ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group Meeting
Thursday, 13 July 2017 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-wg-13jul17-en.mp3 Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p6bkj4ak3kn/**

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/HmTwAw

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

Julie Bisland: Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. And welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 13th of July, 2017. On the call today we have Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Rafik Dammak, Jen Wolfe, Heath Dixon, Chris Seaburn. We have from staff, Marika Konings, Amr Elsadr, Berry Cobb and Julie Hedlund and myself, Julie Bisland.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this I'll turn it over to Jen Wolfe. Please begin.

Julie Hedlund: Julie – this is Julie Hedlund. Did you mention Avri Doria also as a participant?

Julie Bisland: I did not. I didn't see her. Avri Doria as well. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. Thanks, everybody. I hope you all had safe travels back from Johannesburg, those of you who were there, and have hopefully have a chance to recover. Appreciate your time today on the call.

Today on our agenda we'll of course review any updates to statements of interest, and then we want to take just a minute and talk about our timeline and sort of where we are in terms of our tracking and any changes that we might want to make to our timeline. And then we'll continue on with where we left off a couple of weeks ago with our – excuse me – our discussion on Recommendations 10 and 11 and then move on to – or excuse me, Recommendation 13.

So first, any updates to the statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, why don't we go ahead and move on? Julie, do you want to give us an update on where we are with our timeline and then we could move into a discussion of how we think we're doing and any changes that we need to make.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And I have pulled up a modified timeline. And thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for noting that this could be something helpful that we should maintain and periodically review. So just as a reminder, there was – there were timelines in the implementation plan for Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3.

These timelines, however, were noted as suggested timelines understanding that once we got into the work we might need to make some adjustments. And we'll also note that when the timelines were created we anticipated that perhaps we might be able to address several charter implementation plan charters simultaneously but we found that we generally have a fairly small group on each call. And typically we've needed at least two calls to run through the charters and sometimes more than that if we have, you know, made revisions to the charters.

And then once they've been approved they go out for a consensus call which also takes some time. So we are actually in a situation where we'll need to adjust the schedule in several cases. So I'm just going to – I'm going to just make this a little larger as I go through it looking at the – if you look in the Adobe Connect room – starting with Phase 1, work already underway. We've noted that we have currently completed approved and completed charters and that the implementation is approved and completed by consensus, Recommendations 14, 15, 16, 24 and 25.

We had coupled Recommendation 18 with Recommendation 16 but we decoupled that and pushed 18 into Phase 2. We currently have drafted implementation plan charters for Recommendations 30, 10, and 11, 13 and 19. We are continuing discussion on Recommendations 10, 11 charter and 13 today. Those have been previously discussed. And staff has introduced new charters for Recommendations 30 and 19.

And staff notes that with those two charters, we will now have created charters for all of the recommendations in Phase 1 and that's the work that's already underway.

And then if we move down to Phase 2, we'll note that when staff created the charters for Recommendations 18, 31 and 33, and once those were reviewed for various reasons, because of work that was ongoing, that related to these items, the working group had decided to move these into Phase 2. And so we probably need to create a new schedule for them to recognize that they'll be completed as part of the Phase 2 recommendations. And then we have grouped Recommendations 27 – 26, 27, 28 and 29, that's a typo there, and Recommendation 6 – I'm sorry, those are together and then Recommendation 6 is separate. We have not taken those up yet, we haven't created charters for those yet.

So any questions on the Phase 1 and Phase 2 timeline before we go to the Phase 3 timeline? Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thank you, Julie. Well this is very helpful. The question I raised that is also, well, to make it transparent to ourselves to see what could be done in order if we are of the opinion that we should keep the deadline so end of 2018 as the overall deadline. And also to have in mind what could be reported, you know, in terms of schedule, (unintelligible) so I recall I think we have to periodically, well, to report with the OEC maybe at the AGM in Abu Dhabi could be. So that is helpful.

So having said this, there is a question to me which I cannot see from this chart, is what does that mean, you know, adjusting schedule, do we have an idea already, you know, what it means for – in a worse case scenario, let me say, worst case, what that could mean here from the present day counted, how long that would take. Or do we have an idea that we should just discuss about that. So I would rather think well it would be helpful if we could have something, an option, you know, to see where we stand with it so what does it mean with regards to the overall schedule and that may be helpful. So that's just a comment here, thank you. I appreciate very much this kind of charter, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And I'll note that with respect to adjusting the schedule, so Recommendations 30 and 19, if we have time to talk about those charters today, we'll have a better sense of what the work might be for those two items, and once we know that, we can – yes, I think Recommendation 30 is likely to be 60-days still so that would mean then that we would probably, if we looked at it today then we would extend 60 days from today.

And Recommendation 19 my sense is probably that's shorter than 90 days, but that would be something we could determine once we start talking about Recommendation 19. Recommendations 10 and 11 and 13 we'll discuss today and I think it's possible that those might be ready soon to go out for consensus call but of course that's up to the working group. So those may not

really shift all that much, I mean, obviously they've shifted some already you know, by a couple of months just because we've started them later, you know, we didn't start them and have charters ready right on March 15. But they may have a sort of a shorter time.

So I think as we – perhaps what we can suggest is that as the working group takes up the charter and we have a sense of what the work entails and perhaps with some guidance from staff, we can think about how long the implementation might take and then staff can go ahead and turn new dates into this chart. Would that be a suitable way forward?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Moving on to Phase 3, as you may know, we have not started any of these yet. These are the medium and low priority recommendations. We'll just note that several of them were set to be under consideration as of June 15, obviously that deadline that passed.

So again, I think that we, you know, rather than perhaps arbitrarily putting in a start date for these, once the charter has been prepared and taken up by the working group, again, perhaps we can look at these and decide, you know, whether or not we think that they would take as long as, you know, we've suggested here, you know, whether they might need less time, and proceed accordingly. So again, looking at the charters as we go, determining how much time we think they'll need and then adjusting the timeline accordingly. Thank you.

And, Jen, I don't see any other hands up.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, I mean, and I mean, I feel like this is sort of what we anticipated which is why we asked for such an additional amount of time, you know, that we knew these things were going to take time. I guess I would comment, I would like to see us try to move maybe a little faster through some of the

recommendations that are already underway because I know as we move into some of the next phase it's going to take – that's where we really wanted to have more time. So, you know, as we continue on I guess I would just, you know, encourage everyone who is participating to, you know, let's try to expedite this process so we can stay on track. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: No other comments then why don't we move on to Recommendation 10 and 11? Do you want to pick us up on where we left off?

Julie Hedlund: Yes…

Jennifer Wolfe: I think you were going to give an update too on the geographic names…

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you very much. And so this recommendation just as a reminder, talks about having the criteria for a professional facilitator moderator and we note that the, you know, the face to face PDP working group pilot project has been completed and there was an assessment of that and a survey, but we talked last time about, you know, whether there needed to be criteria that each, you know, each situation, each working group is different. And staff mentioned that there were going to be moderated sessions, there were two actually on the geographic names issue relating to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group policy development process.

And so we did have those two sessions. And, you know, I think staff had suggested that maybe we could do some kind of survey or maybe we could just solicit input from say the PDP working group chairs as far as how they think the sessions went. We just – staff just with the PDP chairs, have talked a little bit about how the sessions went. They were quite well attended. There was quite a bit of discussion, much of it was very constructive, I think

particularly in the latter part of the longer of the two sessions, which was on the Thursday.

And not to put her on the spot, but I see that Avri Doria is on the call but is muted. I don't know, Avri, if there's anything that you would like to say about how you think the sessions went in ICANN 59. But I'm just also looking at there's a comment in the chat I see from Chris Seaburn. "Just for the record, when will other changes or talks that happened at the GAC affect us? Would that not affect all charters?" I'm not sure I understand the question, Chris. I'm not sure what changes or talks at the GAC would necessarily affect the charters.

I see Chris is talking or typing, pardon me. And I don't know that Avri is necessarily in a position to speak. Oh, I see Avri does have her hand up. Go ahead, Avri, and I'll see what Chris has to say also with respect to that question.

Avri Doria: This is Avri speaking, assuming I can be heard. I think there's…

Jennifer Wolfe: Very faintly. Can we make you louder?

Avri Doria: Probably. Hold on a second, it's taking me a while. Is that better?

Jennifer Wolfe: That's much better, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, sorry, took me a bit. So as I was saying, that was a lot of work to say that it was a good experience in terms of a particular discussion. We haven't had our final debrief with the facilitators. So it certainly helped bring the discussion out to open it up. Whether in the short term that we used it, it helps us find the consensus or not, I don't know.

                 But at this point I'd say initially that it was a good experience. It was useful in terms of the kind of discussion we were doing when we had to cross all of the

SO AC lines, basically try and include the whole community. But it still needs more evaluation. So I'd say it was okay, it was good but it really needs more of the post-event analysis. Sorry that that's not a lot but that's about what I've got. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Avri. And again, sorry for putting you on the spot there, but that's very helpful and I agree that, you know, we can – as we continue to have more evaluation we can bring that, you know, whatever that we think we can bring we can bring back to this working group if that's helpful. And, Wolf-Ulrich, I see you have your hand up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking, thank you. Well, I cannot judge on the – what might happen, you know, and I'm not so deeply involved in this group. I was intending, you know, the two meetings. And I really agree, you know, it was a professionally moderated session and the intention also the process they had in mind I think it's – it was good, you know, for – to restart the discussion, you know, from a point where it was deadlocked, yes, and open it to the wider audience or to the different proponents of the different views.

I think in this way it was helpful, well, it is really up to now the questions what's coming after that. So and can this impetus be continued, you know, in order to have a constructive dialogue. So if there are deliberations about that how to continue that, that would be very helpful. That was my impression. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And I see that Chris has put more things into the chat. And Chris also has his hand up, maybe that would be easier. Go ahead, Chris.

Chris Seaburn: Can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Chris Seaburn: Hello? Yes, okay. No my question was the last day at ICANN 59 the – I mean, the afternoon before the closure, there were a few things that was actually discussed, and it seems that a few of the groups may disappear. One of them seems to be the ccNSO and everything, which is going to be changed to TLD, which I understand. That would probably be falling under the GNSO, that's why I was asking whether that would not be affecting the initial charter we have right now.

Julie Hedlund: So, Chris, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Staff can certainly look into your question. I was at ICANN 59, others perhaps can also help out here. But staff at least are not aware of anything relating to the disappearance of the ccNSO. I'm not sure what that…

((Crosstalk))

Chris Seaburn: Yes, there's the minutes that came out from the GAC officially. I'm not sure but I saw it today and it does mention there that for example ccTLDs would disappear, so would the ccNSO. And it might be called TLD. And the overall idea seems to be that they might be porting it under the GNSO. So it might be something – you guys may want to look back at that briefing on the last day of the GAC.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, so you were speaking about the GAC communiqué. Okay. Well I will note that if there's something relating to the ccNSO, that shouldn't have any bearing on these charters. In addition, keeping in mind that even if there were changes relating to say ccTLDs becoming gTLDs, these charters are based on an already completed review of the GNSO and then the resulting recommendations from that review so, you know, and as we note, you know, some of that work has already been underway, some of this is new work.

Of course if there are anticipated changes or improvements to the GNSO, that this working group decides may affect the charters, the charters can be adjusted accordingly. So thanks for bringing that up. And actually staff, we

can go and try to find that GAC communiqué too if people are interested. Rafik, I see says – thinks Chris is talking about geographic names. I think indeed, Chris, I think the part of the GAC recommendation that relates to geographic names and that may indeed be what you're referencing.

So where we stand with Recommendation 10, 11 is that I think we're still – Jen and Wolf-Ulrich, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we still want to see if there was some additional you know, post analysis, you know, post meeting analysis that might be helpful as to the utility of having the facilitator and I know that as Avri mentioned, there still does need to be I think more information gathered with respect to the results, you know, the sort of post mortem, shall we say. So perhaps staff can hold this one and then come back with additional information when it's ready.

Chris Seaburn: Because the way I was assessing it, it looked like because they're having so much problems with the ccTLDs, it seemed to be the easiest way is to bring it up to the GNSO and make it three letter words using ISO. So it looks like from my guess it's going to land under the GNSO directly but with different ways. So if we're talking – well, the geographic names, which is going to be like we're moving I guess – the governments are moving away from the two letter word so they're probably looking at three as ISO does, so that would definitely have an effect on us.

That's why I was a bit concerned when I was looking – well some of these charters look fine, I don't see any issues, but I'm thinking if it moves to the GNSO, the way we look at certain things would be different. Because if we're talking about geographic names, we're talking about countries and the countries where evaluation and how we do it with the normal way with names may be slightly different.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Chris.

Chris Seaburn: That would be the challenge.

Julie Hedlund: If I could suggest that perhaps this is actually related, it seems, to the work of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, I don't know if you're involved with that group. But that certainly…

Chris Seaburn: Yes, a bit.

Julie Hedlund: … a discussion there. But it isn't necessarily related to this charter that we've been discussing here. So, Jen, if it's okay with you I'd like to go ahead and move onto the next item…

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: …on the agenda?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Chris Seaburn: Okay, yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely. And just – Chris, I'm not sure if you've been on any of our calls previously, but this is about the implementation of the independent review that's already been conducted, not necessarily the substance of any of the other policies, so this is really more about how are we making improvements to process and procedure of the GNSO, not necessarily some of the you know, in the weeds issue. And I think the reason we were talking about that particular issue was just in terms of using a professional facilitator.

Chris Seaburn: Okay, thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: So in the interest of time and moving us forward, Julie, please go ahead and take us forward.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So we also have talked about Recommendation 13 and that is – and this was on our last call on June 22. So the Council evaluated an appropriate pilot technology solution to facilitate wider participation in working group consensus based decision making. And staff had explained – had – I'm sorry – staff had researched just very quickly had researched the tools that are currently being used. And namely Microsoft Word and also Google Drive products, had done a quick analysis of the type of capabilities that is useful for these tools to have and a comparison between the Google Docs and Microsoft Word for creating documents and then sort of the cost comparison as well.

And then the question arose at the last meeting as to whether or not there would be any collaboration tools as a result of the new information transparency initiative. And actually the question was not even necessarily to that specific initiative but just in ICANN's plans for document management whether or not it was anticipated that ICANN would be piloting any sort of collaborative documentation tools.

So staff had looked into what this initiative is. This was announced in March of 2017, it's the Information Technology Initiative. It was announced in a blog and as part of the executive team report that was delivered to the ICANN Board of Directors in March of 2017. And it is – specifically that said that the proposed solution for document and content management and replacement of the existing ICANN.org Website was presented to the executives who have provided internal approval for the project.

So staff has reviewed some of the internal guidance with respect to the project. There hasn't been much more that's been published on this particular initiative as it is fairly new. But with respect to the community, the goal is to facilitate access to content. You know, part of this initiative recognizes the difficulty in you know, in the community finding content, say on ICANN.org and, you know, finding documents. I think we've all been in this situation. And so the project is aimed at sort of organizing how, you know, providing a sort

of method of organizing documents and making them more accessible you know, to the – the content more accessible to the community.

It's not focused on creating collaborative tools, you know, so it's not focused on creating a – say, you know, a document collaboration tool, it's more making it easier to, you know, making it sort of streamlining how documents are produced, making them easier to find and access and searchable. So it's – so we still would have – it wouldn't affect, say, for instance, the community using the collaborative tools that they're already using, that is say Microsoft Word or you know, or Google Docs.

So in that respect, you know, I think we're at the point now perhaps that this working group can decide whether or not the current you know, information laid out here that we do have tools that working groups are currently using, they're currently using Word, they're currently – several groups now are using Google Documents, Google Drive Documents, and quite successfully. I know in particular the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, the – are using Google Docs and Google Drive Documents quite extensively for draft documents. And it seems to be working well.

So I guess the question would be whether or not the current tools are sufficient or whether further work needs to be done in this area. So, you know, the question is then whether or not the recommendation has been met or whether or not there should be, you know, further research into alternative tools or further evaluation. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any comments or questions? Okay, see none, no questions or comments. So, Julie, what are your thoughts then if – seeing no comments, in terms of moving forward?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So I would suggest – staff would suggest that we could go ahead and change the word here under the working group determination to indicate that, you know, the working group has done the, you

know, the review analysis of the current tools that are under use and, you know, has found that, you know, these are accessible and you know, facilitating collaboration, that no further work needs to be done on this recommendation at this time. And staff could then put this out for a two-week consensus call.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, if there's no objection, I think that we should move forward accordingly.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And staff will take that action.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. So then let's go ahead and move on to Recommendation 13.

Julie Hedlund: That was just Recommendation 13.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I apologize. I apologize.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: I'm looking – okay so let's go ahead and move on to Recommendation 19.

Julie Hedlund: Very good, thank you. All right so this is Julie Hedlund from staff again. And this is a new charter that staff has drafted on Recommendation 19, which relates to working group performance. Specifically, the recommendation states that as strategic manager rather than a policy body the GNSO Council should continue to focus on ensuring that a working group has been properly constituted, has thoroughly fulfilled the terms of its charter and has followed due process.

So let me just then go into the scope description. So staff will provide applicable guidance from the current Working Group Guidelines as directed by the working group – and as directed by the working group develop a suggested procedure for periodic review of working group constitution membership and activity. The working group will determine whether this procedure will require changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures and if so, direct staff to complete a revision for public comment and approval by the GNSO Council.

The GNSO Review Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented or whether further steps need to be taken to meet the intent of the recommendation. Assumptions are that applicable guidance exists in the Working Group Guidelines concerning procedure for reviewing working group constitution membership and activity. And deliverables would be further guidance if the working group deems that it is required – this working group I should say.

Excuse me. So moving along then to the analysis that staff has performed, so the current Working Group Guidelines include Section 7.0, the working group self assessment. A working group self assessment instrument has been developed as a means for chartering organizations to formerly request feedback from a working group as part of its closure process. Working group members are asked a series of questions about that team's input processes, e.g. norms, decision making and logistics, and outputs as well as other relevant to dimensions on participant experiences. Screen shots of the questionnaire have been assembled into a PDF.

There's a link that's included in the guidelines. So that working group participants can review in advance how it is designed and what specific information will be solicited during the working group's closure process, coordinating with the chair, staff will provide a unique link to the online questionnaire along with open and close dates and any specific instructions. Staff will then perform the following actions, monitor the online process

providing status updates to the working group chair, provide technical assistance to working group members if requested.

Notify the chair when all team members have completed the questionnaire and follow the – following the close date, summarize the feedback in a written report to the chartering organization. And so these are the current guidelines in the Working Group Guidelines for a self assessment. So there is already a mechanism in place for the working group to assess – to assess its performance.

And then in addition to this, and this was noted actually by the GNSO Review Working Party with respect to this recommendation, when it made its assessment, the GNSO Council as the manager of policy development processes, oversees this ongoing effort, updates of each PDP are given to the GNSO Council during each ICANN meeting. A post PDP working group self assessment is undertaken and the results are forwarded to the Council.

So as the working party noted, not only do we have the self assessment to determine the performance of a working group, there also is – there also are updates on the working group's performance that are periodically provided to the Council and then the post PDP working group self assessment – those results are also forwarded to the Council.

So with respect to going back to the recommendation, it appears at least to staff that there is a mechanism for the Council to ensure that a working group has been properly constituted, thoroughly fulfilled the terms of its charter and has followed due process. There are currently then with respect the scope, there are currently guidelines for assessment. And I see that, thank you, Amr, Amr has put the working group self assessment into the link into the chat.

There is an assessment and currently these – this assessment process is part of the GNSO Operating Procedures. I guess one thing that staff could do to assist with this as well is go ahead and present to the – we didn't actually

print it out here, but present to this working group the actual self assessment so that this working group can see what that comprises. I'm wondering if I can very quickly try to see if I can pull that up for us to look at here. Let me just see if that's something I can do quickly. I don't want to take a lot of time setting up a document, but let's see.

This actually – I'm looking at this – okay, questionnaire is what we want. Okay. And this is the questionnaire. But I see that it's going to be difficult for me to actually bring this up. But you're welcome, since Amr has put the link in the chat, then – oh and yes, I also to the questionnaire, I would recommend that you could bring it up as well. But there's just a number of things in the – the questionnaire is fairly – just looking at it – is fairly lengthy. So, yes, I would suggest that folks would take a look at it, just looking at some of the questions, okay.

There's a section that relates to the charter, mission, team members', tools and resources, so that's Section 1. So there's questions concerning the charter and mission of the working group, the expertise, the representativeness, external human resources provided, technical resources and administrative resources. Section 2 includes processes such as norms, operations, logistics, and decision making.

Section 3 concerns products and outputs, again, relating to the working group's primary mission and the quality of the outputs. Section 4 addresses personal dimensions such as engagement, fulfillment and willingness to serve. And then there is a section on demographics. And I think that is – yes, that's the last section. So it would appear that the questionnaire is quite – is quite comprehensive and does focus on the terms of the charter with respect to the working group and whether or not it's followed its processes and, you know, and also the membership, the composition, etcetera.

And I notice Pascal has a question. Pascal Bekono, "Notify the chair when all team members have completed the questionnaire. What can happen if one

member do not fill the questionnaire?" Pascal, I think what generally happens is that staff follows up with that individual until that questionnaire is completed. So there was like a separate communication where staff can follow up and make sure that everybody has you know, if possible I suppose if someone was ill or, you know, there were, you know, other reasons, you know, that no longer accessible, that you know, if there was a legitimate reason somebody couldn't complete it, that, you know, then maybe – I don't think that, you know, that is a gating factor. I think that, you know, if it's possible we would get that feedback, if not we would still proceed with the final assessment.

And I see Amr is typing. So just while…

Jennifer Wolfe: Maybe we should just open it up to see because I don't know, in my opinion it seems like this is already being done and is covered, but I'd be interested to know if anybody else has concerns with any other clarification is needed on this one.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you very much. Let's go ahead and do that.

Jennifer Wolfe: I know Amr is typing. But anyone else have any comments? Anyone think more needs to be done? Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, this is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well the only question I do have is looking at the tools we have at the time being, which are comprehensive, to my mind, is the question these are tools who may be used, so that's what I understand, it's on a voluntary basis. So for the working group it's not an obligation to the working group, as I understand that.

So my question here is, is that enough, you know, with regards to the recommendation itself, you know, which points out that the GNSO should continue to focus on ensuring that the working group has been properly constituted, so is my understanding correct on the one hand that this is a

voluntary work to be done, on the other hand, well there could be a request or a more specific wish from the GNSO well to fix it as an obligation. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Any comments to Wolf-Ulrich's notation? So you think that perhaps this should be broader to fix it as opposed to just assess whether or not it's…

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, this is Wolf-Ulrich. So I'm not sure, you know, I think it's enough, you know, well because it seems to me that while it may be up to the leadership of the working group on depending on the issue, whether a self assessment is requested or not. That seems to me enough. I'm wondering whether that was the intention of the recommendation itself or whether the intention originally was well just do it as each working group should perform these kind of self assessment and that's it. Thank you. Julie has a comment maybe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, Julie, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So my sense from looking back and actually let me look at the implementation plan again just to remind ourselves, I won't try to bring it up on the screen, that would be a little time consuming. But I'm just going to try to quickly pull up this particular item because there's some – just to see if there are any more notes in there.

And I know Amr was part of the working party so, Amr, I don't know if there's something that you want to add. But it seemed that the recommendation aligns with the current process that – and it was noted that, you know, that there is already, you know, guidance in the Working Group Guidelines. I mean, this is something that was raised while the working party was making its assessment.

I do note yes, that it says should continue to focus on ensuring the working group has been properly constituted. I think that some of the other items that

Amr has brought up here, just to note them in the chat, I'm not going to read through all of them, but there are also other – there's guidance elsewhere in the Working Group Guidelines that covers this, for instance, representativeness is covered in Section 3.2, that addresses issues such as diversity and representation in the community. Section 2.2.1 talks about participation and representational balance.

So and it should be noted that, you know, that while, you know, that the self assessment is part of the procedures that do now have to be done by working groups so it's – while, you know, not all working group members may you know, certainly active members typically do complete the questionnaire, you know, all active working group members are you know, are strongly encouraged to do that. The process is definitely followed for the working groups as they finish their work.

And then we do have the periodic assessment of working groups via the, you know, working group liaisons to the Council where any issues with working groups can be raised, you know, to the Council along with the out, you know, along with the updates that are provided. So staff sense is that this recommendation aligns with what is already a current procedure that's being followed.

But again, Jen, if there's others I don't know if that addresses your comment, Wolf-Ulrich, and if others have comments as well?

Jennifer Wolfe: Amr, I see your hand's up and I know you've noted quite a bit in the chat. Do you want to provide more clarity there? Amr, are you speaking?

Julie Bisland: His line dropped. We're getting him back, one moment.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh okay. Okay. Oh I see, yes, he just dropped. Any other comments while we're waiting on Amr to come back? Okay, we'll just hold on for a moment here. Amr, are you there?

Amr Elsadr: Hi, Jen. Yes, this is Amr. I'm back on. And thank you and thank you to Julie and just to add to what she said, I just wanted to note that, yes, the GNSO Working Group Guidelines that I put in the chat do address the issue of representativeness in GNSO working groups and this is one of the tasks of a working group chair to make sure that proper presentation is available. And this also extends to sub teams on working groups to the extent possible, noting that there may not be as much interest in the work of some of the sub teams but again, a working group – a GNSO working group chair is meant to, to the extent possible, ensure that there is properly representation of the different stakeholder groups of the chartering organization being included in those sub teams.

I will also note that the PDP manual addresses the same issue in terms of implementation review teams so implementation review teams that do follow up on adopted recommendations from the GNSO recommendations that have been adopted by the ICANN Board are also meant to be representative and in cases where one IRT is managing recommendations for more than one GNSO PDP working group, then again, it is meant to ensure that, you know, there are proper representatives from the different stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO when this IRT is being constituted.

And if I am not mistaken, I believe there are also provisions in the PDP manual and in the bylaws that both the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board take into consideration the membership of the GNSO working groups and making sure that all the different groups are – were present when they are considering these recommendations. But I haven't actually dug those up, I'll try to find them. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Amr. Any further comments? I see we're almost up to the top of the hour. Any further comments? I think then, Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: I was just noting, Jen, that staff would go ahead and add, you know, some of these other references that Amr has suggested so that, you know, it's clear that there is, you know, additional guidance here. And then I guess maybe with those additions, staff could put the question to the working group as to, you know, whether or not, you know, this implementation is considered to be complete. And, you know, and if there aren't any objections, then, you know, maybe we could just make those changes and, you know, add those references, give a week or so for review and then if there's no objections we could proceed to put it out for a consensus call?

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that would be the most effective way to go forward, yes. That way when we pick up on our next call we can move forward.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Jennifer Wolfe: Unless there were comments obviously, but…

Julie Hedlund: Right, of course. Well then staff will go ahead and make those changes and we'll get that out and then perhaps now that we're short on time we could start out the next call with the charter for Recommendation 30.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, absolutely. We are right at the top of the hour so I think we can plan on our next call on July 27 to pick up with Recommendation 30 and then we can map out a couple of other recommendations to try to move onto during that call. Any other comments or questions before we close out this particular call? Okay, seeing none. Thanks, everyone, for participating and taking your valuable time to join the call today. This will bring the call to a close and we'll look forward to talking in two weeks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Thanks, Jen. Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Thanks, all. Bye bye.

Jennifer Wolfe: Bye.

Julie Bisland: Thank you. Today's meeting is adjourned. (Brian), the operator, could you please stop the recordings and disconnect.

END