TRANSCRIPT GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday 6 October 2016 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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: Jennifer Wolfe, Heath Dixon, Sara Bockey, Wolf Ullrich Knoben, Lori Schulman, Rafik Dammak, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Pascal Bekono

Staff: Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Larisa Gurnick,Lars Hoffmann, Charla Shambly, Berry Cobb, Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:none

On audio only: Mahendra Limaye

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Iris). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 6th of October 2016.

On the call today we have Jennifer Wolfe, (Heath Dixon), Sara Bockey, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, and Lori Schulman. We've received no apologies for today's call. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, (unintelligible), Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to stake your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you and thanks everyone for being here today for the continuing work of the GNSO Review Working Group. I know we have a small number of people but I also know, you know, there are many people who do go back and listen to the recordings or read the transcripts and chime in on list. So I appreciate you all taking the opportunity to actually show up and participate and hope that you'll participate as we work our way through today.

As a - just a matter of governance, I know the first item on our agenda is always to review statements of interest. Any changes to anyone's statement of interest? Okay great.

So our agenda for today is to just review what our goals as a group, what our timeline is and the deadlines that we're working on, and then we can talk through - we - I was able to work with staff - and thank you very much to staff; they really did a lot of the work - to propose an approach to drafting the implementation plan. So we want to talk through that and get your feedback on that approach today. And then we'll talk to our next steps and when our next meeting is.

I think you did hand over - yes, okay. So just a reminder to everybody, the purpose of our working group is to prepare an outline of the implementation plan to agree on what the methodology would be for the implementation plan and to create an action plan and next steps. Our hope is to then have that to present to GNSO Council and then to the OEC.

So just a couple things to think about as we work through the implementation plan of these recommendations is of course our volunteer capacity. We always know everyone's very busy and even, you know, just on these calls we can see it's hard to get people to turn up, so we want to create a realistic implementation schedule and plan while defining the expected outcomes and measuring the results.

So our timeline. I won't go through all of the balloons that we've already worked our way through. I want to focus on the last two, which is where our work is really important. What we are shooting for in our work is to have an implementation plan finished by November 21 so it can be presented to the GNSO Council during their meeting on December 1, and then at the end of the year it can go to the board for approval of the implementation plan.

Anybody have any concerns about that timeframe? Okay.

So moving on to, you know, the overview, some of the things that we need to think about, the questions that we need to work through in this call and the subsequent calls that we have, out of the 34 recommendations that we're dealing with, you know, which ones should get implemented and when, what are the dependencies between those.

And this is where I think staff can really help is looking at these and defining where there's dependencies between them where work might already be underway and help us work through that.

We need to determine what data we want to capture so that we can measure. We need to determine the priority. We did already as the working group go through and create a high, medium, and low. So to some extent we can just build from that work that was already done, making any changes that we think is appropriate.

Who is going to oversee the implementation? That could be the community, it could be staff, it could be a combination, but we want to make sure we define that. Enforce our metrics. You know, how do we define that we've been successful in implementing a recommendation. And then how are we reporting?

That's the overview of what we're trying to accomplish. Anybody have any questions or comments? Okay.

So moving on. Just to remind everybody, we did talk about this last time as well, but just to remind you the way that the working group dealt with the 36 recommendations - and two of them have been removed from our purview, so we're only dealing with 34 - but the way we had worked through them was to define all of them in terms of high, medium, and low. And we had seven that were identified as high priority, 17 that were medium, so that's kind of our big group, and then 12 that were low priority. And then within that, we had also determined if there was work already underway.

So as we go through this, we can also take that column of work is already underway and try to determine if that could be implemented in a way that's already being done. Any comments from anybody on that? No? Okay.

So we worked together since our last call to outline what the implementation plan might look like, and we'd like to get feedback from everybody on this. We think it could start of course with an overview of the recommendations and then continue with an identification of the dependencies between them.

So if anything - if one is interdependent upon another that we can identify that in the plan, the data that we need to capture, and then the prioritization, the high, medium, and low, and then also any kind of low-hanging fruit, something that might be easy to implement. And then step number five in the plan would be the methodology, who's going to implement what metrics, who will collect them.

Oh, Wolf, please go ahead. I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Jen. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. Jen, I'm not as fast as you are in following you. So maybe my question is related to the two charts before. But just a question, are we going to talk about how we organize our self in working out this plan?

Like I said, in that item, do we need, let me say, to split up for our group, you know, to for example to one group dealing with the orange recommendations and the other (unintelligible) recommendations or how shall - or shall we go on in one group? Is that to be discussed as well or depending on, you know, how we understand, you know, the amount of work we have to do. So that is my question, because I would have a - then a comment to that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. And so I guess what I would look at is that right now we're not actually going to dig into each of the recommendations. That's what will be in the implementation plan. That would be in the implementation phase. What we're trying to do right now is just create a plan that could then be put into motion into 2017. Anybody else have comments though on that or what your interpretation is? Or staff if you want to chime in, I'd very much appreciate it.

And then also, Wolf, I guess my concern about trying to split up into groups is we have such a low turnout as it is I think. If we try to divide it up, we wouldn't have very many people. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks, Jen. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I understand that, so yes it's going to be a little bit not so clear about that. So because I understand all that is the group in total has to outline it and say some framework, to set criteria under which we have to approach the implementation plan.

And then after that, it could be split up. If we are clear about that, it could be split up. And maybe different parts are going to dive into the implementation to the recommendations. So that could be a way. But I'm open though either way. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. (Heath), please go ahead. (Heath), I couldn't hear you. Oh you put a question in the chat. Oh I didn't see it. Oh you don't have audio. Let's see here, sorry. I missed your question. Oh the dependencies have already - have not already been identified. No, Julie or Larisa - I don't know if

Larisa's on the phone - but has some work been done on that? I know staff was going to help with that. Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Hi this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And that's something that staff was going to help with. There has been, if I remember correctly, some work done already by staff on some dependencies. And so staff will start with what has been done and, you know, work to produce something for this work group to consider.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks. And Lori, I think I'm seeing - I see your hand up. You still don't have sound? Oh you have sound now. Okay, go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Yes I have sound. Thank you, guys. I had to dial out. Thank you. Good morning everybody or afternoon wherever you are. I'm a little confused about a lot of things on this work group, and I did not - I was not on the previous review panels or working parties so I'm coming in fresh to this.

I have experience on SCI and - by background to way of this small group, but what I'm not quite understanding is all the discussions now going on within the GNSO, and I know there are working groups discussing how the new responsibilities under Work Stream - not Work Stream 2 really, but the new responsibilities now that ICANN's fully funded how the GNO - how the GNSO responsibilities fit into the bylaws and what does that mean for a changing GNSO.

So my question is are those discussions being coordinated with what we're discussing or is this considered and independent track? Because I think it would be a mistake to continue to work independently under an old model while we're talking about potentially a new model or a new way of looking at GNSO responsibility. And I was wondering what other people thought about, particularly Rafik, because I see Rafik's on the call and Rafik has a lot of experience with GNSO and the governance structure.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Lori. And I'll take my shot at trying to respond to that and then I certainly invite staff too. I think - so to answer the first part of your question, the purpose of this group is to take the 34 recommendations that were identified during the independent review of the GNSO over the last, you know, year and a half that's been approved by Council and that's been approved by the board and create a plan to implement those recommendations for improvement.

So our purview is pretty narrowly defined, to be focused on taking those recommendations and creating a plan. And even right now what we're trying to do between now and November is just create the plan, not implement, not each and every recommendation, not determine how each and every recommendation is implemented but create a master macro plan on how to implement those recommendations.

And I'm going to skip ahead to a slide here just because it might be helpful - oh here it was - to just show what we're talking about is really what I think what we're trying to do in these next couple of calls is take the recommendations and put them into groups and say one group could be implemented between January 2017 and December 2017, and another one could be implemented, you know, in 2017 to '18, and another one could be implemented between October 2017 and 2018. And these are just examples. These dates do not have to be exact.

But really I think our work is much more organizational at this point rather than substantive into the recommendations, where we're just trying to create a framework for them to be implemented. Larisa, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Jen. This is Larisa Gurnick, ICANN organization. Thank you so much and good morning, good afternoon. Lori, you make a really good point and I wanted to respond to you in two parts. Part one, I think that to the extent that there is changes that are underway that might have an impact on

the implementation, these could be flagged as part of the dependencies as each recommendation is being analyzed so that the work should not be contradictory in any way to other work that's already underway.

And that's in a more general sense of course but also in terms of specific connection with Work Stream 2, in the work that staff is doing to support Work Stream 2. For example on the subgroup that is dealing with diversity, we've actually provided to them information and sections of the GNSO review report that dealt with issues of diversity and proposed some recommendations, which ended up getting adopted, so that there could be some alignment or linkage between this implementation team and the subgroup of Work Stream 2 that's also looking at diversity issues. So we have made at least that one connection so far.

Lori Schulman: Larisa, yes this is Lori. That's great. And I would just very strongly recommend that wherever we find linkages to identify them. I am a bit concerned that this study, given the acceleration of implementation and where we are now that the transition has happened, I want to make sure we're not working with something stale, so it's not - there's a relevancy here that is now, that there's a relevancy for the work we're doing now, not work we did two or three year ago. So that's a strong concern that I have. But thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Lori. It's of course an excellent point and I think is probably, you know, that's a challenge that we have, right, because we - this is our mandate is to take what's been given to us. You know, I think that's certainly a question that we could raise, and I think certainly we could look - you know, if you look at the timeline that's up on the screen, if we were to take, you know, a look at all of the recommendations and say we're going to batch them, you know, as we do that, we might and look and say we think there are some that may no longer be applicable and maybe put them into a batch and ask, you know, council to take a look at that.

Rafik, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Hello, can you hear me?

Jennifer Wolfe: There you go. We can hear you now. Go ahead, please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Okay I am not going to elaborate more on the issue. I think it was responded already but yes we are more - I have to say we are kind of doing implementation review and we don't have the mandate to change the recommendation as they can from the GNSO Working Party - the GNSO Review Working Party and how it was approved by the GNSO Council and the board.

So the issue I think it's not necessarily new with a whole different review that ICANN have now with Work Stream 2 and what happened with Work Stream 1 by changing the bylaws. So there are so many things going on that that's a risk we have in mind.

Back to more the - this working group scheduling. So we are aiming for December but I think we have in the middle Hyderabad meeting and I think - I see in our working group we have several folks for the U.S., you have your own holidays in the middle. So are we really aiming to make it by the beginning of December? It's just like less than two months. So are you planning to do so?

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Rafik. An excellent point. And thank you for raising that. And I think that leads into an important part of our discussion, again, recognizing that there are phases to all of the work that is being done. You know, and I think that with this first piece, you know, what we're really trying to develop is a plan that looks something similar to what's on your screen where we again group these recommendations into batches and then have an outline of how we think those could be implemented.

And within that, I think that's where Wolf-Ulrich's recommendation may come in, where within the first batch there could be two or more subgroups who then tackle a specific plan for each of those recommendations. So I think just to try to help frame this conversation today and help us move forward as best as we can within this timeframe is that we really want to just take a macro look right now and stay focused at that big-picture level. And then as time goes on, we will get deeper and deeper.

So I think it is possible that we could get this done by the December GNSO Council meeting if we all stay up at the macro level, recognizing we'll get deeper in as we move into 2017 and set new timelines. So - and I know we also have talked with staff about doing some of the work for us in between like identifying all of the dependencies, helping to create a framework of a plan that we all might be able to react to, both on list, so we could get more participation, and then also in our calls.

So I guess I would ask does that seem reasonable to everyone on this call that we take that macro approach and focus on trying to get that macro level implementation plan between now and December? Wolf-Ulrich's a check, yes. Thank you. Rafik, I see your hand is still up. Did you want to comment again? Okay, I see lots of checks, so that's good. Thank you.

Okay so with that, let me ask for your feedback then on this idea of batching so that we might take let's just say for right now the high priority recommendations and put those into the first batch. And then a second batch would be sort of that medium level, and the third batch would be the low priority. Does that make sense to everyone? Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sure. Thanks, Jen. I wonder, you know, when you look to the table, to the matrix and we have shown just some of these before, a few recommendations and numbers, you can see there is the prioritization column, yes, it was this one. And then we have also in the rows, you know, we have these different types, the green, orange and yellow ones. So the

most part is in the green and the orange one, and I wonder whether we should maybe distinguish with regard to the batching as well between the green and the orange.

The orange I understand is something we found out in the working party which is underway but has to be reinforced to some extent while depending on the status where we are with it. And then it should be put forward to the OEC with a - with outlining what they have to do in order to reinforce it. So I wonder whether this has an influence on the kind of batching we are going to do, whether we could just go, you know, the high priority, which would put both types of these together, or whether we have to split it up a little bit. So this is a question right now.

So I didn't go into details with those recommendations; I didn't read them, which is - which means green and which means orange, but I think about there might be the distinction is with regard to the aim - the target we have to put it forward. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And I think you're absolutely right. And just for everybody's reference in case - because Wolf-Ulrich was part of the review working party, the different colors - the green was where simply everybody from all the various groups was in agreement that was a good recommendation, the orange was where we identified that work was already being done somewhere. And so I think, Wolf-Ulrich, that's a great point that perhaps we take that category and say there's already work being done somewhere, so maybe we batch that separately.

And then the yellow was we agreed but with modifications. Those modifications have now been adopted, so I think we could move that into the green category when we look at it next. (Heath), I see your hand is up. Do you have audio now or do you need me to read from the chat?

(Heath Dixon):   This is (Heath Dixon). Can you hear me?

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh there you go. Great, yes. Thanks.

(Heath Dixon):   Thank you. So my question now is do we have - I agree with the idea of keeping it a high level. Do we have an example of an implementation plan previously prepared that has this same kind of high level? I'm just wondering, it seems like one thing that we could do is simply produce a plan that says here are three batches of recommendations. We think that the first batch should be implemented from January to December of 2017, the second should be on a second timeline.

It could be very simple like that and not give any further guidance or it could start providing additional guidance as here are the steps that are going to need to be done at each stage in January through December of 2017.

So what level of detail - if we're going to do it at this high level, I'm just wondering, is there an example that we can look at to see how much work is going to be required? Because I think that gets to steps such as when do we need the dependencies prepared by staff so that we can take those into account and put them into the timeframe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, (Heath). Excellent question and I'm going to ask members of staff if you want to chime in. I know one of the things we had possibly talked about is everyone agreed with the approach we were taking today, staff might actually be able to take the recommendations and put them into a framework for us to then start reacting to. So I know it's hard when we - we're just still trying to talk about how to do this. Julie, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Hi this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So what staff had discussed with Jen in preparation for this call was, you know, our willingness to develop some of the work sort of in a strawman format to present to this working group that would include first and foremost I think the dependencies as well as, you know, as Wolf-Ulrich has noted, can we set aside things that are already

being done and sort of flag them, you know, so that those are batched on their own, can we look at, you know, all of the things that, you know, would be sort of high priority first, you know, and any dependencies between them.

So it might even be dependencies be something that, you know, is high and low and maybe they can go together. But that would be a first step that staff could do, and I think we could do it fairly quickly. I know I'm prepared to work on this, you know, right away.

And for example, you know, in a week or so I think I could have certainly some, you know, say by, you know, a week or so I could have something that this working group could look at as a first step. I mean it wouldn't be a fully fleshed out plan of course, but it would have things like the dependencies and some of the batching for the group to consider and an outline similar to what you see here, if this working is okay with this outline. And that's a question then for all of you.

Here we have a possible outline for a plan, you know, indicating, you know, some of the work that staff can do as well. So if this working group today says I think, you know, we think this outline looks good, then staff is prepared to start the work right way. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Julie.

(Heath Dixon): This is (Heath) again.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh yes, please go ahead.

(Heath Dixon): So then my question - I think that's great. I think my question then is would that be a sufficient plan and it would be the work of the committee between when we receive it and December to simply agree upon which recommendations fit into which batches from a timing perspective, or will we then need to do additional work of identifying for each recommendation what

steps needed to be taken, when they would be taken, who would do them. So that's what I'm trying to get to is do we just need to organize the batches or do we need to also lay out the various steps that will need to be done.

Jennifer Wolfe: So, (Heath), I'll - again I'll try to answer what I think and then, Larisa, I see your hand's up. I think that what we need to do is yes we do - the first step obviously is to organize the batches, but then I think we do want to help take it to the next step to say who should do it, you know, and how will it be measured. I don't think we have to go the furthest step in terms of the details of how it's implemented, but we do need to create the basic framework. So that's where most of our work will be is in talking through that and making sure everyone's comfortable with that plan. Larisa, please go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Jen. This is Larisa Gurnick. Another component that might be helpful to think about is resources that would be required to do the work, both in terms of staff support, volunteer time, but also if there's any cost associated with the implementation. I don't have a particular example in mind so I'm just talking a little bit more conceptually, but it would be helpful to identify any of the implementations that might require significant resources so that that can be considered for the budget cycle.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. And I did pull up a slide that just shows some of the things that we should be considering as we do this. Rafik, is that a new hand? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, just coming back. Okay. I'm not sure if - what I missed exactly but in terms of prioritization and so on, maybe related to what was discussed before, I think we have to prioritize by what we have like high, medium, and low priorities because this is what we want to implement first.

I'm not sure if it seems that's already going. The difficulty we could face is in terms to understand what was already done and to check the missing piece.

It can be more tricky than what we think. So I guess it's better to follow the order priority and not the color classification.

On the other hand, I think maybe having also a dependency in the beginning would highlight the risk we may have for some recommendations to implement. But I guess I would wait for the outcome of what the staff can deliver as strawman and then we can decide on the best approach to (unintelligible). Because now maybe we are just kind of discussing a little bit in abstract. I'm not sure how many among us are familiar with the recommendation or recall the date. So.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Rafik. Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks, Jen. I'm all - the issue with regard to put at the end, you know, all these things into batches, you know, and to find out, but this is the very last step I think so for our planning discussion here. So - and the - I understand (Heath)'s question relative to what extent or to what detail, you know, we should put in our ideas into the batches.

So my view on this is that we need well for the first one, you know, the idea - and therefore I make the distinction between the already agreed and the still - the ongoing work of recommendations. And so I think there is a difference because we have to find out where we stand, you know, with those recommendations, but where we stand, with the orange recommendations for example, and what is still open, so what does it mean you're still open and what is the impact on resources we need in order to fill the gap, you know, and resources from staff, resources with regards to the batching.

This is - and that is what I would expect from a board point of view or this group point of view, that we could give a first idea about this time and money. Also it was outlined in the charter that we have to provide ideas about the measurements. So - but - so maybe we can save time if we start with the first two on that and the measurement idea and discussion comes later on, so I

don't know, but that's I think (unintelligible) only if we are clear what we are going to do. So thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. All excellent points. I think - I guess I want to pose just a general question to make sure there's no objection to the idea of staff, you know, taking a week and putting together a draft framework for us to then start reacting to. I think that could be extremely helpful with the timeframe that we have so that when we come to our next call we've all had a draft, you know, circulated on the list, had an opportunity to read it, and be able to then really start to dig into the substance of, you know, how this is presented, what those measurements are that Wolf-Ulrich was just speaking to.

Is everyone in agreement that that is a good idea to have staff take a week and prepare something for us to react to?

Man: Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Is anyone opposed, I guess I should say? Is anyone concerned about that approach?

Man: No.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay good, good. So with that, why don't we use the time we have here to provide any other suggestions or feedback for staff so that as they go and tackle these recommendations that they can take that into consideration when they prepare this for us. There's a couple things just up on screen to prompt if you want to talk about them. And I - we do have, if you want me to pull up any of the recommendations on screen, we do have those here in the slide deck. I'd be happy to pull those up.

But what would you - just starting with this first one in terms of volunteer capacity to implement improvement, you know, how - what do you think they should factor in in terms of other work that's going on and what would be

realistic when we move into the implementation of some of these recommendations? Any comments anyone has to staff on that point? None? Okay I see a few people are typing in the chat.

Anything - how about how many recommendations might be realistic to tackle in a one-year time period? Any comments on - when we're talking about 34 - (Heath), please go ahead.

(Heath Dixon):   I think - (Heath Dixon) for the record - so I think that the number of recommendations depends upon the amount of work that needs to be done for each. So my suggestion would be that that is comparing the strawman, it should answer some questions like who would need to do what. And I realize we're going to have to dig in and flesh out a lot of this out, but at least give us a high level estimation of, you know, is this is a - I want to say who. Is this something that staff would need to do, is it something the community would need to do.

If it's something the community would need to do, what's the number of volunteers that they anticipate would need to be involved. You know, with the what, is it actually collecting the data, is it identifying data to be collected. You know, those different steps like that I think takes longer amounts of time. So I think that's - then there's the when of, you know, do we need to collect data for six months before we can move forward.

So if we could get at least some ideas from staff on their thoughts of numbers of people, amounts of time, actions to be done, that will help us not only to lay out a credible plan but also to answer the question of how many of these can be tackled in each group based upon that amount of work as opposed to just, you know, kind of a guess or, you know, just dividing it into the three groups of about 11each.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Excellent point. If that can be done in the draft that we have for our next call, that would be extremely helpful to then be able to determine how many are realistic to tackle year by year. Lori, please go ahead.

(Heath Dixon): Yes and even if it's not a full - sorry - even if it's not a full, you know, I don't expect staff to do all of the work for us between now and then, but just to get some bare ideas on those, that will allow us to then look through those and think about whether we agree or disagree and to kind of flesh those out. But at least to get those points started, I think will help us to then do the work of working through all of those as opposed to us starting fresh and try to do that as a committee.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Lori?

Lori Schulman: Hi. I wanted to second what (Heath) said. I think that makes a lot of sense. I also wanted to say too if the report hasn't already categorized the changes, it may be helpful not just to kind of time them out in the batch but actually categorize the batches, like what type of work is involved. Because some implementations may be more administrative and others may require something else. So I would imagine if you could in a way put them in little buckets of what actually has to happen. That might also be helpful.

I don't know. Because I remember the feedback in this report and, as I said, I was not part of the working party, but my understanding was that some of those recommendations were based on data that was considered to be out of (unintelligible) quantitative. And it might be helpful to know that in terms of how we plan a workload, you know, what's based on data and how we can change it out to an administrative remedy, or maybe there needs to be another type of committee or we'll call it an implementation moving forward. I'm not sure.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Lori. No, understood. And I think that's why it will be helpful for us to be able to be reacting to something on our next call.

Any other comments that anyone would like to raise, you know, with this plan that staff will take the recommendations, use the existing categorization and present it in a plan with a methodology with some proposed metrics, and then we will go through those, you know, one by one in our subsequent calls with - it is an aggressive goal, excuse me, to work towards this December deadline but I think we should do the best we can to try to move towards that.

And if we can't do it, then we make the determination that we can't do it. But if we can keep it at as much of a macro level as we can, hopefully we can shoot for that goal.

Any other - or staff I'll ask you if you have any other specific questions you would like to raise to the group while we have a few more minutes remaining? Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I don't have any specific questions. I think I just want to say that this is all very helpful. I do feel that I have the guidance to move forward. I'll just note actually I would ask all of you to do the doodle poll for the next meeting, and that's for recurring meetings. So please keep in mind for your schedules that we're looking for a time that people can meet on a weekly basis.

And I will note that our chair, Jen, is traveling next week so we're actually really now thinking more about the week after next week, which then staff can use next week to build up this strawman document and have it ready for the following week for the beginning of our, you know, first of our recurring weekly meetings.

So I don't think that everyone has taken - I'm sure that people have not all taken the poll yet so I would just urge you all to do so, so that the sooner we can schedule that, the recurring meetings, the better. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. I think that would work great if you're able to draft something in the next week. And then I'm just looking at the calendar. We would have - if we have a weekly call, we would have about five weeks before that November 21 deadline to get something to Council. So once we get the draft and we have our next call, we can just dig right in and try to keep us on track to work our way through that, you know, make changes that we think are appropriate and hopefully get that completed by the 21st of November.

Any other - and please do take the doodle poll. And I made the mistake of just filling it out for next week where I'm out, but please look at it as every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, what would work for you for the next four or five weeks.

And, Lori, I see your note. Certainly I understand, you know, it's hard to turn up for calls. I know a lot of you are on many working groups and there's a lot that everyone is working on, but certainly at least on list if you're able to see it, you know, make your comments. I will work really hard to make sure I keep track of all of the comments and that we raise those in the calls and that we can all then work together towards creating a really good implementation plan for the GNSO.

Any other comments? Julie, is that a new one? I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: It's a new hand. You reminded me - this is Julie Hedlund - that we do still have the opening for a vice chair or vice chairs, and I'll resend this just to bring it to everyone's attention again, but I did send around the - sort of a guiding document that talks about what the chair and vice chairs are expected to do in the working group.

These are based on the GNSO working group guidelines, but this particular working group would be expected to fall into that category as well so not just applying to PDP working groups but to working groups in general.

So I'd ask everyone to take a look at that; I'll resend it. And then I would ask if people do want to nominate someone or volunteer themselves, to please do so on the list so that everyone knows, you know, who has, you know, who has stated an interest and also to - it would be also helpful if volunteers could say, you know, how, you know, their background and experience, you know, fits into (unintelligible) for a chair or a vice chair. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Yes it would certainly be appreciated if someone wants to volunteer as vice chair so that if I'm not able to be on a call or just need some help, that would be fantastic. And just as a comment too, you know, we do have a tight deadline here for this initial work. I would assume, and we'll obviously decide as a group, but after this initial work is done, we won't need to have a meeting every single week. We'll probably set something maybe every other week, so it won't be such, you know, as big of a time commitment if that is scaring anybody as we move into the implementation. And we might even have subgroups, if that's what's determined later on.

Any other comments for staff as we move forward into them drafting a strawman plan for us to react to? Any other comments or questions that anyone would like to raise at this time? Lori?

Lori Schulman: Hi. Just a question so I understand the task. So we have this initial piece of quick work that is due on December 1 and then we are the group that follows the implementation of the work, whether that takes a year, two, or three? Is that what we signed up for basically?

Jennifer Wolfe: I guess I'm going to ask Larisa. I think that obviously the plan will create perhaps some subgroups but I think our role is to help shepherd those implementation plans through. Julie or Larisa, are you able to comment to that? Yes, Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Is that Larisa? Because Larisa you could go ahead or I can take this. Ah, okay.

Larisa Gurnick: Go ahead, Julie. Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. So this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, I mean I think it's in the charter, I don't have the exact language, but that this group also can be, you know, would be involved in, you know, in helping shepherd the implementation as well. I'll look again at the charter. I don't think that's set up as a requirement but I think that is the idea that this group would, you know, hopefully have the, you know, because of the experience of working on the plan, would have the - also the expertise then to help at least as oversight, you know, since obviously it would be also staff would be very much involved in doing the actual implementation, but, you know, part of that implementation team.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any other comments? I see in the chat there's a nomination for Wolf-Ulrich. Wolf, is that something - I don't want to put you on the spot if you don't want to be put on the spot. We can let you respond. (Lawrence), please go ahead. (Lawrence), is your audio working? Wolf-Ulrich, go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks. Surprisingly I just saw this nomination by (Lawrence). Thanks, (Lawrence), for the credentials. But I understand the nomination period is not finished, not yet, so it's still open and we should, let me say, set a deadline for the next meeting or so and then we'll see. Okay?

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay that works fine. Thank you. Any other comments? (Lawrence), do you have audio now?

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes we can hear you. Go ahead.

(Lawrence):   Yes thank you. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich for bringing that to our notice. Yes I think the nomination is still open. We can have more people come in, but I'm

sure that a lot of value that we can also (unintelligible). That said, I think what we (unintelligible) this period is one having relationships in place to help us build upon on what (unintelligible) for now. (Unintelligible) has more or less like prioritized some of these recommendations.

There are some (unintelligible) I'll have to quickly look at this one. I'm thinking that maybe we might need to - in order to meet with the deadline of having to present something to council, you know, we're looking at November or much, much later. We might maybe first of all pick some of the points that we have before us, especially those that are not in disagreement at all (unintelligible) while work on the others are ongoing, so to say.

It appears that if we're going to have workgroups, we might not be able to have so much workgroups. So I think that at this stage, we should quickly work on leadership so that maybe by the next call or the call after that, we can pick some of the issues and start working on them since we don't have much time before us to work with and get (unintelligible) that we have to take into consideration that would include us till the end of the year, especially after Hyderabad.

We might not have a full complement of the team because of Thanksgiving and everything. So I think at this point we need to quickly work on having strong leadership in place and not just to have (unintelligible) but also have to direct the fallback. But I think the leadership working with staff presents (unintelligible) then the work can continue well, you know, work can continue. That's just my little contribution for now.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, (Lawrence).

(Lawrence):   That was (Lawrence) for the record.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sorry, I didn't hear the last part.

(Lawrence):   That was (Lawrence) for the record.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay thank you, (Lawrence). Any other comments before we close out the call? Okay seeing none, we'll go ahead and wrap up the call. Thank you everybody for your time today and your comments. We will look forward to receiving the draft plan from staff. And certainly for those of you who can't be on the next call, please do respond on list and we will make sure we incorporate your comments.

And for anyone else who might listen to the recording later, if you aren't able to be on the call, please know your comments will all be incorporated on list and we'll look for the next meeting to be set after everyone takes the doodle poll and to then be responding more substantively to a draft plan. So thank you to everyone and thank you very much to staff for taking the lead and doing some of the heavy lifting for us. That will help us in achieving our goal and meeting our deadline.

If there's no other comments, that concludes the meeting. Thank you.

END