as these things are bucketed?

Because my thinking is that, you know, if I'm on the OEC and I got a list like this I would probably take everything that was in orange and say okay that's already being done, you know, and let's just measure that that is happening and I would...

Chuck Gomes: And that's probably not a great approach because this may be an area where more needs to be done and so we shouldn't just write it off.

Jen Wolfe: Yes. Maybe...

Chuck Gomes: But it is already being done to some degree. So I do think orange is the better color.

                 But I - and maybe we want to make a comment Jen -- Chuck speaking again -- that the fact that some efforts are being done on this should not be taken that, you know, that we let it just go on as is but more efforts are useful here.

Jen Wolfe: I think if we're going to change it to orange then we need to put that in our comments.

Chuck Gomes: Yes that's what I'm saying.

Jen Wolfe: Yes absolutely. So if we change this to orange I think we need to comment that, you know, philosophically or at least we think this is already being done but want to measure it.

Chuck Gomes: And more efforts quite possibly will need to be made in this area.

Jen Wolfe: Right, right. I think that's...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: ...the way we do it.

                 Yes. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So 35?

Jen Wolfe: Yes go right ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes so the Special Working Group this is one we show do not implement. I doubt that we want to say do not implement on this one. But then we color - it's not color-coded red right?

Jen Wolfe: Well we color-coded it yellow meaning we agreed with the intent but wanted modification. And this is where and I had actually drafted the first take on this based upon the conversation that we had so that instead of being, you know, that there's a working group established, you know that it was, you know, to the extent that it would be - that when these are - or it should only be to the extent practical that the members of the working group represent, you know, diversity from a demographic cultural gender and age standpoint.

                    Because I think the big concern was is that really practical to do that and, you know, what if that can't be done?

                    So yes you're right it does say on a priority do not implement but we have to probably...

Chuck Gomes: Well I think I'd change the priority to maybe a medium.

Jen Wolfe: On this one?

Chuck Gomes: And leave it color-coded...

Jen Wolfe: Yellow?

Chuck Gomes: ...the way it is.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I mean but what do others think? I'm not, you know, it's not just what I think here so...

Jen Wolfe: Well and where you okay with the way I had the proposed...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: ...rewording of it?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay. All right, got that one.

Chuck Gomes: Thirty-five.

Jen Wolfe: And 36.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. So that's right 36, thanks. Is that the last one?

                 It looks like it...

Jen Wolfe: Yes it's the last one.

Chuck Gomes: ...yes.

Jen Wolfe: It's...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, when approving in the formation of a PDP working group the GNSO Council require that its membership represent as far as geographical cultures, you know, diversity, et cetera.

                 And then the stuff this one probably should have been two recommendations, one for the board and one for the council but that's besides the point.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: We shall - this is another one where we show do not implement as a priority
                  because more people chose that than the others. But I don't think we're really
                  suggesting not to implement it.

                  So I'm okay with the fact that we didn't color code it red. So I would suggest a
                  medium priority on this or even low would be okay if you guys think that
                  would be better than medium.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, no I think on this one I mean these yellow ones I think these are the
                  ones where we honestly had the most discussion and there were people who
                  didn't think it should be in that red column.

                  You know, I think the assumption is sort of if we put it in red that, you know,
                  maybe those will just be off the table right.

                  But these things in yellow it tends to mean there was more, you know, more
                  discussion and differing viewpoints.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: So I agree we should have do not implement in the priority. I think it's just a
                  matter of, you know, do we think this is, you know, if they're going to look at
                  these and ultimately attack them in order of how we've ordered them in high,
                  medium or low are they - does that mean this should be last on the list that
                  that they're looking at?

Chuck Gomes: You know, the more I think about this on the fact that 45.5% suggest the do
                  not implement probably a low priority...

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...makes more sense than a medium.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Do you feel that here to there might be some benefit is one of the outcomes to start looking at the data making the data available so that it can be considered?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Larisa Gurnick: That might be a good, you know...

Jen Wolfe: Starting point?

Larisa Gurnick: ...in-between starting point that saying that it could be important, could require action but may not need action. So at this point all you're suggesting is just to measure, make the data available.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And I don't know how we deal with it but in cases where we suggest starting to collect some data even if it was a low priority starting to do that might be useful in the future.

                   So we - maybe we just add a comment to that effect even though we may rank it as a low priority. We think the data collection part that you're suggesting (Larissa) would be a good idea to go ahead and start doing if possible.

Jen Wolfe: I think that's a good point. And that's where I feel like too the, you know, the more clarity we have on our comments the more meaningful this will be when everybody goes to look at it.

So Chuck that was the last of your comments. I just want to make sure I asked, you know, you and David while we're on the phone is on the yellows did you - did anybody have any other comments or concerns?

What we had decided in our prior calls was that we wanted to rephrase those recommendations. And so I had taken a first pass at that and we had circulated that out to everybody. But if you want, you know, we can certainly do that.

And when I send this out to the group I'll flag that note again to please take a look at the yellow specifically and the prioritization that we have since those are kind of the big things that we've changed.

And I think then our next up will be, you know, I will circle back with Charla in getting the spreadsheet updated with the comments that we've just had today and then ranking it, sorting it.

You know, I think what will be maybe easiest is if we keep the color coding in place but sort at the top level by high, medium or low. And that way our NAs or the - should come down at the very bottom.

So we'll probably see a mix though of the other colors in between but it would be in order of low high medium priority. And then the color coding will help people be able to readily know what was the outcome of the group discussion.

And I can write a draft opening executive summary of how we approached this work, how to interpret it, how to look at this data. And then we can get that circulated to everybody for any final comments and, you know, with the hope that maybe we can turn this by February 8 and if not then, you know, we'll need that additional time.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds good.

Jen Wolfe: Do we want to know your age Chuck? I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: I put it in there...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Is that an official category? I don't buy it. I don't buy it at all. Young at heart always right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: My mother said the last birthday you'll have is when you turn 25 and from then on you're just 25 so I'd like to go with that.

Okay any other comments from anybody or Larisa, Charla, anything we - else we need to talk about today I have missed or we haven't covered?

Just jump in.

Larisa Gurnick: Jen its Larisa.

Jen Wolfe: Yes.

Larisa Gurnick: I think that, you know, I'm still going to kind of keep our focus on the outcomes. And perhaps this is something that can an action for the working party or even the GNSO Council to give some thoughts as to how to agree on an outcome to facilitate the implementation and measurement of success down the line.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Larisa Gurnick: And it takes more than the number of people we probably have on this call.

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Well that's exactly it. And you know possibly may be even doing some pre-work where and I'd be happy to work with you where maybe we take these and maybe we create some proposed outcomes and then let people react to it.

               That might be a faster easier way to get responses as opposed to kind of having everybody come at it with a blank screen and say what you think? So I'm happy to get with you and do that.

               If you want to try to do that we can try to get that and then get this circulated quickly or we could do that as a follow-up piece.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. My suggestion was I mean if you could get it done that would be great. But I think it's going to be pretty challenging to get it done and still get this out in time for the council before the 8th.

               So I think a follow-up on that and maybe we can even include a comment to that effect in our submission. So I think of follow-up's actually okay and maybe with a comment.

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: If you can get it done I have no objection to that.

Jen Wolfe: Right. But then we're inviting comments on that piece as well which could take - I guess what I - and may be Marika you can jump in here.

               But for council to look at this they just really need to see what we would propose offering to the OEC and say yes they agree or no they disagree right? A mean that's really what we're looking at?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. So I mean I feel like the - and (Larissa) correct me if I'm wrong but then the outcome piece is really just a follow-up piece to make sure that as this moves forward there's something to benchmark it against?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: And that in order of process I think that's the kind of conversation that would be helpful to have as the implementation plans are being developed because there's clarity for what we're shooting for...

Jen Wolfe: Sure.

Larisa Gurnick: ...for implementation how we're going to measure for achieving it or not. So I think that that's a really good plan.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Well then why don't we focus on let's get our prioritization in terms of let's get this updated. We'll work on the cover sheet and get that out as quickly as possible so hopefully we can be in track.

                   And then we can always I can get with you (Larissa) we can do some pre-work and then maybe get some potential outcomes and circulate that for feedback you know, maybe in tandem as those two things are happening.

Larisa Gurnick: Sounds good.

Jen Wolfe: Okay anything else?

                   Okay we'll thank you Chuck, thank you David. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is just a note that I can work as well on the a motion that would accompany the work of the working party and just looked at the list of members and someone that could reach out to see if you would be willing to make that motion once of course the final product is available would Wolf-Ulrich.

I know he's not on the call today but I know he has been on some of the recent calls and of course he is a councilmember. So that may be a way of getting it in front of the council you know, for this meeting or...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Do we of a council liaison? I don't think we do do we? Because Jen you were on the council when we started this thing.

Jen Wolfe: One was started, right.

Chuck Gomes: Yes but we probably don't...

Marika Konings: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: ...that's a very good idea Marika but we should also be thinking about what councilor - do we have some - we have some councilors that are on a working party still I think.

Marika Konings: Yes correct. So Wolf-Ulrich is one of those. Stephanie Perrin is another when I see on the list. We actually

Jen Wolfe: Yes she is.

Marika Konings: The last council we actually had more people that was on the council. But with the recent change several people have come up off the council so...

Chuck Gomes: So eventually will need to reach out to one or all of those to see of one of them will sponsor, another one second it or something.

I wouldn't be surprised if this was one of those because it's pretty involved with that we'll get our deferment request if there is a motion put forward.

Marika Konings: Right, so in that case it wouldn't be bad indeed if you are able to make, you know, Monday's deadline basically because, you know...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...the deferral is for one meeting so then at least it has to be considered in Marrakesh. And if it's, you know, only gets on the agenda in Marrakesh then there's some risk that it will either be pushed our meeting. And as a...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That's all the more - you're absolutely right Marika. This is Chuck. It's all the more reason to get this out before then so that it's not dragged out for three more meetings.

Jen Wolfe: Yes thank you for calling that to our attention -- very important point.

Okay so we'll work on this. We'll work on getting this turned quickly.

Okay. All right we'll think everybody. Thank you so much for your time for joining. I appreciate it. And Chuck as always thank you for, you know, your diligence and going through all of this in such detail.

I hope everybody feels like, you know, we're managing a lot of information and I feel like we have juggled it pretty well and gotten it to an organized format that we can deliver something that has, you know, meaning to both the

council and also to the OEC so that it's easier to take action on it and not just this big pile of recommendations with a we agree or disagree. So thank you for all your hard work.

Chuck Gomes: And let's be really clear to the working party members and the communication that goes out that they have a very short window.

Now for our own benefit and we don't have to communicate this but bottom line is even if some things get through that maybe some working party members didn't have a chance to communicate we will all have opportunities through the actions of the GNSO Council and ultimately probably in terms of what the committee, the board committee...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...does too so...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So everybody will always - there'll be more opportunities.

Jen Wolfe: There's always more opportunities to comment in ICANN right?

Chuck Gomes: Seems like...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: There's always one more round.

Okay well good. Well thank you everybody, thanks again. Have a great day and I will see you all and talk to you soon.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Okay thanks.

                 Bye.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and remember to disconnect all the remaining lines. Everyone enjoy the rest your day.

                          END