

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 14 December 2017 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-14dec17-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p1w248cas6f/>

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

Members:

Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (ISPCP Primary)
Lawrence Owalale-Roberts (BC Primary)
Jen Wolfe (RySG Primary)
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)

Participants:

Kris Seeburn (NCUC)

Apologies: none

ICANN staff:

Julie Hedlund
Emily Barabas
Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kileen). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review call on the 14th of December, 2017. On the call today we have Krishna Seeburn, Jen Wolf,

Rafik Dammak, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Sara Bockey, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. We received no apologies for today's call.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks so much and thank you to all of you again for taking time for the call today. We appreciate your continued commitment to this effort. On our agenda for today we'll do our standard request for any updates to the statements of interest and then we'll move on to the discussion of the implementation charter for Recommendation 4 and then move onto 34 and then move onto the charter for Recommendations 5, 9 and 17. And if we have enough time we'll hit Recommendation 22 and then we'll talk about the break for the holiday and our schedule as we pick up again in the new year.

So just briefly, are there any update to your statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, why don't we go ahead and move on to the implementation charter for Recommendation 4? Julie, would you be able to pick us up on that?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And, yes, we'll go ahead - I'll go ahead and take us through that. I'm just bringing the document up now. Let me make it a little bit larger. So just to recap from our meeting two weeks ago, we had our initial discussion of Charter 4 and also Charter 34 and the charter for 5, 9 and 17.

So what we've done as staff is we've collected the edits based on the discussion on our last call and incorporated those edits into these revised charters. And we sent these around with the agenda last Friday. So we'll walk through the changes and see if they're acceptable. And so I'll focus on the changes but I will just - can just remind, you know, as we start here what

each of these recommendations is since it was a couple weeks ago since we discussed them.

So this charter s for Recommendation 4, nonfinancial community recognition. And I just see a typo there that I'll make sure we fix in the next iteration of Recommendation 4 but there's just the one recommendation. I'll make a note of that.

So this recommendation is that that the GNSO Council introduce nonfinancial rewards and recognition for volunteers. And the scope was that staff would provide an overview of existing nonfinancial rewards and recognition for volunteers and then this GNSO Review Working Group would assess the overview and determine what steps, if any, need to be taken.

So what staff had found was that there already exists a couple of options for community recognition and just as a reminder then there is the community recognition program whereby community leaders are recognized for their service and contributions at the Annual General Meeting each year. And then there's the Multistakeholder Ethos Awards that are also done on a yearly basis at the Policy Forum meeting. And I won't go through the description of these as we do already do that last week.

So part of the discussion - or last meeting - part of the discussion captured in the last call was the need for there being some way to recognize the contributions of people who aren't necessarily, you know, they're active in the community but they're not necessarily you know, in a leadership position or an officer position. So staff did note that there is also the ability for the GNSO Council to recognize working group members.

And so staff have added some text here that the GNSO Council recognizes working group members for their contributions via a resolution thanking them for their work when it is complete. In addition, ICANN staff are exploring other ways that recognition that can be provided for working group and other

community volunteers who would not fall under the programs described below.

The goal is that recognition for other types of volunteers would fall throughout the year and it is anticipated that such programs may be in place before the 2018 Annual General Meeting.

So that was the new information that we've contributed here to the charter. The only other change noting that these were the changes captured following the last meeting. So let's go ahead and turn this over to the working group for any discussion or questions. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any comments or questions from the group? I see a couple people are typing. Kris says, "These look good." Wolf-Ulrich is fine with it. Okay, good. Julie, I think it looks like we've got consensus that this looks good to proceed.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you, Jen. So then staff would like to suggest that we go ahead and accept these changes and then send out this final version for a consensus all. Normally a consensus call would be for two weeks, but that would bring - if we sent out today, which is our goal to send these out today, that would bring us right into the holiday week through the 28th. So staff would like to suggest that we extend the consensus call for three weeks to the 4th of January.

Jen Wolfe: Julie, I think that makes sense unless anyone has an objection. And if there could just be a reminder that went out after the holiday that would probably be helpful too.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. This is Julie Hedlund again. We'll definitely send a reminder, I would say we'll send one then on the 2nd of January to remind people that that's out there. So all right, we'll do that, thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, excellent. All right so moving on to Recommendation 34.

Julie Hedlund: All right, thank you, Jen. And I'll go ahead and bring that up. And make it a little larger here. So again this was a recommendation that we discussed - excuse me - at our meeting two weeks ago. And this recommendation is that PDP working groups rotate the start time of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world. So - and what staff did was took a look at what was already happening - what working groups were already doing and whether or not this seemed to be effective.

So and staff did find that for each of the PDP working groups the leadership team currently conducts an assessment of meetings times to ensure that the meeting schedule supports and promotes participation from all regions while not unduly burdening other members who want to participate. And I won't read this all because we did - we did go over this last time. So but we did note some edits based on the discussion on our last call so here is the new text for consideration.

So staff notes that there is ongoing assessment by working groups and periodic assessments of attendance by leadership. Staff also notes that when leadership teams look at effectiveness it may be different for different working groups. Every working group is unique and each has different member needs and composition. A secondary goal may be to encourage participation from those who may not be participating from that time zone. Rotation, even if it loses attendance from other time zones may still be deemed valuable.

And then staff in the next paragraph noted, "As the review of the effectiveness of meeting times is ongoing and may vary among working groups, staff recommends that the GNSO working group consider this recommendation to be implemented." Now this - these changes are with respect to that - to the suggestion from the GNSO Review Work Party -

Working Party - that described, you know, how it thought the work should be undertaken, had recommended a definition of effectiveness.

Now that is not language that's in the recommendation itself, but staff did take that into consideration in these additional edits in that there is an assessment of effectiveness but that may vary based on the working group and so staff deems it's not necessary to have a single definition of effectiveness and may actually not be useful to have one.

So I'm going to stop there and I see that there are some comments in the chat from Kris Seeburn. "I'd like to propose that we keep track of a matrix to see effectiveness but it has been workable."

Lori Schulman: Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Lori Schulman: Hi, it's Lori Schulman. I'm not on Adobe Connect, I'm only on mobile so if you don't mind me inserting myself in the queue?

Julie Hedlund: Please go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, to the comment that was just taped in, I agree. I would go - I think it is important that each working group do what each working group needs to do in order to get a task done in terms of, you know, what rotation may or may not work for particular working group, particularly the larger ones. And but I do support the idea that I think ICANN on a holistic level should be looking at when these shifts occur, what the patterns are generally. I think that would be important from a true global engagement perspective.

And I come at this from my own organization who's global and we have found time shifting not always as robust in terms of promoting engagement as we would have liked from those particular regions. So it may not only be time,

sometimes it's language, sometimes it's other cultural issues regarding verbal participation versus some other kind of participation. So I just think that that ought to be accounted for in this type of assessment in talking about whether or not we're meeting any particular recommendations in terms of global engagement and time shifting.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So thank you for your comments. I will note - I know you mentioned language and some other ways that participation can be encouraged. I'll note that there are other recommendations that we haven't taken up yet that deal with - there's one in particular that deals with language separately so that may fall - that will be dealt with by this working group in a separate recommendation.

This particular recommendation is very limited in scope in that it only talks about whether - it talks about working groups rotating the start time of their meetings. So - and I see now Kris is saying also it's the rotation. I'm wondering if we're maybe not being clear enough about what is already being done as part of the assessment that working groups undertake for their members with respect to the rotation.

It's actually fairly - it's a fairly methodical approach whereby staff does an analysis of the participants from the different time zones, you know, how many participants in each time zone when determining the rotations. And in many group this means - could mean as many as three rotations, sometimes it's two. It depends on the composition of the group.

So and if that - and that's reassessed and so staff in coordination with the working group leadership also take note of attendance at times and that attendance is gathered and it is posted and collected in the wikis for each working group and it's periodically assessed as well as to whether or not there you know, the drop off perhaps off membership at a particular time. And, you know, and then periodically communications go out to the working group to, you know, to see if there's a, you know, a better time to, you know, rotate to.

Excuse me. So I'm wondering if that might get to your concern about whether or not there is, you know, sort of a robust method to make sure that the rotation is meeting its goal of, you know, encouraging participation. I'll stop there and I see also Kris says in the chat, "I would still like to see how good this works out." And I see Berry is typing so I'll stop here.

Lori Schulman: Julie, I'll insert myself again. Are there other hands up?

Julie Hedlund: No, there's no other hands, there's some typing in the chat. I think maybe Berry Cobb is also trying to address this so perhaps, Lori, if it's okay, I'll - I will read out what he has written in the chat.

Lori Schulman: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: He says, "I'd also note that it is very challenging to get the data to perform this analysis at a more broad level in that locations of working group members are not connected to attendance records. A centralized working group onboarding and attendance tool would help centralize this data for a more robust analysis on how community members participate."

Thank you, Berry. And I'm thinking that - I'm wondering whether or not that's something that is planned. Berry, do you - is that something that ICANN - and I should know this and I apologize for asking this question. And, Berry has his hand up. Go ahead, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Julie. So there is a project in the pipeline for a centralized tool for working group management and attendance tracking. It's kind of sitting idle due to issues with budget and prioritization as well as just ensuring that should a certain tool be created, you know, how would that have impacts from a, you know, privacy and data collection and, you know, GDPR types of issues. But it has been in the pipeline for a while but there's no formal activity on the project as it currently sits.

And I'd just remind that this group, you know, this isn't the first time it's been mentioned. You know, the - this type of centralized platform I believe touches two or three other recommendations either directly or indirectly that have been put forward as a part of this review.

And just to put clarity about my previous chat is, you know, in terms of how working group members sign up for participation of a working group be it whether they choose to be a member or observer is one particular path which is - used to be signed up via email, now has kind of been migrated to a Google Docs platform by which the secretariat manages on the backend. And then the secondary aspect is when a working group member that is required to provide a statement of interest that is also on a different platform that contains this country location or time zone location when they complete their SOI. So those two sets of data are not centralized together.

And then the third and most important component is that our current method for taking attendance is a separate decentralized platform, which essentially is a spreadsheet that contains really only the participant or member or observer name and their affiliation. So the idea is that all three of those components are combined into one centralized platform that allows not only for optimization of the onboarding and management process but then the jewel, so to speak, for lack of a better word, is that having all of that data in a centralized platform can then make for more robust reporting to understand how the community is participating.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Berry. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. That's extremely helpful. And Lori, I haven't forgotten to come back to you. I'll just read one comment that Sara Bockey put in the chat. "Definitely want to look at location but I would also suggest lifestyle/commitments would come into play. You may be in APAC but not able to attend during working hours or late evenings due to family matters."

So go ahead, Lori. And there are no other hands up at this time.

Lori Schulman: Hi, Julie. I think that we've gotten to I think the root of my inquiry. I just want to make sure that in any conclusions or reports that we do as part of this group that when we do get to be very targeted sections like time shifting that we're also acknowledging it's part of a bigger puzzle. I guess that's my main concern, that participation is multi-factored to the point that my colleague just made about there might be family commitments or - it's a tough nut and I just wanted to make sure that time shifting was not necessarily looked at as the silver bullet. That's all.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. I think we have - this is Julie Hedlund again from staff. I think we have some additional information that we could add to this charter to provide more context and to link up, as you say, Lori, to the broader picture. I think it would be helpful for staff to note some of the limitations of the way that data are collected now and, you know, recommending that once available various data could be combined in some kind of centralized tool.

That's not per se part of the scope of this recommendation, but as you say, Lori, it does help to show that this is just one piece in overall participation. And then I think it's useful to point out also that participation is not simply a factor of where one resides but also, you know, lifestyle and commitments. So even if one does have the data as to where one is residing, that is not necessarily indicative of whether or not one is going to participate.

So I'd like to suggest then that staff add - make some changes to this charter and send it around again for a review. And then hopefully at our meeting at the beginning of next year we can go ahead and get it out for a consensus call if those additional revisions are acceptable.

Jen Wolfe: Julie, I think that sounds like a good next step. Any objections? Okay, great. Thanks for the great comments, everyone.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you. And, Jen, I'll just read - quickly if I may I'll read from the chat that Kris has said that "It's helpful and makes sense. It is not always residence issue for sure." And then "fine by me."

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thanks. Thanks, everybody. Why don't we go ahead and move onto the implementation charter for Recommendation 5, 9 and 17?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. And just getting the document up in here. So again this was a charter that we discussed also on the last call and staff has incorporated some changes based on that discussion. Excuse me. So just as a reminder, there are three recommendations encompassed in this charter. They are all related so that's why we've gathered them her.

Recommendation 5 is that during each working group self assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered. Recommendation 9, that a formal working group leadership assessment program be developed as part of the overall training and development program. And then Recommendation 17 that the practice of working group self evaluation be incorporated into the PDP and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual improvement in the PDP.

So moving ahead to the - just as a reminder of the scope, staff did review the current working group self assessment survey, and including new questions and/or a new survey for leadership. And that's relating to Recommendation 5 and 9. And then on 17, looking at the - reviewing the current procedures for self evaluation and whether or not modifications are necessary.

And staff notes that the questions in the self evaluation survey - the survey itself is linked into the GNSO Operating Procedures but the questions and the contents of the survey are not incorporated into that Operating Procedures. And so that means that one can make changes to the survey and that does

not require you know, them going out for a public comment and a formal approval by the GNSO Council as would changes to the Operating Procedures.

So staff had suggested then some changes to the self assessment survey and - but also noted that some of the questions that are already in the survey do seem to speak to the recommendations. So I'm not going to read through again what we found for 5, 7 and 17 other than to note that in some cases staff felt that the existing questions address the recommendation. In other cases staff suggested adding questions such as for Recommendation 7 adding additional question to Section 2 and 3 on leadership effectiveness.

And then on 17 there - the staff had noted that already the self assessment is part of the PDP and it's part of the Working Group Guidelines so there is already a formal step that the self assessment has to be done and the results are provided to the GNSO Council. So just so - to zero in on the additional text that staff added based on the last discussion, the GNSO Review Working Group noted in the discussion of the self assessment - and just parenthetically this is from the discussion at the last meeting - that members of the working group that is doing the self assessment must provide their names when responding to the survey.

The GNSO Review Working Group noted that some respondents might be concerned about providing answers to responses relating to working group leadership and wondered whether the confidentiality of the responses is made clear. Staff notes that the first page of the survey provides the following guidance concerning confidentiality.

And again quotes, "Confidentiality will be asking you for identifying information to ensure that each response is valid. Your individual responses will not be accessible by anyone other than the ICANN staff administrator and they will not be disclosed or published in a way that could be matched to your identity." Thus staff suggests that clear guidance is provided concerning

confidentiality and the treatment of identifying information.” This was a specific concern raised in the last call and we’ve added this text to address it.

And the other change that we made was we included as an attachment the working group self assessment survey. So it would then be easy for anybody to go and you know, and see what the survey actually contains. And, you know, with respect to recommendations. So I’ll stop there and open it up for comments and questions.

I see Kris is saying, “Plus one.” Wolf-Ulrich is saying, “I’m fine with it.” And Kris is also saying, “I’m happy with this approach.” Any other comments?

Jen Wolfe: No, Julie, it looks - oh is that Lori?

Lori Schulman: Yes, I’m fine with it. It’s Lori. It’s okay.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So Jen, I’d like to suggest then that staff goes ahead and incorporates these changes and, you know, accepts them. And then sends this out for a consensus call, again, for three weeks through the 4th of January as we were doing with the other item with a reminder to go out right after the holiday.

Jen Wolfe: I think that sounds great. Thanks, Julie.

Lori Schulman: Julie, this is Lori. Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I really recommend that you make that response date the first Monday after the new year and not January 4. There are many people who celebrate the holidays through January 6, particularly in Latin America. And I find that there’s a lot of deadlines at ICANN right now due between like the 3rd and

the 10th and if we could push this a little I think it would be courteous to the community.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Thank you, Lori, I think that's a really helpful suggestion. I'd suggest then, Jen, that for both the items to go out for consensus call that staff go ahead and make that call through the 8th of January unless there's any objections?

Jen Wolfe: Sounds good, Julie. I think everybody's in agreement there.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, well excellent, we're moving right along here. We definitely have time to hit the charter for Recommendation 22.

Julie Hedlund: And I have to say actually that I have apologies, I had hoped to have that item complete - or staff had hoped to have that item complete but it was overtaken by events. But I do have a suggested possibility of how to use our time still productively and that is I think it might be helpful if you agree, to go back, revisit our work plan as we're looking ahead to January in any case and we might make some changes to the work plan as we're planning for January and February. So we could talk through kind of what we've completed and what we have coming up and talk through what those recommendations are and see again if this working group is good with the plan as it stands.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, that sounds great. Why don't you take us through this?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. And this is Julie Hedlund again from staff. So just to recap, we did work through Recommendations 26-29 but we had these currently on hold at the moment because - so these are all recommendations that relate to the statements of interest and also information on membership in constituencies and stakeholder groups.

And we agreed that because the issues - let me put it this way - the impact of GDPR that there would likely be some impact on basically all of these recommendations, not the recommendations themselves, let me put it this way, but the data that's being gathered, as part of the recommendations that we put this on hold pending further guidance on how ICANN is going to be, you know, addressing GDPR issues particularly with - as they relate to data that is gathered and accessible on, you know, the community members and in particular the statements of interest.

And so we do have that out there on hold. And I think that while the working group was satisfied with the language in the combined charter there was the sense that, you know, if there was a likely change to the charter based on, you know, GDPR and then, you know, it would be better to hold this and revisit it. So that's the status on that one just to remind everybody.

Then we just completed Recommendation 4, that will go out for consensus call. Recommendation 22 we'll have ready for the next call. This is a recommendation that the GNSO Council develop a competency framework - based framework which its members could use to identify development needs and opportunities. And so one of the things that staff is looking into with respect to this recommendation is the current programs that are available to community members to - for training and development.

So these include ICANN Academy and ICANN Learn and there are possibly some other learning tools and opportunities as well. So staff is working on identifying those and pulling those together to see if they are a, you know, are you know, what could be considered a competency-based framework. And I think we need to kind of look at that definition as well. So staff is working on this particular recommendation and will then make that one ready for discussion at our next call.

And then we already addressed Recommendation 34 and we're making some additional changes to that recommendation with the goal of having it go out for a consensus call in early January.

Now I'm just going to move ahead to note that also we've addressed Recommendations 5, 9 and 17 and that's going out for a consensus call. Now others that we'll be looking at Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 together. So this - these are - Recommendation 1 is that the GNSO development monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard GNSO working groups. Two, 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 policy development. And, three, that the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups.

So part of staff analysis that we've begun on this recommendation is to look at the current outreach activities to try to document how these may address the recommendations and also to see if there already exist metrics that could be used to evaluate effectiveness of these initiatives.

So there are several outreach and volunteer development initiatives that staff had identified and that we'll be analyzing as part of this charter. There's a Stakeholder Journey project, the ICANN Academy Leadership Program, the ICANN Academy Chairing Skills program pilot, Volunteer Engagement Project, the Next Gen at ICANN, the Fellows Program and the ICANN Learn Program.

So staff will analyze these various efforts with respect to the three recommendations and that is something that we'll also try to have ready for the next meeting in January. And then also for January, Recommendation 7 and 12, 7 is that stakeholder groups and constituencies engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English as a means to overcoming language barriers, and 12 that ICANN assess the

feasibility of providing a real time transcription service and audio conferences for working group meetings.

Now so here - and I'll note as I said previously, is the recommendation - or recommendations that address language with respect to participation. And so staff is going to look at what is already being done with respect to assisting - making engagement easier for those whose language is - first language is not English such as efforts underway in the ALAC for real time transcription service. So that is also a recommendation that we'll have ready in January.

And then looking ahead to February, we'll be looking at Recommendations 20 and 21 that the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's strategic objectives with a view to planning future policy development, and 21, that the Council should regularly update 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 policy making process.

And staff has already begun analysis of these two recommendations in particular to see if there already efforts to, you know, underway with respect to reviewing ICANN's strategic objectives and then also whether or not there are any current efforts for the analysis of trends in gTLDs. So we'll be getting that one ready for February if no sooner.

And then just looking farther ahead, and as a reminder that several recommendations relate to diversity and diversity statistics, in particular Recommendation 6, 33, 35 and 36 all relate to diversity. And are on hold because the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability - the sub team on diversity has recommendations that are out for - current out for public comment. And once those recommendations are finalized they can be analyzed against these recommendations.

And that's an exercise I think that staff can start sooner rather than later, that is that once the comment period is closed, and I think it closes on the 5th of

January, and once the comments have been analyzed then staff might be able to see what the - get a sense of what the final recommendations will be and perhaps we can get an earlier start. But I know that the sub team and the CCWG Accountability group goal is to have the recommendations finalized and approved by ICANN 62, if not sooner.

Actually I think maybe even ICANN - actually I think ICANN 61 is their goal but then staff has factored in if there needs to be time for say changes to GNSO Operating Procedures and those would have to go out for public comment and so on. And so it might take longer to finalize these recommendations.

And that is then all of the recommendations. And just as a reminder, the implementation plan for this working group is set to complete all recommendations by September of 2018. So here staff is projecting a goal of completing all recommendations no later than June of 2018. And we'll try to continue to move as quickly as possible through all these recommendations.

So I know that was a lot of information and I'll stop now and take any questions. And of course staff will update this work plan as well. Any questions?

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: ...typing, but, Julie, it looks like - I mean, thank you for that thorough review, by the way, that was very helpful to just have the context of, you know, where we're headed. And I think it's great that we're going to be ahead of schedule.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. This is Julie. I was afraid for a second I put everybody to sleep so I'm glad that that's not the case. Thank you for that. Yes, so we're certainly going to continue to work towards, you know, finishing sooner rather than later. I know that is a goal of this working group to finish as quickly as

possible because it won't be too long before another review starts, so we do want to have all of these complete as expediently as possible.

And I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up. Go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Julie. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks very much. So I'm fine with this plan. It's just a question, do we have any idea when you look at the plan for the next year and the recommendations coming up then, whether there are some of them who may have an impact on - or impacted by any budget questions? So it means that there could be an impact on budget requirements for the future so that's just the question, I don't have a specific one but maybe you have an overview whether or not at all? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, that's a very good question. And I think that is something that I think would be useful to incorporate into this plan, you know, where we think budget might be an issue. Most obvious item that could have budgetary effects is Recommendations 7 and 12, because these address in particular 12, because 12 talks about providing real time transcription services in audio conferences for working group meetings.

That potentially could be quite expensive. That - and part of the assessment that staff will do is staff is aware that there is already you know, real time transcription provided at various instances. The most obvious is during ICANN meetings for remote participation. Now it is limited to certain meetings, it isn't offered for all meetings, but certain types of meetings. You'd have to justify why you need it, there's sort of a backend to the process for staff to request it.

But certain types of meetings, those that are broadly attended, or expect to be broadly attended can get the service. And also our understanding is that ALAC is also experimenting with doing some real time transcription so staff plans to gather data on the costs of these services and then to project what

the costs would be if for example, you know, all, you know, PDP working group meetings you know, had real time transcription what that might be.

Now recognizing that any budgetary, you know, recommendations, you know, we're already in fiscal year '18 so we would be looking, you know, whether or not funds needed to be requested say for fiscal year '19. That budget process is, you know, will start up shortly. So we do have this recommendation set out for consideration in January. I think that's important because if there were possible budgetary effects then we'd want to identify them as early as possible so they could be incorporated into planning for fiscal year '19. So thanks again for that question.

And we'll look that the other recommendations too to see where we can identify that there might be possible budgetary needs and incorporate that into this work plan.

So, Jen, this is Julie again. If there are no other questions on the plan, perhaps we could talk a little bit about the schedule for January?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, I was just looking at the calendar. I think on the calendar invites we are scheduled to pick back up again on January 4 but it sounded like from our discussion today perhaps it would be preferable to push that? Are there any comments from the group? Or, Julie, did you have anything to add to that?

Julie Hedlund: Jen, this is Julie Hedlund. So we can do that but we will run into a couple of issues if we do and that in particular if we stick to our two week rotation, then that would mean that, you know, the meeting would fall on the 11th and the 25th but the 25th falls during the GNSO - the staff policy development retreat in which we do try to avoid scheduling meetings. But we could - you know, we can do a meeting that week, I'm not saying that we don't do meetings because we have done them. It will be in LA so it would mean that it wouldn't conflict with anything because it would be at five o'clock in the morning.

But and because if we were, you know, to do 11 and then push it out to the 1st of February, you know, then we really only have one meeting in January. Alternately we could do the 11th and the 18th and do, you know, back to back and not do a two-week split. So a couple of questions for the working group.

Lori Schulman: Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, hi. I'm - the GNSO Non Contracted Party House intercessional comes right on top of that Board retreat, that week of the 25th though I think it might be a little later. I just wanted to note that, so I would probably be in favor of an 11th and 18th call rather than, you know, something the week that we'll be flying out for the intercessional, those who are representing the NCPH.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori, for raising that. Yes, and staff is aware too that yes, that intercessional does follow I think immediately after that week so there would be issues there as well. So - and I'm seeing - okay so I see that Nathalie says that the NCPH intercessional is the 1st and the 2nd of February. And Sara is saying, "11th and 18th seems possible and easiest if that works for everybody."

I'd suggest then, Jen, if there's no objections that we do the 11th and the 18th so we avoid that first week in January when people are coming back from holiday and avoid those last two weeks in January.

Jen Wolfe: I think that makes the most sense and it looks like from the chat that's what everybody else is concurring. Seems to work the best. Anyone opposed to that schedule for January? Okay, then after that we could pick back up with our two week rotation. And of course we can always address issues as they arise.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks, Jen. Again, this is Julie from staff. Then we'll go ahead and update the calendar and -calendar invites and take care of that. And I will, you know, we'll go ahead then actions from today, we'll get a couple of consensus calls out, we'll do the updates to charter 34 and we'll update the work plan and get that sent around. And then I can say that I wish everybody a very happy holiday and new year and then we'll look forward to talking to everybody on the 11th.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thanks, Julie. Thanks again to everybody on staff for all your hard work, we really appreciate all the (unintelligible) it makes our job a lot easier. Thanks, everybody for joining.

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Have a great holiday and we'll pick back up in January.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: And, Jen, thank you for your leadership and we'll - it's great. Thank you, everybody. I know I don't always make all the calls but I do the best I can.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. Thanks for joining. Have a great holiday.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Happy holidays.

Jen Wolfe: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, everyone, for joining. This concludes today's call. Operator you may stop the recordings and disconnect the lines. Thank you very much.

END