

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party call that will brief the Council and other interested members of the SG/Cs on final recommendations issued by the independent examiner as the result of the independent review of the GNSO held on Tuesday, 12 April 2016.

Amr Elsadr:Hi all. Waiting for a dial-out.

Rudi Vansnick:hi everyone

Jennifer Gore:Hello

Rinalia Abdul Rahim:Hello everyone. Just listening and observing today.

Susan Payne:hi i'm a bit late joining. who is speaking please is it Larisa?

Amr Elsadr:Yes. That's Larisa.

Susan Payne:thanks

Philip Corwin:Hello all. Have been on audio line since the start.

Amr Elsadr:Maybe noteworthy that the working party reviewed the recommendations against the rationale for each recommendation in Westlake's final report.

Denise Michel:sorry. audio problems

Denise Michel:yes

Terri Agnew:@Denise, I have sent you a private AC chat

Denise Michel:i'm on phone now

Rudi Vansnick:it would also absorb a lot of resources to handle such analysis

Rudi Vansnick:needs to be looked at cross-community wise

Donna Austin, Neustar:There is a considerable amount of data being collected to inform the CCT-RT that could serve as a baseline for future collection. I'm not sure this is a GNSO task to collect, but perhaps should have access to such information when considering new policy efforts etc.

Rudi Vansnick:what priority should it get ?

Amr Elsadr:@WUK: Would be happy to help, if you like.

Chuck Gomes:@ Denise: It would be helpful if you sent your suggestion regarding rewording.

Denise Michel:@ sure

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:which email list we should use?

Denise Michel:@ chuck - sure will send

Marika Konings:@Jenn - no concerns, but as the motion was seconded by Amr, he would need to sign off on it as well (although technically it doesn't change the motion, but the document referenced in the motion)

Amr Elsadr:When rewording rec#21, might be worthwhile to check if what folks are looking for haven't already been covered here: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/dmpm-final-09oct15-en.pdf>

Amr Elsadr:@Denise: I believe the NCSG actually makes it a point to not ask for the age or gender of its members.

Rudi Vansnick:it certainly is ;-)

Larisa Gurnick:Rec #6 touches on diversity

Rudi Vansnick:age is important

Amr Elsadr:Some may not appreciate being asked to identify with pre-set options on gender.

Marika Konings:It is not collected as part of the SOI either - not sure if it would create any privacy concerns?

Marika Konings:although the secretariat does collect information on location / timezone to facilitate scheduling of calls

Mary Wong:Especially as SOIs are publicly available and published.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:+1 Amr

Amr Elsadr:FYI: The summary of comment for Westlake at ICANN 53 prepped by staff can be found here: <https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-gns0-review-01jun15/msg00002.html>

Chuck Gomes:Please size table so priorities show.

Amr Elsadr:Also difficult to determine what the diversity of the Internet as a whole is. :)

Larisa Gurnick:@Denise - Working Party and staff are discussing what a desired outcome would be and what data points are needed. That aspect would make the recommendation implementation feasible and useful

Johan (Julf) Helsingius - GNSO NCPH NCA:And is this something for GNSO, or the board?

Chuck Gomes:@ Denise: Would you recommend making this a red?

Amr Elsadr:Are there any thoughts on the alternative language to this recommendation suggested by the working party?

Amr Elsadr:But as Denise says, a WG may not be the best option right now.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:How would the data be stored? Under what privacy policy? Why would we put together a WG that reflects the current users of the Internet if the goal is to increase involvement from those not currently using it? What is the actual relationship between GNSO participation and access to use of the Internet?

Amr Elsadr:@Paul: :)

Susan Payne:@Amr I think the revised language is preferable to the original recommendation. But agree with Denise about concerns on setting another WG

Amr Elsadr:@Susan: Same here.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:For example, this call is in English.

Susan Payne:yep - and at a time that is not terribly user-friendly for those in Asia

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:@Susan,, +1 We can collect personal data all day, but if the systems in place discourage diverse participation, all we did was collect data and publish it in English...

Philip Corwin:I share Paul's concern. While we should strive for WGs to be diverse, I wouldn't want to see years of work rejected by Board based on something other than the quality of the report and recommendations.

Denise Michel:I have to drop-off. Thanks Jen, Larisa and everyone for an informative call

Larisa Gurnick:Thanks for participating, Denise

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:Shouldn't this one be Priority High?

Susan Payne:@Paul - I would say this is high priority. Feedback to the review was that this isn't being done wasn't it

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:Thanks!

Amr Elsadr:@Paul: regarding priority, also, this is largely being done, and not too many applications for new constituencies.

Marika Konings:For the record, the GAC has considered this on various occasions but always responded that no one is able to represent the GAC, apart from the Chair, but I guess it doesn't hurt to ask again ;-)

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Marikia, I doubt that the GAC will ever move away from the premise that no one is able to represent the GAC, but perhaps they could come to understand that providing a Liaison does not mean representing or advocating positions. I think the use of 'non-binding, non-voting liaison' is important.

Amr Elsadr:Due process here means pretty much the PDP manual/WG Guidelines/bylaws etc.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:@Chuck. Thanks for the clarity.

Amr Elsadr:@Paul: From the Westlake study, there seemed to be some concern that the Council acts as a legislative sort of body instead of a process manager.

Amr Elsadr:..., which as far as I can tell, is not the case.

Marika Konings:Thanks, Donna - the Consultation Group did touch upon that point, but there still seemed to be a lot of sensitivity in relation to the concept. However, we have definitely seen an increase in individual GAC members participating in PDP WG efforts and the other mechanisms that have been developed by the CG are also intended to facilitate early engagement and participation in the process.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:Same questions for Recommendation 6 - what privacy policy, where will the data be stored, etc?

Marika Konings:but as said, it never hurts to ask again :-)

Amr Elsadr:A lot of this data is publicly archived, along with WG call attendance stats and others.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:How was this done in the last GNSO review? Working group? Or was it done at the Council level? (Too long ago for me to remember)

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:Sorry for not knowing. The PPSAI pushed out most of my extra brain cells.

James Bladel:I recall several "steering committees" to implement the recommendations.

Marika Konings:and work teams

Mary Wong:Yes, there was a group that also formed work teams

James Bladel:@Chuck - How do you mean? Relay the comments from the work party to the Council?

James Bladel:Beyond the report itself, and the motion, I don't know that other materials are being presented on Thursday's call.

Chuck Gomes:@ James: No, i mean relay the comments from this call to the Council.

James Bladel:Ok, sorry for misunderstanding. Will ask that we distribute these slides and the chat transcripts to the Council list.

Chuck Gomes:In addition, I suggest that the specific recommendations made regarding priorities and categories be mentioned.

James Bladel:Ok. That might require a friendly amendment to Wofl-Ulrich's motion.

Chuck Gomes:10 minutes; good luck.

Terri Agnew:Slides, transcript and AC recording will be sent to council

James Bladel:Thank you, Terri.

Philip Corwin:No questions from me right now. Very useful briefing.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim:Excellent discussion. Thank you!

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC:Great call! Thanks!

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.