**ICANN Transcription**
**GNSO Review Team**
**Thursday, 12 October 2017 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording GNSO Review Team Meeting on the Thursday 12 October 2017 at 14:00 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.
Attendance may be found at:  https://community.icann.org/x/k4VEB
Recordings may be found at:
https://participate.icann.org/p9n0yx7t4bh/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal AND http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-12oct17-en.mp3

Julie Bisland:     Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group Call on the 12th of October 2017 at 1400 UTC. On the call today, we have Kris Seeburn, Sara Bockey, Lori Schulman, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. We have apologies from Jen Wolfe and from staff, we have Emily Barabas, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cob, and myself, Julie Bisland. We would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

And with this, I'll turn it back over to Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Thanks very much. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Good afternoon or hello to everybody on the call. So Julie has circulated an agenda and let's just dive in with the agenda. Are there any questions, any additions to the agenda? Not from your side. I have a slight idea with the agenda because the agenda

is mainly focusing on the reports we are going to prepare for the (unintelligible) OEC. I do hope that we don't need all the time of this meeting for this status report.

So in case we would have some time left, why shouldn't we start or continue discussing with the charters. Julie, do we have any opinion on that? Are you prepared to do so, to continue?

Julie Hedlund:    Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. As it stood from the last meeting, there were several questions and action items relating to recommendations 26 through 29. Those are still outstanding. Staff doesn't have updates to those at this time. Those were the last charters in Phase 2 so the next charters to be started would be for Phase 3 and staff wanted to take an opportunity to first look at how those charters might be grouped, if someone of them perhaps are dealt with by work that's already under way and determine some ways to streamline the work.

Staff haven't had a chance to do that yet. However, I do have a suggestion if we have time today or if not today, certainly at our meeting next week. There were a couple of charters that are currently sort of on hold because of a couple of actions. One is the charter for recommendations 10 and 11 and that related to using a facilitator for working group meeting discussions and that was pending an assessment of the geographic names facilitated session that was held at ICANN 59.

So staff does have an update on that status item and could speak to that. And then maybe if the workgroup agrees with the progress then we might be able to put that charter with amendments out for consensus review. And then furthermore, there is as charter 18, recommendation 18 and I won't speak to all of it here but that's one that we had on hold for various reasons that we could revisit. And if we could indeed deal with those charters, then we would have completed all of the Phase 1 work and could show that in our OEC

report. And so that's something for this workgroup to consider if we have time today.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Okay, great. So why not just begin with the reports but before we do that formally, I would like to ask for any amendments of SOIs if there are some. I see none. So let's just start with your draft report and let's just (unintelligible). And Julie, if I could have you over just to give as a brief summary of that report and okay.

Julie Hedlund:   Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So just as a reminder to the workgroup, and I see also that Rafik has joined and Lawrence has joined as well. So welcome to you both. The organizational effectiveness committee of the Board of Directors has requested semiannual updates from this working group and so this is the first of the semiannual updates -- the implementation status report and the OEC as it stands now has asked simply that this working group would transmit via staff their final report to the OEC and the OEC would review it basically over email, that is that there would not need to be a formal presentation to the OEC on this report. And staff knows that this report also can form the basis of the update of the working group to the GNSO Council, which I think will be scheduled on the agenda for the council meeting on the 1st of November at ICANN 60.

So the report forms a dual purpose. Staff is currently clarifying with the OEC support staff whether or not there needs to be a formal approval of this report by the GNSO Council. There was a formal approval, a motion to approve the original implementation plan but it's not clear to staff whether or not a formal approval would be needed for this status update. We're thinking probably not but we've asked for clarification on that point. Because as this point, the Council has only asked for an update from this review working group in the same way that it asks for updates from other review groups.

And Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Thanks, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Just an (unintelligible) question but I think the first question for me is so we are going to do -- to give an update to the Council as I understand. How much time do we have? So we have a short update I think?

We don't have a draft schedule yet, but I think it would be no more than 15 minutes. Normally, these kinds of updates are 15 minutes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Okay, so it can at the end of this update, we can ask the Council not for an approval, but for any comment or objections on this report. I don't expect anything more and we can outline also intending to send this report to the OEC not with a formal approval by the Council. This is a big discussion around that. So well, we can ask for what kind of decision but I don't expect that.

So I would be transparent when I give the update to the Council and that's it. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund:   Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. That's extremely helpful. And so we'll definitely try to proceed in that way. And I'll note that the wording in the original -- and this is Julie Hedlund again from staff -- the wording in the original board resolution whereby the implementation plan was approved notes periodic updates for the working group to the OEC not from the Council to the OEC.

So the Board had envisioned that the working group would be providing the updates, which suggests to staff that there was not a formal approval by the Council needed. But absolutely, we should make this process as transparent as possible to the Council.

So that is the background and I will then proceed to give an overview of the report and what it entails. We have the executive summary, which just gives the background on the effort and then a status. And the status is pretty clear. Right now, the working group has agreed by full consensus that nine out of

the 11 Phase 1 recommendations had already been implemented via previous work.

And this is an important point because as you may recall, the Phase 1 recommendations were work that was already underway. And part of what the OEC is asking, and as we get into the report, I can show you the format and what they're asking, but they're asking for the implementation status and what we've noted in that status is that with this work that was already underway, those that have been approved as implemented were all found to have been implemented by previous activities or work.

So the timeline was built around the assumption that additional work needed to happen on some of these items, but in actual fact, once they were reviewed, they were found to already be implemented, say, by changes in the operating procedures and so on. And those details are included in this report.

And then we note that the two remaining recommendations, that is 10 and 11, which I previously mentioned, are pending an evaluation of the geographic names facilitated session. If we can indeed address those two recommendations and get them approved then we could indicate that all of the Phase 1 recommendations are complete.

And then we have then the status summary for Phases 2 and 3. We have in this group discussed the five recommendations and then also two charters for recommendations that were moved from Phase 1 to Phase 2. One of those is the other recommendation I mentioned that's recommendation 18. Those have been discussed and are being worked on. And then one of the other Phase 2 recommendations, recommendation 6, and a Phase 1 recommendation 33 have -- which was moved into Phase 2. I shouldn't have to go into all this detail, but just happen to mention it. Six, 33, and 36 as we note here all relate to diversity and are pending the cross-community working group work stream 2 diversity sub-team recommendations.

And then the working group will start up on the Phase 3 recommendation discussions anticipated in November after Abu Dhabi. And I'll just note that the details concerning noting the dependency with the cross-community working group, work frame 2 diversity sub-team, is because the OEC is particularly interested of knowing of any dependencies and how they might affect the timing of the completion of the implementation of the recommendations. So that's why it's called out here.

And then we include -- and this at the recommendation of the OEC support staff -- the timeline for Phase 1 and Phase 2 recommendations and then also for Phase 3. And what staff did for Phase 3 in fact was originally Phase 3 recommendations were grouped according to how they -- according to type. So whether or not they dealt with, say, PDPs or whether or not they dealt with Council operations and so on.

Staff thought it made more sense to group these as to whether or not they're medium or low priority because that actually sets them out more logically in the timeline. And in fact, the OEC again is interested in the implementation timeline and is particularly interested in the level of priority of the recommendation, whether or not it's medium or low. So this is a change from how the timeline was originally reflected in the implementation plan.

And then dates have been adjusted based on the current progress of the working group but none of the end dates exceed what was anticipated as the final end date for the completion of all the work. That is the work is still on target and is expected to stay on target. So staff has one suggestion for the working group to consider as an additional graphic, and also staff notes that we will prepare slides for this working group to review before next week's call that would be the slides that could be used for the presentation to the Council.

The suggestion is to have one single timeline that, say, like an arrow type of thing. We've used this in some other presentations where we show where we

are in the Phase 1 with the start and the end date of the implementation of Phase 1 recommendations, where we are in the Phase 2 recommendations showing that work is underway and where we are in that part of the timeline, and then where we anticipate starting with Phase 3 recommendations and where we see all of the work ending.

So there would be one view of the full start to finish implementation. So let me ask the working group if that is something that they think would be useful to add to this report.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:    Thanks very much, Julie. Yes, I would like to ask for comments on that. Otherwise, I do have a comment. So let me go first and thank you very much, Julie. And I heard from your presentation as well that you are in close contact with the staff related to the OEC. So that's very clear what the expectation from their side with regard to out report. This is really helpful because I was also thinking about what could be of highest interest for the OEC to know from us.

So I do have some questions and comments. The first thing is, well, just the very first slide, the deck slide because it tells -- it's called GNSO 2 review. I think it's review two from the GNSO isn't it? It's just a question here. So it was -- it may confuse the GNSO 2 but that's just a question about that. The other thing is I was thinking about when I read the executive summary myself, I would like to read it as an outsider, I think the main message is in the very last paragraph. So saying that we are the working group doing this work and on which grant we are working and doing that.

So my approach would be just to shift this very last part of up to the top of this executive summary and the history, why it was set up and which way. So it's then the rationale for that. But that would be just as an eye catcher for the OEC. But we could discuss that. That's what I would see. And in the status summary, at the first part of Phase 1, I understand that we are going to send the report to the OEC after the ICANN meeting, which is in November. So

why should we -- if it arrives in a way that something is going to be expected to be completed in October that's over then. So maybe we can adjust that so according to the status we have achieved at the Abu Dhabi meeting.

So this is my comment to that. And with regards to this second page of this executive summary, the first part so where there are notes to the timeline made, the question to me is whether we should also add a kind of judgment of our group regarding the timeline, the recent timeline. So if we can judge on that, okay, so we are what do you say that confident, well, to keep this timeline, which was outlined as well at the beginning. And definitely, which will say, okay, we are confident to keep the timeline until the end of next -- is it next year? Yes, next year to keep that timeline. Or if there are any indications that would weaken this judgment.

So that's my comment and just for discussion. But if there are any comments maybe other than Julie to this, I would be happy to hear. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund:     Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff and others I'm sure may wish to comment, but just to answer a couple of your questions and just acknowledge the helpfulness of your suggested edits. So the GNSO 2, the 2 in the title was -- that is how the OEC refers to this effort. I imagine it's to differentiate it from what was the GNSO 1 review. So while it may seem confusing to this working group or others, this is a -- when the template was given to staff from the OEC support staff MSSI, this title was already in place as GNSO 2. So I'm not sure if we should change it.

So I'll just make that note. With respect to moving the main point, which is in the final paragraph, to the top of the executive summary, that is an excellent point and staff will go ahead and make that revision. And with respect to the third point and the notes, I think staff would like to suggest in addition to adding the graphic that shows a single timeline, staff would like to perhaps present this timeline as another section of the executive summary in that it would say timeline and then there would be the preamble, a paragraph, as

you suggest, Wolf-Ulrich, to talk about how this working group is confident in being able to meet the timeline as will be shown in the figure that we'll provide, and then explain the adjustments that were made to the original timeline. But making it clear that we don't expect that we will exceed the original timeline. And in fact, some things may actually be able to be completed sooner than originally scheduled. Although I don't know if we want to say that or not setting up expectations.

But thank you for that and let me then wait and see if other workgroup members have comments. Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:  Thanks, Julie. Yes, I'm fine with all this and I think we do not have a problem to make this -- to this judgment on the timeline with regards to the timeline. Because it's just from our reasoned point of view, we are working always -- we did the best from the beginning to make a plan. Well, as usual, there is something (unintelligible) different during the discussion of a plan and during the implementation of a plan.

So but from the time from the point of view (unintelligible) at the time being. So we could judge that we are confident really. So that there is nothing going and we will -- well, if there is something coming up so as usual, which makes us aware of any bigger change of the timeline, we will report immediately and make the OEC and the Council aware of that. So that's what we could I think summarize in that paragraph as well. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund:  This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Thank you for that, Wolf-Ulrich. I'll add then also some text. We'll add some text about we would notify the OEC if any issues should arise that could affect the timeline or something of that sort. So thank you for that. Does anybody else have any comments before I move on?

Then I'd like to move on and what I won't do, since you do all have this text, is I won't walk through every single recommendation. But what I will do is give

a summary of the sections. So moving along to the recommendations implemented to date.

So these were the Phase 1 recommendations and they were identified as work already underway. And so what you'll see here in this looking at recommendation 8 can be illustrative of what all of these would look like. And I realize that there's no way you would have had time to read this report given that you only just received it last evening or in the morning for some of you. But we will keep this open for comments. Staff will send a revised version today and we'll keep this open for comments through next week's meeting.

So the format as noted is a template that's provided by OEC that they use for reports from the review work teams or working groups. So we have of course the recommendation description, was the implementation completed and if not, why not. In all of these cases, the implementation is completed. No difficulties were encountered. They want to know the prioritization and then they want to know the timeline.

And so rather than try to reconstruct the timeline for each of these things that were already completed, because we're not really talking about work that was started and completed during the time of this workgroup except for with one exception will be recommendation 10/11, in the rest of these cases we indicate that the work was completed based on, say, in this instance in 8, implemented with the publication of revised GNSO operating procedures on June 24, 2015.

So we try to indicate when the item was deemed completed if we do have a date or deemed completed and then indicate the activities that completed that implementation, noting whether they're (cost) or not. We weren't finding any costs associated with these things. And then to make it even more clear for the OEC, they've asked for links to report. So we have a link to the implementation charter showing then that it's been implemented and the date that it's considered, you know, approved by this working group.

So that is the format for each of the items in this first section and I'll stop there and ask if there are any questions. Not seeing any hands up so I'm going to go ahead and move to and I'll note again that we've got nine recommendations here out of Phase 1 completed and we'll hope to add Recommendations 10, 11 subsequent to this working group discussion and then we would be complete with all the Phase 1 recommendations.

And noting too oh, one thing Wolf-Ulrich that you mentioned earlier that I wanted to note. You were asking when the report will be given to the OEC? The OEC can get - we can give the report to the OEC as soon as the update has been provided to the GNSO. So if there were no comments or objections raised during the update to the GNSO on the 1st of November then we would give the report to the OEC. But I will note that as you noted Wolf-Ulrich that that is indeed November and not October. So anything that's indicated as complete in October, you know, should be shown as complete.

So I'll move to the next section. So this is upcoming recommendations to be implemented. And here we have from Phase 1 Recommendations 10 and 11 which as I noted what is currently underway and we want to get the feedback from the facilitated session in, you know, 59. And here we say complete by October and here's where the note that Wolf-Ulrich has mentioned comes into play then would be completed. If, you know, we were able to get this out for a consensus call we could anticipate that it's completed in October.

So that would change the (unintelligible) and that would place this one in the implemented section Phase 1. And so then we moved to the Phase 2 high priority recommendations. So we are noting here that the working group has discussed Recommendation 6 and 33. And Recommendation 36 is similar in that it relates to diversity.

And the working group had asked staff to combine these recommendations into one charter. That's work that staff still needs to complete but we are at

least reflecting that here that these are combined and that they all have dependencies based on the diversity sub team and the CCWG Accountability Workstream 2.

And so we call that out and based on the updates that we had at one of our last meetings it looked as though the sub team was hopeful to complete its recommendations by ICANN 61. If that were the case if we went out extrapolated from that a little bit if there were say changes that were needed to say any of the GNSO council practices then we - those would need to go out for public comment. So we're extrapolating out to June 2018. Of course this can, you know, this can change but that would be our guess for at this moment.

And I see Rafik has noted Wolf-Ulrich as liaison we can work together for a status update to council. Yes thank you Rafik for joining.

So at any rate so here we - this format is slightly different in that the - in addition to the timeline then we have to include the proposed implementation steps. So we've done that for each of these recommendations. And then you'll see the same is true with Recommendation 18 which may be one that - well maybe one we want to revisit and see if we can bring this one to a conclusion as well. I won't get into it now but if not it would stay in this to be implemented section.

And then we did talk about Recommendation 26 through 29 and that work is underway. This one is fairly lengthy because there are so many recommendations but I'll just note that, you know, we did discuss these in the 28 September meeting. And so we have some additional work on each of these recommendations that is noted here for staff.

So, you know, if we're able to complete any of these items before shipping this to the GNSO by the document deadline then will update this report accordingly. The goal would be to try to see if we can address these issues

before then but some of these I think are pending say there is pending an update from legal for instance. So I'll stop there and ask if there are any questions?

Then hearing none I'll just move on to - and I see actually that I have an error here that I will fix. Let me just look back to make sure. Yes I see that the header on this page that I'll bring us to should actually say Phase 3 as opposed to Phase 2. That's the medium and low priority recommendation. And as noted previously what staff has done here is to put all of the medium recommendations first and then - and to follow those with the low priority recommendations. And again it's the same format as we deemed previously. Essentially the groupings of these recommendations - pardon me. I'll try to stop this from moving.

The groupings of the recommendations are the groupings that we presented in the implementation plan. So that has not changed. But the implementation and timeline has changed somewhat because it's been affected by the time it has taken to complete the Phase 1, Phase 2 recommendations. But as noted previously we're still on track to complete these within the overall timeframe.

So there these are and I'll just note that if you're wondering where this text is from, all of this text comes directly from the implementation plan for this section. So for anything that has not been implemented staff simply cut and pasted the relevant text from the implementation plan into this report. So there's no new text, no new edits and no new groupings of recommendations. And the only difference from the implementation plan is that the medium priority items are all grouped together and the low priority items are all then follow grouped together following that.

And so that brings us to the end of the report. There's no summary. It's the format is just the executive summary and then those that are implemented and those that are awaiting implementation. So it's a very straightforward report and only lengthy in the fact that there are many recommendations.

So Wolf-Ulrich what I'd like to suggest is that staff takes the action to update the implementation plan based on the comments received today to get that out ideally today to the working group and with the expectation, you know, a request for any further comments on the list. And I - it's not my understanding that something like this would need to go through a consensus call because it's not an implementation of a recommendation. It's simply a reporting of the status of where we are. So my suggestion would then be that we plan to finalize this report on the 19th because we do have to get it to the council within the documented deadline for the meeting on the 1st of November. And I believe that is I believe that's 22 October. So we would really need to finalize the report by the end of next week.

And staff will also produce a set of presentation slides, very brief slides for this working group to review. And then those could be used for the update to the council on the 1st. So let me stop there and see if there are any further comments?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Thanks very much Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I think this is on a very good way well how this is here framed and the report. And I like this, you know, to have a very condensed executive summary, you know, which each point is a message so where we are and how we see, you know, the way we are doing this.

So I think this is really good and if you update just in the light of today's discussion then that's okay. And for the with regards to the report or the presentation to be given the council I don't expect also any big problems. So we'll - we are - we should really be focused well on the main messages and, you know, and leave it as it is here right now as an annex or the recommendations we have, you know?

I'm not sure whether the OAC is some of the members are really diving into those recommendations at the time being. Usually what I expect from that

(unintelligible) committee is well just in case if they see some problems coming up, you know, then they will ask us. But on the other hand it's fine. I'm really confident that this is the best way are we doing this?

But anyway are there any further questions from others? Seeing none so at the time so we have something well to continue here with that report and to these on doing - preparing that. Now Julie shall we then switch over to any potential charter discussions or the way how we are doing with that? So I see you on the screen with Recommendation 10, 11. So would you be so kind just to guide us where we are with that and what is to be done and just to continue this discussion so for the time we have left the last 15 minutes? Julie please.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So just as a reminder Recommendations 10 and 11, 10 with the council develop criteria for working groups to engage a professional facilitator moderator in certain situations and Recommendation 11, the face to face PDP Working Group pilot project be assessed when completed. If the results are beneficial guidelines should be developed and support funding made available.

So we had a fairly lengthy discussion I think over a couple of meetings on these recommendations and just to move quickly to the solution, you know, staff did note that the pilot project was complete. Staff did note that the guidelines for facilitation that let's see here. On the - I'm sorry the pilot was conducted. There was a survey published so we have the results of the pilot project.

And so the discussion that we had centered around whether or not there should be guidelines. And as a reminder there were some concern that because each PDP Working Group is different and some working groups might not need facilitation it would be hard to develop guidelines or it might not be advisable to develop guidelines, you know, that would say mandate, you know, certain mandate working groups to use facilitation.

Staff also noted that ad hoc funding is available and most recently was used for the geographic names sessions that were held at ICANN 59. So the report from a consultant, the consultant that held those sessions has been provided. It's not a public report. It's a misguidance for the PDP Working Group. It went to the working group leadership. But what staff would like to suggest is that make some alterations to this charter to try to get to the implementation of this user recommendation.

So here's a suggestion for discussion. Staff can provide a what do I want to say, a summary of how the session proceeded at ICANN 59, the geographic names session and, you know, the outcomes of that.

What was the attendance like? What was the discussion like, some of the summary details to indicate, you know, how this worked and also to talk about how, you know, this was something the worked for this particular PDP Working Group because of the nature of the complexity of this particular issue and the very disparate views on this issue but that may not be the case for other PDP Working Groups.

And so what this working group might consider as a determination could be that the status quo, the current ability for working groups to request and get facilitation if they need it and for them to conduct that facilitation in a way that makes no sense to them is a system that is working and addresses the Recommendations in 10 and 11. So I'd like to suggest that staff could update this, revise this charter accordingly and send it out for discussion at next week's meeting with a view to perhaps finalizing it for a consensus call. So I'll stop there and ask for any comments or questions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Yes thanks Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes well I would - I'm in support now to doing so. The question is I'm - at the time just at the moment I'm not so very familiar where we are with the outcome of these facilitated sections related to our recommendations here. And because, you know, the

question for me is here so does the outcome of these facilitated sessions and, you know, the what we draw from them does this help us in the end? Will it cover what was expected from the beginning with these recommendations or are we going just to say then okay that's where we are with it because there is something still going on the - in the sector of geographic names which may then influence or impact on our further steps on that?

So I'm not sure that is the right question there but this is a little bit for me a little bit cloudy here. So that's it my question. I don't know whether you understood but I see Lori. Maybe Lori could chime in here. Please Lori.

Lori Shulman:     Yes hi. Can you hear me?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Yes.

Lori Shulman:     I see my meter is good so I hope you can hear me okay. Yes I just - I'm trying to understand so just from an overall working concept for any dislocated meetings it's more it's one issue. Like we're saying I mean and Wolf-Ulrich brought up the geographic issue that I actually think there's a lot more very difficult and almost irreconcilable differences at the moment in a lot of the working groups.

If you look at the transcripts for RPMs, if you look at the transcripts for RDS what, you know, what we're calling the big three, the subsequent procedures, the RPS, the RDS there's been enormous amount of polarization. And I do believe that the community has (unintelligible) really have lost sight what we are a community all that pulling of (unintelligible) when we walk together choice of proposal for the transition it is evaporated and rather quickly. So I think any recommendations if you can (unintelligible) and processes that you can developed through facilitation and (unintelligible) really support...

Julie Hedlund:     Wolf-Ulrich may I...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes please Julie go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So Lori let me see if I can get at your question. But I may need some more explanation from you because I'm not sure if I quite understood your point. So this - these two recommendations would pertain to any working group. So the idea behind the recommendation is that if a working group - and you're right there's some very contentious issues in all of the current PDP working groups.

If any of them decided as a working group that, you know, as the sub Pro working group did if any of them decided yes we would like to have facilitation, we would like a facilitated session then they do have the opportunity to request such a session either at a ICANN meeting or my understanding is that as...

Lori Shulman: Hello?

Julie Hedlund: ...project - I'm sorry go ahead.

Lori Shulman: Hello?

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry go ahead.

Lori Shulman: Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Lori I'm sorry go ahead if you have a comment.

Lori Shulman: Yes I keep losing - I apologize but I didn't hear half of what you said. You just - it just went dead.

Julie Hedlund: Oh.

Lori Shulman:     I apologize because you're explaining well but I didn't hear it all.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund:    Can hear me okay?

Lori Shulman:     Now I hear you fine.

Julie Hedlund:    Can you hear me okay now Lori?

Lori Shulman:     Yes, yes, yes, yes.

Julie Hedlund:    Okay. Very good. Let me try again.

Lori Shulman:     Yes I can.

Julie Hedlund:    So even just to be - try to be even more brief. So these recommendations pertain to any working group that wishes to have facilitation. And our evaluation has determined that yes working groups can request facilitation either at an ICANN meeting as a sub Pro or, you know, outside of a meeting. And Recommendation 11 relates to the PDP pilot, working group pilot project which has been completed and staff includes here in this charter as a recommendation coming out of that.

What staff is suggesting is that we could indicate by looking at the current status that is the example of the ability of Sub Pro to request and get a facilitated - well two facilitated sessions at ICANN 59 as an example of the fact that the current process does allow working groups to have facilitated sessions if they wish, that the working group would not necessarily recommend guidelines for facilitated sessions because each working group is different and might want to - some might not wante it. Some might want it to be done differently, some might want it outside of a meeting.

But in any case the current situation allows working groups to get facilitation. We have an example of that. So the suggestion from staff would be that we could show that this implementation has been completed. Then yes indeed if this was something that RPMs requested or RDS requested they could follow the same process as did Sub Pro which was simply to make the request to the planners - well to the GNSO Council essentially to include time for facilitated sessions. And then the request went to ICANN org for the contracting of a facilitator and then that was managed by ICANN org but that it did indeed occur and was an opportunity that was given and implemented.

Lori Shulman: Okay now I understand. I think I missed a little (unintelligible) here. But I guess my point is a different point. I understand why we would want any official guidelines but I was thinking of the guidelines a little differently and it may be out of the scope of this group and I'm not sure. And that is not necessarily the guidelines for when you ask but for guidelines for when you should ask.

In other words I'm wondering if the groups are not reaching out for help soon enough. If there should be some - and I don't know if this is necessarily a reform but some sort of advice or procedure that has almost like red flags, when you have these conditions we recommend facilitation or something like that or do you think it usurps the leadership too much? I have really mixed thoughts about this but what I don't have mixed thoughts on is the polarization that's in ICANN now. It feels worse to me than I can really, really remember.

And I feel that as a GNSO I mean we have this obligation to try to come together as a community. We know that we stand on different sides of the issues but there is compromise. And I think we're losing sight of that. And I see that. I see that on their yes list. I've seen it and, you know, deepen it on the RPM side.

And I feel like we need more support, guidance -- whatever the word is -- from the org and from the (unintelligible) itself as how we wade through these polarized situations.

Julie Hedlund:     So thank you Lori. And recognizing that we have - this is Julie Hedlund again from staff. We have just one minute left. I will note that I think that mandated piece is out of scope, maybe out of scope of these two recommendations because the recommendation is really talking about making sure that there is the opportunity to use this as opposed to not a requirement to use a facilitation red flag for that. But I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up. Please go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Yes thanks Julie and Lori. So this is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well just we're on the top - at the top of hour and I would like to cut this discussion. But we have the question here is really Julie what do you expect from us from our group here? Again so with regard to this recommendation is it well should we come up with a clear determination in the end or what is still open here?

That is - maybe you could put that again so to the list and we come back to this by the next meeting next week. And I think and then we can be we could finish that discussion. Maybe there is also really a clarification of the mandate. And I have also to look back because I forget sometimes, you know, what is really asked for and what we are (unintelligible) this. So I would suggest that we doing this for the next meeting and come back to the recommendation.

Julie Hedlund:     Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. Yes so staff will go ahead and incorporate a suggested working group determination for this item for discussion at next week. And also staff will look at the working group guidelines to see if there are already guidelines that address the issues that Lori has raised with respect to what working groups should be doing if there are, you know, diverging viewpoints, you know, difficult issues and so on. So

we'll try to take both of those items. And sorry to take us one minute after the call.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:   Yes no problem. Thanks very much Julie. So we're doing this - so we have a schedule the next meeting for next week and we'll come back to this. And Julie we expect while you're circulating that that's great. So thank you very much all well for contributing and participating and hear you next week.

Julie Hedlund:     Thanks everyone. Goodbye.


END