ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Tuesday, 18 October 2016 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: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-wg-18oct16-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Members:
Heath Dixon (RrSG Primary)
Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)
Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)
Donna Austin (RySG Alternate)

Participants:
Advocate Mahendra Limaye
Pascal Bekono
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts

Apologies:
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (ISPCP)

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Julie Hedlund
Larisa Gurnick
Charla Shambley
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de Saint Gery
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call held on Tuesday the 18th of October, 2016.

On the call today we have Sara Bockey, Donna Austin, Mahendra Limaye, Heath Dixon, Jennifer Wolfe and Pascal Bekono. We have listed apologies from Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Larisa Gurnick, Charla Shambley, Lars Hoffmann and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With this I'll turn it back over to Jennifer. Please begin.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you and thank you to all of you who are able to be here today. We certainly appreciate your continued time and commitment to the work that we are doing and creating an implementation plan for the recommendations of the GNSO review that have been approved to move forward.

For those of you who may be reading the transcript or listening to the recording, we certainly appreciate your continued participation on last or providing your comments and feedback.

Just a matter of our formality, have there been any changes to anyone's statement of interest? Okay seeing none, we'll move on. Our agenda for today, we have a one-hour timeslot for our call. We are still looking for vice chairs so we will speak to us briefly about that.

But the primary substance of our call today is to have staff present to us the draft strawman plan that they have created. We determined in our last call that with the volume of work that we have to do and the short time frame that that would probably help give us a platform from which to frame our

discussion and move this forward. So a big part of our call today will be staff presenting to us what's been drafted, and we will then comment on the overall structure and plan, and then begin to move into the sections and have the more substantive conversation. And of course we will close out with our next steps at our next meeting.

So with that, I'm the vice chair, we are hoping to have a vice chair at some point in time in the event that I'm not able to be on a meeting due to my travel schedule, and of course just to help support the efforts. Are there any volunteers to serve in that role?

Mahendra Limaye: I would like to participate but I'm relatively new to the procedures and (unintelligible) with procedure.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. And if we could just ask, you're not in the Adobe Connect are you? Mahendra, right? That's…

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Are you on Adobe Connect? Are you able to see the screen?

Mahendra Limaye: I didn't (unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: Are you able to see the screen in the Adobe Connect room?

Mahendra Limaye: No, no there is no (unintelligible) mechanism.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Okay understood. Understood. We certainly welcome your participation. Were you trying to volunteer as…

Mahendra Limaye: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: … vice chair or were you just saying you would like to be - participate?

Mahendra Limaye: Yes, I would like to (unintelligible) since I am new to this (unintelligible) the vice chair and I'm (unintelligible) my nomination but I would certainly like to contribute (unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well thank you. We certainly - we welcome your participation. Julie, I see your hand is up…

Mahendra Limaye: Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: … did you want to proceed?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'll send around the requirements for chair and vice chair just so folks have that. What we asked before, and when I sent it I'll do this again, is that we do ask that someone - if someone is volunteering for the vice chair position to provide a little bit of context concerning their skills and experience relating to the chair and vice chair requirements. So I will follow up after this call and send it around as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you Julie. Okay well without why don't we go ahead and move forward to the substance of our call today? As I said, staff has circulated the strawman draft. And so what I'd like to ask, and I don't know, Julie, if you want to present it or if someone else from staff, but if you could talk us through and show us the document and help us understand how it was created and the thought process behind it and then we could move into discussing the sections and moving specifically into the substance of the document. Julie, is that you, a new hand?

Julie Hedlund: That's a new hand.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. I'm happy to go ahead and walk us through the document.

Jennifer Wolfe: Perfect. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: So again this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Everyone should just start with an overview of the document. And I'm going to leave this synced because then I'll be able to move through it as I'm speaking. And at any time if anybody has any questions just please do raise your hand. We can certainly move into discussion after I've run through the overview, but, you know, if there's any questions as I'm speaking please do raise your hand.

So just a little bit of background again, in case folks weren't -- for the people who might not have been on the last call. As Jen mentioned, the request went to staff to produce a strawman draft of the GNSO review recommendations implementation plan.

This is to assist the working group to move forward perhaps a little more quickly. The intent of this draft is to provide some suggestions and guidance to help move along a discussion concerning the implementation plan. So this is really to assist the working group. Staff is not, you know, putting out here anything near, you know, a finished product. It really is just for guidance and also to help the working group move along a little more quickly.

And so just starting at the first page, this is just a standard template that we use. And we do note that this is a strawman that is provided for consideration by the GNSO Review Working Group, so it is just, you know, suggestions and guidance right now.

And I'll just move to the table of contents to show you what the structure of the document is. The table of contents and the structure of the document follows very closely to what was discussed in the slides at the last meeting. In the slides that staff provided in the working group discussed, we talked about

what might be the various sections or content covered in an implementation plan.

Some of this is standard to any document so what you see here of course in the executive summary, which we would always want to include in any longer document, and some background of course on, you know, why we are where we are, what the background to the document, to the GNSO review and how we got to this point.

And then there would be possibly an overview of the recommendations, just a high-level overview of, you know, how they originated, you know, how they are grouped, that sort of thing. And I'll go through these sections one by one as well.

And then there is really the heart of the document and that is prioritizing the recommendations and also pulling out the various dependencies. So one of the things that the working group asked staff at the last call was to look at the recommendations and suggest possible prioritization perhaps in batches looking out say what may already be being done, what are things that were agreed on without any modifications by the GNSO Review Working Party, and then what were items that were agreed on with modifications.

And then also looking at, you know, are there dependencies between these recommendations? Is there a way to group them that might make sense based on, you know, their topic areas or areas of work? You know, are there resource requirements? Are there budgetary requirements?

So one of the things that staff have done, and I'll cover this in more detail when we get to that section, is to just make some suggestions both sort of examples of what kinds of information we would be looking for there, and then also some suggestions for some of the recommendations, really just for discussion and consideration for the working group.

And then another area that we suggested could be included in the plan is - and this was in last meeting of slides, is a methodology so what, you know, how are we going to approach the work of the implementation? And so that's also a key section of the plan.

And of course a timeline for the work, you know, when do we expect certain deliverables, you know, how are we batching these things? Are we doing them, you know, one year? If there a, you know, and then another year or is there overlap? And so that's important to include.

And the last item is something that when I get to the section I can show it to you again in more detail, but ICANN is standardizing or trying to standardize the way it does implementation juried this is something that has started I think already with ATRT 2, where there are templates that we can use to group items in progress and to ensure that, you know, the various details and aspects that one would expect to have in an implementation plan are covered and covered consistently across all of the recommendations and implementation.

So that is included as an annex. And I can speak to that when we get to that section. So that's the overview of the document. And I want to stop there and see if anybody has any questions or any suggestions of what might be missing. And anything else that anybody would like to say. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any comments? I think, not seen any comments, I think that makes a lot of sense. It does fit a good structure and organizational structure to this document. So if you want to go ahead and continue on into the document that would be helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund again. So I'll move along here. And, you know, you'll note in this plan that there is some language that staff has put in just suggested language at this point and then indicated where there would be more text added as we get to more final version of the plan. And

that's the case here in the executive summary that we would have additional information to add once we get closer, you know, to a final version.

And then moving to the background, again, nothing really new here, a discussion of, you know, how the review transpired. And then, you know, what was the result of the review, how were the recommendations grouped in the final report by the independent examiner, and then of course the work of the GNSO Review Working Party and its feasibility and prioritization analysis and recommendations arising from that report.

And then, you know, moving into the adoption of that report and approval of the recommendations by the ICANN Board and then the requirements for the implementation plan. So again, this can be modified as we get to a final version but it would be fairly standard information to include.

And I do note in the chat that Lawrence has joined on the telephone.

So moving along to the overview of the recommendations, again, this would be more of a high-level overview just talking about again how they were originally organized. And then how they were evaluated by the GNSO Review Working Party. And again these are all just suggestions by staff.

And then again in a little bit more detail about the feasibility and prioritization analysis. And then we're moving into sort of a description of what we are - how were grouping the recommendations in this implementation plan. The defection of the overview is likely to change. You know, if this working group decides on a different order of categorization for example, or prioritization than this section would change. So again some of these things will be finalized really once the working group finalizes the prioritization and dependencies and sort of the grouping of the various recommendations.

So that is the overview section. And I hope I'm not going too fast but I do kind of want to get to what I think is sort of the heart of this discussion here today.

And that is Section 3, and I do thank Chuck Gomes for noting that the numbering is off in this section and staff will go ahead and fix that in our next iteration of the document.

So I'm going to spend I think probably most of the time on this. So before I launch into this section just briefly pausing, any questions about the document and the sections of the document I've covered thus far? And I'm not seen any hands up so I'll go ahead and proceed on the prioritization and dependencies.

So the first thing to note here is staff looked first at what the GNSO Review Working Party had done in its organization and prioritization in particular of the recommendations.

The Review Working Party did provide a prioritization. And that was based on very extensive analysis they did, a spreadsheet that where they looked at, you know, not only, you know, whether or not a recommendation was work that was already underway, whether or not it was a recommendation that was agreed to without modifications, or whether it was a recommendation agreed with modification.

They also assigned to the recommendations whether or not they were low, medium or high priority and also sort of the level of difficulty of implementation. And based on that they had provided a prioritization. And staff have taken that prioritization looking at it, it seems to make a great deal of sense and it was based on extensive evaluation.

So that is what staff suggests could be the starting point for the working group. Of course as the working group have more time to look through this plan and, you know, has other suggestions for prioritization, you know, we're happy to do that. This just seemed to be a logical starting point.

And then I will show you that as we get into these recommendations I'll show you then how those fall. But that's the explanation for the current prioritization in this document. Any questions on that?

Mahendra Limaye: None.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. So one of the other things that staff did as a suggestion is, while we looked through the recommendations they appear to fall into three different categories. These could perhaps be broken down further, but at least as a starting point we thought it might be useful to look at the broader categories in which the recommendations fell.

And what we found is that there appeared to be three categories or groupings of the recommendations. And I'm seeing that Pascal is asking the question. "Is it possible to add an annex in this document with the recommendations?"

Actually, Pascal, the recommendations are in the document. Are you asking whether or not we could add the - in the annex the spreadsheet evaluation that was in the feasibility and prioritization? And I see Marika is typing. Because we certainly can add the spreadsheet in which the Review Working Party, you know, produced its feasibility and prioritization report.

Yes, and also we can link to the wiki to where there are documents. It is true that the spreadsheet, for example, is quite lengthy. So we have a couple of different options there. But just to go forward, or groupings that seemed logical to staff, and of course these can be changed, but just as a starting point for discussion. And the recommendations themselves are listed here.

It seems that there was a group of recommendations that related to the policy development process to improvements, to effectiveness and implementation. And so those recommendations are coded as blue. They're not necessarily grouped together, and I'll show you why, but they are in blue so that one can see that they kind of fall into the same group.

And then the next grouping that seemed logical was the recommendations that related to the various GNSO components, so the GNSO Council, stakeholder groups and constituencies, and their appointments, membership, members, statements of interest, procedures and support. So basically anything that relates to the Council, the stakeholder groups and the constituencies those are all grouped together and coded as brown.

And then the third grouping that seemed to make sense was it had to do with working groups and how they operate so we value waiting performance, for example. Evaluating participation and also encouraging participation so things like outreach, and, you know, tools to make it easier for people in different regions to participate, the self-evaluation and, you know, ways to support volunteers and to encourage leadership. So that seemed to be a logical grouping as well.

And I see Lawrence is joining the room. Thank you.

So I'm going to stop there and I'll show you some examples of these, but I know we have, you know, certainly staff who, you know, we're supporting the working party, and I know they've had a chance to look at this as well but does anybody have any questions about that grouping at this time or does suggest a groupings, shall I say.

Jennifer Wolfe: So, Julie, I'll just ask the question to you and also to the group here. As you went through this, do you think the way that we should attack this is to take these three sections and talk about these all in one grouping because they're related? Is that what you see as the most effective and efficient way forward?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. That may be. I think what I found just as I was - as we as staff were, you know, running through this exercise of putting these things together, and this is also part of the methodology to approach the plan. In

some of these senses, like here's just an example, there are several items that have to do with statement of interest.

They are at various levels of prioritization but say anything having to do with statement of interest might make sense as, you know, a discrete project where it might be, you know, this might be added to the statement of interest or maybe there has to be, you know, more of a requirement for statements of interest or maybe we need, you know, more types of members to do statements of interest.

All of those might be something that could be grouped as a project. And, you know, and same thing with perhaps, you know, some of the, you know, sort of membership items. You know, maybe those are just - could be as simple as making some changes to that particular section of the GNSO Operating Procedures that has to do with stakeholder group and constituency membership, you know, or changes to, you know, that section of the procedures that deals with statement of interest.

So I think that's sort of the next step, is if we accept the categories that we have here or as we finalize the categories, shall I say, then I think the working group can say okay, based on this and based on the level of priority these items seem to be a logical group as a project. Because we will have, and just moving ahead to just preview what will be the tool that we can use to do that, is this GNSO review recommendation charter.

And the idea is that not that one would complete this charter for every recommendation but that one would try to see how many, you know, recommendations make sense to put together as a project and then complete a charter for that particular project. You know, and that, you know, with dependencies, you know, with the goals, with the timeline, risks, performance, deliverables, etcetera. So that's one possible approach. So is that helpful to you to Jen into the working group members?

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that is helpful. And I think it does make sense, you know, for a couple of reasons. One, you know, we could schedule a call just to talk about, you know, each one of these categories or it might be a series of calls. But at least then we are talking about similar issues and how to put a project team together to implement those issues. I think that certainly makes sense in terms of moving forward into implementation.

You know, I certainly welcome comments from everyone on the call. But I would also just asked the question then, you know, when we talked about batching, do we then really just see three - like these are the three batches that we would save these should be rolled out at a certain point in time. What is - I'd be curious to know what other people think.

We have talked about not trying to do all of this in one year because it's not really feasible so, you know, when we start to look at how these get rolled out if we have these three projects, you know, how would we then batch those? Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. One consideration, and I think this is something that Wolf-Ulrich may have mentioned and possibly Chuck as well, but there is work that was identified in a number of recommendations that the working party determined is work that's already underway.

So one of the things that - and so what staff did is pulled these items out. And the working party had actually also put these in order of priority. So staff pulled them out in order of priority, and some of these could be dispatched relatively quickly in that if we can, you know, in many cases here it does point to the work that is underway, you know, how this is covered. And after these items it might just be a slight modification to what's already being done or a slight, you know, addition to what's being done.

Or perhaps no change in what's being done but, you know, just the monitoring of it. And, you know, so just as an example here,

Recommendation 16, that we, you know, we adopt the policy impact assessment as part of standard part of the process. This is actually something that's already in the PDP manual.

And so of the GNSO action items that the working party had identified was, you know, is there a framework for assessing the policy impacts? You know, what would be measured? And so it might be that, you know, that this is covered say in the final report of the data and metrics for policymaking, DMPM, working group final report.

It may be a matter of simply looking at that and saying yes, looks like that recommendation is covered and so we can mark that as complete. And so one suggestion might be to start by looking at these first, addressing them, you know, right away as sort of a first batch because they should be so to speak low hanging fruit. And so it might not make sense to say pull the, you know, the blue items out and put them with something that maybe is not in progress because conceivably doing that would flow some of those things down.

But it might make sense to take say the blue items here in the work that's already been done, you know, and, you know, take them together and say, you know, are there any dependencies between these and, you know, and how are they being, you know, how are they being addressed at this time. And so that's one possible way to start.

And then the other two items - other two areas that staff pulled out as possible prioritization is those items that were recommendations for the working party listed as agreed and not needing any modification, and then perhaps the ones that will be a little bit more difficult to deal with would be those that are agreed that require some modifications to the recommendations.

So that's one suggested way of how we could start by doing the work underway, but then also looking for perhaps the highest priority items in both the work that's agreed on, the work that's agreed with modifications and address them first in their categories. And then maybe the medium ones, may be low. And some of these could be done concurrently with the work that party underway because that should be pretty easy because some of that may not need, you know, any additional work at all.

I don't know if that's helpful, Jen. And I've been talking an awful lot here so there are other staff on the call is anyone else has anything they want to add to what I've said.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any comments from the group? I think that's what I'm trying to get my head around right now is just, you know, how we proceed in terms of digging into these issues. You know, I like the idea of tackling the things that might be, you know, putting things together that might be really easy because there's work already being done and we could dispatch those very easily.

But I also like the idea of grouping them by category, how you have the PDP improvement since the one, you know, the membership related issues and the working group performance. I'd love to have some comments from anyone on the call as to how you think we should proceed. And just keep in mind our goal is to try to be as efficient as possible so that we can move into the substance. But we want to make sure we've framed the conversation in the best possible way to do our work. Any comments?

I see Donna is typing.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. Is that Mahendra or Lawrence? No? Okay. Any other - any comments?

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Donna is saying the groupings make sense. Okay. Donna is still typing. Any other comments from anyone? Or even staff, I know you've really dug into this. And I know we're dealing with a lot of recommendations so we're just trying to be as efficient as we can. Anyone else from staff would like to comment? Donna, please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Julie. Donna Austin. Sorry, not Julie, Jen. I'm not typing so fast this morning so I thought I'd try to talk. So I think the groupings appear to make sense. I guess it's a balance between, you know, what are the high priorities. Sometimes it's a case of what is a low hanging fruit, which generally turns out not to be so low.

So I guess it's just finding a balance between how we want to prioritize the work. So, you know, the groupings make sense. We've got some that are high-priority. Are we going to do the groupings, sorry, is this group going to - how do we work through those, you know, groupings? Is it a stage thing? You know, do some have absolute timelines that have to be agreed to? So I think it's fine but perhaps there's other layers to it just to get the balance right. Thanks, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Donna. And Lawrence, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Thank you. This is Lawrence for the record. I think I'm also in support of the beautiful way it's been documented (unintelligible). That may be to help us work faster if it's possible to look at the ones where the area categorization where we had (unintelligible) fully agree to, partially agree to and (unintelligible) at all. Is it possible if we (unintelligible) the first category which is those which each and every, I mean, which everybody agreed to, we could still -- it might be possible to still break them down into the three categories because then we know where it's supposed, I mean, where the action is supposed to sit.

So maybe with that we could first of all deal with the ones that, you know, we all, I mean, that have previously been agreed to. So in other words we could have (unintelligible) these three categories, the working group performance, the GNSO Council and the other category, I'm not privy to see that now.

So maybe if we take it in that light, if we still need to break it further in that light we can then deal with those that have been agreed to and then take the other two categories and work on them. But at least we will have been able to deal with some aspects of the tracks ahead of us. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Lawrence. And Julie, I see your hand's up. Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: I this is Julie Hedlund. Thank you. So first of all, I do want to note that this (unintelligible) to the list. I think most working group members have not had a chance to, you know, to really spend any time in detail, you know, looking at this in detail. And so I'm also going to look forward to, you know, looking at, you know, hearing from comments on the list as well.

And in fact in particular I note that Wolf-Ulrich Knoben had originally planned to be available for this call that now he is unable to be - did say that he would send his comments on the plan to the list. And so I expect we will get some additional comments and questions once the working group members have had a chance to read this.

But I'm wondering, Jen, if it might be okay if I start - if I go through this section just a little bit more detail because I think that might answer some of the questions that - and the questions in particular that Lawrence had.

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely. I was just thinking the same thing that I think we have a good understanding of how we can group some things. But why don't you take us through this? And also 100% agree, I know I was traveling and didn't have a chance to read it thoroughly. I just was able to look at it briefly. So I think with all of us having this discussion we can now have time to actually read the

document and begin to really formulate more detailed comments on last. But please, Julie, let's use this time for you to continue to present the document to us.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. So as mentioned before, the first area that staff broke out was the work that's already underway. And some of these, some of these and in fact, you know, staff can of course assist with this analysis. But some of these could indeed be marked completed.

I think actually even a lot of this work was done, you see some of the links here as I go through these, it might be that it's just a matter of checking back - staff checking back to say, okay, this is, you know, here is a point or two exactly what's being done. This is how it's being done. And then maybe the working group saying, you know, looking at them and saying yes, okay that we agree that's been done. We can mark that off.

Or, you know, this might need some additional work. You know, and, you know, what work is that? How will that be addressed? And it might just be a very minor, you know, implementation plan or charter for the items that still have additional work.

And those could be grouped, you know, to the extent that they fit together. So for instance here is a couple of examples, Recommendation 11 and 14. Both of these deal with, you know, with the PDP and how the work of the PDP is addressed and assessed. So, you know, there is the PDP working group pilot project. You know, then is that, you know, maybe it's just a matter of doing an evaluation or having a, you know, a few metrics to evaluate how that pilot project, you know, it's going.

And then also for example, on PDP chunking that is something that's already being done. We can point to some examples of where that's happening. And it might be that, you know, we determined that that's been addressed. So I'm

not going to go through each one of these and, you know, describe them. But that might be an approach for the work that's already been done.

And that's really actually quite a few recommendations, as you see here, of items that, you know, could conceivably be dispatched fairly quickly and something that, you know, staff could then go out and find those links, you know, find those projects and, you know, and note how they've been addressed. So that's one approach.

Then as, you know, Lawrence was asking about the, you know, agreed recommendations and then there's also the recommendations that were agreed by with modification. Again, the GNSO Review Working Party did organize in priorities the agreed recommendations as well as those agreed with modifications. And that is the prioritization that we've picked up here. But then also added the, you know, the color coding for how these fit in their various categories.

And then an additional area we did identify some dependencies in the work that's already been done but needless to say there aren't as many dependencies there because some of these things are already addressed. But one of the things the working group asked staff to do in the last call was for each of the recommendations to pull out dependencies, information on who might be the implementer, you know, resource requirements and possible budget affects.

And what staff did here was we didn't get really - there wasn't time and it's not really necessarily appropriate for staff to get too deep into these, but staff did provide some text as a guidance to the working group members to consider, you know, for each of these recommendations. And these items are called out in yellow in here, so you can see that there's something that the working group is going to need to discuss.

And here's an example of, as I mentioned before, things that we might group together as a high priority. And this is, I'm looking at Recommendation 27. And that was the, you know, having a centralized list of members and individual participants of all the constituency and stakeholder groups.

I know that in the GNSO Operating Procedures now there are guidelines for stakeholder groups and constituencies as far as membership lists and so one, but I don't think that there is something that says that this information needs to be available and public, for instance, or centrally located, for example. I think these things are right now, you know, something that's maintained by each of the SGs and Cs.

So, you know, we might then group everything that has to do with membership and statements of interest together in one batch. And if it's something that's marked as a high priority then, and that might include the agreed with modifications items that are related and perhaps we put those all in a, you know, sort of a high priority, you know, Batch 1 categorization.

But just moving through here, just to show you again the color coding, the grouping and categories but these are also listed in order of priority and that's the priority that was identified by the GNSO working party, and the working group -- this working group can of course change that if it likes.

And then, and I'll just note with Recommendation 21, this was one that was not originally recommended to implement but the GNSO Council had changed this to implement but it listed it as a low priority so that's why that can read there.

Some of these dependencies, I will note for instance, you'll see here with this one there's quite a few dependencies listed. This is actually not text that staff developed. These are dependencies that were identified by the working party and the community when there was a public discussion on - and I forget

which ICANN meeting it was. But there was a public discussion, and meeting on the recommendations.

And in this discussion there were issues raised concerning dependencies particularly on this recommendation. And for staff went back and, you know, picked up those comments and put them in here, at least as a starting point for the working group to consider.

So any questions on that section, that's the agreed recommendations, you know, in order of priority and then coded according to the various categories?

Then an interest of time I'll go ahead and move along. Then the next - the third category is agreed recommendations with modifications. Again these are in order of priority. And that was the prioritization that the working party had suggested. And again staff has put in some suggested dependencies, implementers, resources, and budget affects.

And there aren't a lot in that category. And it might be that, you know, that some of these might get - might be logical say for instance, to, you know, take these and, you know, by category and, you know, depending on their priority, you know, group them with, you know, others in their category better in the, you know, that are the recommendations that are agreed but without modifications.

So that's something that the working group can look at as well. And of course staff can help with some suggested groupings there.

So that was the areas that the staff had laid out and that really build on the work of the GNSO Review Working Party. And so I'll stop there and see if there are any further questions. I don't know if that helps you, Lawrence, as far as seeing how we've laid things out.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. This is - and it's a tremendous amount of work. And I certainly want to thank all of you on staff for all the work and the thought process that went into it. Having been the chair of the GNSO Review Working Party, you know, I think it's great to see that a lot of the hard work that we did and going through all of the recommendations is hopefully now framing this conversation. And I want to thank you for all the work you did in putting this document together. It's certainly going to help make our job easier.

I'd like to ask if there are other comments. I know we're coming up towards the top of the hour. I'm thinking that what may make the most sense is to give everyone, you know, this next week to actually go in and read the documents with a bit more detail, perhaps formulate comments on list that they can provide back to the working group and his staff.

And then in the interest of time, and I do want to take just a few minutes and talk about our timeframe in terms of completing this work, that we would then schedule a call perhaps next week if we can, to keep this moving forward so that in our subsequent call, now that everyone has had time to review this, we can begin to go through each of the recommendations and start filling in the blanks, so to speak, and then move this forward to where we actually can create these project groupings as recommended.

And again we can identify low hanging fruit, but try to create these work tracks to then go forward. Can you remind us, I know we were shooting for December I think to get this before Council. Is that correct, Julie? Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, so there are two GNSO Council meetings in December. There's one on the 1st and one of the 15th. And I think the deadline for documents and motions for the 1st is I think it's the 21st November, but staff can pull up that date.

I think that, you know, the requirement is simply to get this in front of the Council, you know, in November but also to get it to the Board by the end of

the year. So ideally we would want to shoot for that first Council meeting because there is always the possibility too that councilors, you know, could defer a vote in which case they could be deferred, you know, to the next meeting. So I would say if we could shoot for 21 November, now that is very short.

So, you know, also with respect to next meetings, the Doodle that we did was supposed to be for recurring meetings so we are hopeful that that means…

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: …this time would be the time that we would then plan to meet weekly, which really would just give us next week because I think the following week people will be traveling to, you know, to ICANN 57. But we do also have a meeting scheduled at ICANN 57 as well for our working meeting.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So if that works we could go ahead and schedule the call for next Tuesday. And I think let's see what we can get done unless the next week and then just begin and try to work, you know, as best we can towards the goal that we have. And, you know, we can reassess at a certain point if we think that that's not going to be feasible.

But I think with the work that you've done to help set this up and the ability for us to go in on list and provide feedback we can hopefully keep this moving forward.

I know there was a comment, Lawrence had said in the chat to break it into groups. I think that is the goal here is that once we create this macro level recommendations then each of those, you know, Julie used the term project, so to speak, but tackling, you know, PDP issues or membership related issues could become smaller subgroups moving forward. So I think that is absolutely the plan.

I know there was a question too, and I had that too, I am not going to be able to be in India due to some other commitments. Do we have a time schedule for this meeting? That would be helpful to know in terms of trying to block off time whether you're there in person or he would be on the phone.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. We do have a time schedule for the meeting. It's actually - there's two possible slots. And I don't know - I can't think of it just off the top of my head. But I'll send that around on the list so that people can start planning. I think there was a slot that we could either do in the morning, I think from 9:00 to 10:00 or otherwise I think it's from 11:00 to 12:00 on Monday the 7th of November. But I'll send that around.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Okay. And so you still - people are already traveling on November 1, is that we were saying?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, actually…

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: … will be traveling and staff will be traveling as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: …will be in the air until the 2nd so…

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: So that week and the week of November 7 - so the week of October 31 we would probably skip that week and maybe just continue work on list? And then…

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: That's correct. I think you would not be able to try to do something that week since…

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: …the - because ICANN 57 actually starts on the 3rd so, you know, then people will be, you know…

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: …of meetings, you know, starting on the 3rd and traveling, you know. It takes two days to get there so for most people so, yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right, of course, okay. Okay so we would plan, just looking at our calendar then, we will schedule a call for next Tuesday, which is October 25, at the same time. We will not have a meeting of the week of November 1. The week of November 7 we will have the meeting in India and try to get as much participation as we can.

In the meantime we can continue to work on list. And then we would resume our calls on the 15th? Correct? November 15?

Julie Hedlund: I think that's correct, yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay so that's - so if staff could kindly send our calendar invites for those dates and times may be getting out at least through November or the first week of December so that we have those on our calendar that would be very

helpful I think for all of us, so that as we are planning other meetings we don't accidentally booked something else if we forget that we've set this recurring meeting.

Julie Hedlund: And I see Terri has her hand up. Maybe she's addressed…

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh yes, Terri, sorry.

Terri Agnew: That's okay. Hi, this is Terri just for the transcript. Just as a friendly reminder, time zones will be adjusting while worrying Hyderabad…

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh goodness.

Terri Agnew: …I know. So for the Tuesday, November 15 call, most working groups will adjust their start time as well. Should we go ahead and do that for this call? Basically we will keep it scheduled at the same - it'll still be at this time so…

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Yes, instead of 1300 UTC time it'll be 1400 UTC time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Terri Agnew: For the 15th.

Julie Hedlund: That would make it - that makes it then 8:00 am for you, Jen…

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I mean, I had to do the math in my head…

Jennifer Wolfe: …look up the chart to remember, like I can't even remember what it is so thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Usually what we do is we do not change the UTC time because that just makes it easier so it's 1300 UTC, that just - that stays the same. And then adjust for not depending on the person's time zone.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. I'm going to trust that all our software systems will work, and if you send out a calendar invites it will show up at the right time.

Julie Hedlund: It should. The calendar should figure that out.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, all right. Well I know we are at the top of the hour. I know some people probably have to drop for other things. Thank you so much. Thank you specifically to staff, to all of you, to Julie, this is really helpful. I think this is going to allow us to do our work very efficiently. For everyone who's been on the call, thank you for your time.

And please do, you know, let's use the list to help us move this forward because we do have a lot to get through in a short period of time. And if you can go through the document and provide your comments on list that will certainly help us to incorporate those comments and move this document forward. So anyone else have any final comments?

Okay, seeing none, that will close the meeting. And we will reconvene next Tuesday.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks everyone. Thanks so much, Jen. And we'll talk next week.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, thanks everybody. Goodbye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please deliver to disconnect all remaining lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END