

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Tuesday, 15 November 2016 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Review Working Group on the Tuesday, 15 November 2016 at 14:00 UTC. 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 may be also found at:
<https://community.icann.org/x/MiS4Aw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-15nov16-en.mp3>

Attendance:

Amr Elsadr

Avri Doria

Heath Dixon

Jen Wolfe

Pascal Bekono

Rafik Dammak

Sara Bockey

Apologies:

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts

Wolf Ulrich Knobon

Staff:

Marika Konings

Julie Hedlund

Lars Hoffmann

Michelle DeSmyter

Coordinator: The recordings have started. Speakers, you may begin.

Michelle DeSmyter: All right. Thank you, . Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 15th of November at 1400 UTC. On the call today we do have Heath Dixon, Pascal Bekono, Jen Wolfe, Sara Bockey, Avri Doria and Rafik Dammak.

We have apologies noted from Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. From staff we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund and myself, Michelle DeSmyter. As a reminder, if you could please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you. And with this I'll turn the call back over to Jen Wolfe.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you and thanks to everybody for taking time to be here for this call today. I certainly appreciate it. I apologize. I was not able to be there in person during the ICANN 57 meeting. I was able to listen to the recording so I think I'm up to speed on, you know, for everybody's comments and where we ended up.

I think with our timetable to try to move this document forward at the conclusion of this call we should go ahead and jump right in. I did just want to add – oh, I'm sorry, I forgot, I was supposed to ask if there's any changes to anyone's statement of interest. Let me make sure I pause to do that procedural. Any changes? No. Okay, I apologize for that.

So our goal today is to continue through the recommendations. I did note and listening to the recording from last week, you know, concerns about there being a lot of work to do. I just want to, you know, frame this conversation that this is still just creating this very macro-level plan. It's not getting into the weeds and all the details.

So what we're trying to do right now is tackle all of these recommendations and create a high level implementation plan that could then be presented to Council and commented upon and/or revised and ultimately approved and then this working group will continue our work as we move each of these recommendations into the proposed implementation step. So I know it feels like we're trying to do a lot very quickly and we certainly are. But just to keep that in mind as we go through this that we are at a macro-level.

So if there aren't any other comments to start, let's go ahead and move right into Recommendation 20. We have now moved into the recommendations that were flagged as a prioritization of medium or low by the working party so we're moving through to these things that were identified as not as large of a priority. So when we talk about our scaled approach this would be in the last bucket of recommendations to address.

So with that we can start with just the final recommendation was that the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's strategic objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's strategic objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.

If you look down to the proposed implementation steps, we now have in here that this working group would review if and how the GNSO Council has done this to date, if at all. And based upon the outcome of that the GNSO Review Working Group, our group here, would work with staff to develop a lightweight process for Council to participate in the development of ICANN's strategic objectives.

Any comments? I do see, Julie, that you redlined in those, and I think that came from the context of the discussion in the meeting last week. Any comments or concerns about this proposed implementation steps? Julie, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Jen, yes, actually sorry, not to be more clear, actually we didn't cover any of these last week. What we have in here, just the initial suggestions that I had put in, you know, that staff had put in. And then we've had some additional staff changes. And so that's redline really what you see in there is just some additional changes suggested by staff to the text that was already in there.

It's redlined because it's in addition to on top of the version that was sent last week, following last week's call. So anyway not a big deal but just wanted to point that out.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you, Julie, that's very helpful clarification. Any comments from the group on these proposed implementation steps? And this is, again, I think another example where we are simply saying there's more work to be done in this group will tackle that work.

Julie, is that a new hands or is that the same one? Okay. All right let's move on to the next recommendation. So moving on to Recommendation 21, just to briefly recap the final recommendation was the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and ensure those affected are well represented.

So if we want to go ahead and scroll down, hopefully you all have had a chance to read some of the comments on that. But where we've ended up with a proposed implementation step is that staff would work with the GNSO to institute methods of information sharing of highly relevant research related to the new gTLDs, or excuse me, to gTLDs to help the GNSO community members increase their knowledge base and ability to analyze potential impact.

These could, for example, include regular staff briefings, implementing the recommendations of the DMPM Working Group, and CCT RT data. Julie, did you want to provide more information on that?

Julie Hedlund: Actually I wanted to, and sorry I didn't say this sooner, there's sort of an overarching question that we can consider as we go through these. And that is that we could consider whether or not, you know, how we want to close these out. You know, in this, you know, for instance, I think, you know, this seems pretty clear, you know, that, you know, of what the staff would do.

I guess the question for each of these recommendations, is there any step that the working group thinks needs to be taken either by the working group to say, yes, we agree that now this recommendation is closed? Does that need to be said?

And the other question is, does the GNSO have to, you know, sort of certify, approve, you know, is there a final step for the GNSO Council to say, for example, to say yes, we agree with this, you know, but this implementation is done.

You know, recognizing that if we had the GNSO do that for each one of these recommendations that could be really onerous, you know, and how would that work for the timing? And maybe there's only certain of these recommendations where the working group might think that oh, this one is a big one and, you know, we think that, you know, there needs to be a step for the Council. Some recommendations clearly have that. In particular were there any changes to the GNSO operating procedures, those have to go to the council for approval.

But some things like this, it's less clear that there would need to be any step by the Council or really any sort of ratification necessarily by the GNSO Working Group. For one thing that staff had put in was, you know, sort of this, you know, final ratification step. You know, GNSO Working Group – yes, the GNSO Review Working Group, you know, agrees that this implementation is complete. And we've actually taken that out I think in most instances. And maybe that's just implied.

Anyway that's just a question for you all to consider as we go through these, whether or not there is an additional step that you would like us to put in here.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. And I think with this one in particular, since it's, you know, the comments as you can read through the table from Council and the working party was, as opposed to commissioning, you know, some sort of analysis, that was more of staff providing that information. So I understand that then it is a matter of how do we determine that that has been implemented, is staff simply providing information.

Are there any comments from the group on this one, any changes that you think should be made to the implementation steps, since we're now talking about staff providing information to the GNSO versus commissioning some sort of study. No comments? Seeing no comments, you know, I think, Julie, perhaps there is an implied this working group is the accountability mechanism to go back and ensure that, you know, we will need to go back and make sure each of these implementation steps are taken.

So maybe perhaps, you know, what I could see is this - the sort of just like a hanging staff is to work with GNSO, you know, to provide this information. Is there some deadline or timeframe in which we say this should occur or it should be done on a recurring basis. You know, and should that be annually, you know, how frequently should that be?

Any comments from anyone on the call or staff? Marika, you know, also want to include something in relation of regular reporting. What do you think would be a reasonable timeframe? Is this once a year? Should it be more frequent than that? Less frequent? Every ICANN meeting is what Marika is saying. Thoughts on that? That's every ICANN meeting there would be a briefing I guess by staff with this information. Or a status report, Marika is saying in the chat. Any other comments from anybody on this one?

I see Heath is typing. That's a good timeframe. Okay, well seeing no objection I think we could proceed with this implementation step being to present, you know, the discussion or the status report at every ICANN meeting. And it should be on the GNSO agenda.

Okay, well see, and there's no other comments and let's go ahead and move on to our next recommendation, which you can see on the screen right now was Recommendation 7, that the stakeholder groups and constituencies engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English as a means to overcome language barriers.

And there are several recommendations that relate, and I think they've got them highlighted there and the dependencies that you can look at. So this is related to some of these other recommendations that would be going on. You know, we're looking here at, you know, the stakeholder groups and the constituencies being the groups that would implement these types of recommendations.

If we want to go ahead and scroll down to the recommended steps, what we're looking at here is that staff would provide an overview of existing measures to overcome language barriers. And based on its review of these measures the GNSO Review Working Group, so our group, would work to develop possible solutions.

So again we have is our - essentially our implementation plan that we would get a briefing on what currently exists and then we would work with the staff to develop other solutions. Any comments or concerns about that approach with this particular one? Yes, Rafik, please go ahead. Rafik, I'm not sure if you were on mute...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Hello, can you hear me?

Jen Wolfe: Oh there you are. There you go. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Hello? Okay. Okay so is it more possible to know more about this – the two implementation a kind of existing measure to overcome language barrier. I can assume that's talking about interpretation and translation because talking from my – our own experience within the noncommercial, there are some requests from some members to get more kind of content and so on in language, but it's kind of – it needs a lot of resources that's not easy for I think for groups within GNSO to support.

So are we talking from what ICANN as organization can provide? And what's existing already? Or is about kind of a new suggestion in term of support?

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Rafik. I think – and, Julie, your hand is up. Do you want to go ahead and respond to that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. So, thank you, Rafik. There – several of the recommendations that we've noted here dependencies also speak to this item. And I think really need to – and they're actually ahead of this item in – I think in priority. In particular one of the items related to this is, you know, the provision of real time translation. There's another recommendation on that, Number 12. But then also just, you know, what is needed to, you know, to increase diversity and so on also is related.

So the recommendation, if we go to that, I think speaks to your question. The first piece of this is that staff would go and, you know, get an overview, as Marika is saying here too, of what exists. And then also to determine, you know, costs. There is some work being done currently in ALAC that's actually mentioned with the recommendations that talks about real time translation. There's some of that going on.

So staff would look at things that are happening and also what other, you know, possible mechanisms, you know, could be used. And then, you know, would work with the working group on a plan.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Rafik, did you have another question for Julie or is that still the hand from before?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks. Yes, just want to clarify because just it caught my attention that's the kind of looks the warning of the – that there is some expectation from constituencies stakeholder groups to provide that. But if I understand the steps is really we will see what exists already and what can be provided within ICANN.

Just yes, I mean, to be realistic about those expectation providing language support it's kind of – needs a lot of kind of – it cost money, that's the reality. It will cost a lot in term of budget, just I want to be sure that we – we are not putting workload and resource, how to say, something that will consume a lot of resource on (unintelligible) groups. Just want to be sure about that. Yes, so that's fine.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, thank you. All very great points. And as you can see, this one is sort of going to be kicked back to us in the next phase of our work so we will definitely be revisiting this particular topic once we get a more detailed overview on what exists and, you know, what other possibilities may be.

So if there's no other comments on that one, let's go ahead and move on to Recommendation 35. This is one of the recommendations where the working party modified with Council approval the recommendation from the independent examiner.

So I'll just read the one that we're working from which was the working party recommendation that the GNSO Council establish a working group to recommend ways to reduce barriers to participation by non-English speakers

and those with limited command of English to the extent practicable, the members of the working group should be diverse and reflect demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity.

So this is one where the recommendation is actually to create a working group to address these issues. So if you then – and obviously you can see there are some dependencies with the recommendation we just discussed. But you can see here the proposed implementation step is that the GNSO Council establish a charter drafting team for the working group and then upon that the charter staff would issue a call for volunteers.

So any comments on this? This one seems fairly straightforward and that we want to create a working group to address this specific issue. But any comments? Rafik, did you want to comment on this? Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks, Jen. I think here it may be an overlap with what we have in the Accountability Work Stream 2 with regard to the diversity subgroup because there is already discussion there about gathering data and so on. So regard how to provide recommendation regarding diversity.

So I'm wondering here about really the relevance to have a working group on this issue in the future. And so if there is a possibility to really synchronize to not kind of duplicate the work. There is some work already that's supposed to be ongoing and to be sure that we don't – I mean, at the end I would expect many of the folk that will be involved – they're involved like the existing subgroup may be interested to join the GNSO working group.

And one of the issue we kind of discussed on the subgroup is that like even, for example, there is no something like standard within ICANN like for example to know about the community members because each SO/AC it's managing it in its own way and so on. So just to be sure not overlap here, maybe just mentioning that if there is a possibility to have a working group

that should be kind of synchronized with what's already going on with Work Stream 2 diversity subgroup.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you, Rafik. Julie, did you want to respond to that as it relates to other work being done?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. Yes, I just thank you and that – Rafik, that was really helpful. And I think there is another recommendation, I know there is another recommendation relating to diversity that where staff did put in language about ensuring that there's synchronization with the work of the Accountability Work Stream 2 on diversity. So we can make sure that that same language is here.

And also as Marika notes, maybe the first step is to look at the ongoing efforts and to determine whether or not there is a need for a separate working group. And we can add that step.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any other comments on this recommendation? Okay, let's go ahead and move on to Recommendation 22. This was another one where there was a slight variation in the working party recommendation, our revision of the recommendation was that the GNSO Council develop a technical competency-based expectation of its members and provide training on the PDP.

And where this has ended up as a proposed implementation step is that staff would provide an overview of the available training and skills development mechanisms and based upon a review of that overview, we the working group would work with staff to develop a competency framework implementation plan. So this is another one of these that we will push further into our work cycle.

But any comments on this from anyone right now? Any concerns about that approach? Okay, seeing none why don't we move on to the next group?

There's a grouping here that were Recommendation 1, 2 and 3 dealing with working group performance, participation and so on. So these have now been grouped together.

And so just very briefly, these deal with monitoring metrics and evaluating ongoing effectiveness of outreach strategies, you know, developing and funding more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and reducing or removing cost barriers to volunteer participation.

So if you go ahead and look down at the proposed implementation steps, what we have here is that staff would provide an overview of the current strategies and pilot programs because we know there is some work being done in these spaces. And then following that briefing or that review this group would continue to work with staff to develop strategic goals, objectives, KPIs, measurements of shared effectiveness between ICANN and the community and to develop an in depth program with a stronger volunteer drive as well as determine cost barriers and solutions.

So again this is one that we are continuing to hold in terms of our ongoing work, but this would be – that staff would tell us what's going on right now and then we would respond to that. So any comments or questions on this proposed step right now? Okay seeing none let's go ahead and move on to Recommendation 5 and 9, which again were grouped together because they're so similar.

This one was, again, that each working group would have a self-assessment and be asked how their input has been solicited and considered and that a from working group leadership assessment program be developed. And then if we go ahead and scroll down to the proposed implementation steps, we've got here again staff is to provide our group here with a proposed modification of the working group self-assessment survey, new questions on how working group members' input has been solicited and considered, and a new assessment survey for leadership based upon the proposed modifications.

This group here would then determine if revisions are necessary and draft them for public comment and present them to the GNSO Council for approval. So this, again, gets kicked into that bucket of things that we will continue to work on. Any comments or concerns about this recommendation and the proposed implementation steps at this juncture?

Okay, seeing none we'll go ahead and move on to Recommendation 12. This was that ICANN assess the feasibility of providing real time transcription service in audio conference for working group meetings. If you move on down to the proposed implementation steps we have here again that the staff would review the work already done in the ALAC in relation to this topic since there's already work being done somewhere else and come back and present it to us.

Our group would then, you know, analyze this information and consider approaches to present to the GNSO Council on this particular issue. Any comments, concerns about this proposed implementation step?

Okay, moving on to Recommendation 17, this was that the practice of working group self-evaluation be incorporated into the PDP and that these evaluations be published and used as the basis for continuous improvement. So as you can see these all very much relate to one another. And this proposed implementation step our group here would review the current procedures and work with staff on possible modifications which would then be published for public comments and presented to the GNSO Council for approval.

Following Council approval staff would then amend the Operating Procedures with these new revisions. And we could then determine that this step has been implemented. Any – so it's very similar to the last one we just addressed, but any comments, concerns about the proposed implementation steps for this recommendation?

Okay, seeing none let's go ahead and move onto Recommendation 4. This was one that the GNSO Council introduced non-financial rewards and recognition. The comments during the working party was that these should not be financial such as travel funding, but, you know, some sort of recognition piece. So we have here as a proposed implementation step that staff would provide an overview of existing, you know, rewards and recognition as well as suggestions for non-financial rewards and recognition.

Again, this would be kicked back to our group to then review and assess that overview and suggestions and determine what steps would be taken subject to of course the GNSO Council agreement. Any comments or concerns on these recommendations or steps, excuse me.

Okay, seeing none let's go ahead and move on to Recommendation 34, again, relating to PDP working groups that they rotate the start time of their meetings in order to not disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world. Just one comment from, you know, the working party was that this is already being done in some instances but is not standard and that, you know, there needs to be some, you know, language to flag that this should be tested for effectiveness.

So the proposed implementation steps is that staff would review GNSO working groups where rotations are used and provide some indication of effectiveness. Staff would provide this to our group for consideration and our group would then, again, determine whether this recommendation has been implemented or if further work needs to be taken. So I think we're recognizing here there's already some work being done but we'd like to get a report on that and then consider how to go forward.

Avri, how are you? Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible). Okay I'm not sure exactly what we mean by effectiveness. And also I'm not sure that (unintelligible) of this one here as opposed to accepting the rotation and keeping it fair. We seem to be trying to (unintelligible) at this point. (Unintelligible).

Jen Wolfe: Hey, Avri. We're having – your voice is really muffled. So we're having a really hard time hearing. Maybe if you type in the chat, I'll read it in. I think I was hearing something about how do we define effectiveness I think was part of what I could hear. And so I'll ask, Avri, if you don't mind, typing and we'll read it in.

And, Rafik, I see your hand. Let's just make sure we capture Avri's comments here.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, can you hear me?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, is that Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: ...as Avri posts we'll read her post so we could make sure we understood what she was saying.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes, so we got, about the rotation, another element I guess maybe to have in mind in term of implementation. It's something we saw lately because the kind of daylight savings change. In order to maybe include about using more standard times like UTC. For example, myself, I'm kind of paralyzed because the time change to adjust to those in United States, the call are usually late for me and becoming more later.

So maybe adding some element about that to have in mind in term that choosing standard timing and so on when we talk about rotation and to avoid kind of issue that can rise from this – from those kind of changes. Just kind of, you know, small mention would be really helpful and to have that in term of implementation.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. And I want to read in Avri's comments. There were two points she was trying to make. One, is how do we define effectiveness? Which I think is a really important point. And then second comment she had is that we're not really doing this and I think we're wiggling out of actually doing it with the way this is being done. So to circle back to the recommendation, you know, clearly this is going to be a recommendation we want to have some more discussions on.

I think – is everyone comfortable with the approach that staff is going to brief us essentially and where it's being used and, you know, if it's effective or not? And I think as we move into that we could really push them for defining what is effective? Is effective getting the most participation? Is effective having, you know, meaningful conversations, you know, what does effective mean?

And then this essentially is going to be kicked back to our group to then evaluate and determine what further work needs to be done. So and Avri is just making a point, I want to make sure we capture her since we couldn't understand her before, that we always favor Europe and the US in terms of timings and that's not fair and in keeping with the recommendation.

Julie, I see your hand is up. Did you want to comment on this further?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. I just wanted to say that staff will go ahead and put in some of these points in the proposed implementation steps of where we're, you know, we are explicitly asking staff to come up with, you know, a definition of effectiveness or metrics, determine effectiveness that, you know, that staff is looking at, you know, using, you know, how to use standard times

and not favor, you know, particular, you know, region or hemisphere. And I'll pick up some of these other comments from the chat room as well. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks. And just to comment on the – what's going on in the chat is that Rafik is making the point that there's a concern effectiveness is defined as how many people show up. If you start out with a time that's not convenient for people in a certain region then it could become self-fulfilling. But clearly this is going to be an important one for us to tackle in our work ahead.

Okay, any other comments? I think basically what we're saying is this is going to take more work and it's going to get kicked back to our group to continue to work on this recommendation and determine if more work is needed.

So moving on then to Recommendation 36, this was one, again, I'll read out what we reworded because the working party wanted to slightly shift how this recommendation was to read. It would be that it corresponds to the process that Council goes through in terms of approving a PDP, forming a working group and that Council review accomplishments towards achieving diversity and proper representation of all stakeholders.

Begin data collection as soon as possible, that the metrics are used to measure diversity, should be specified with more consideration. So this one is dealing specifically with, you know, accounting for diversity, measuring diversity and reporting on that. And again, I think this overlaps with some work being done elsewhere this is recognized, if you scroll down just a little bit, to the dependencies, that there are some other recommendations dealing with this similar issue.

What we have here as a proposed implementation step for this recommendation is that again, our group, our working group here, would review this recommendation after Recommendation 6, which is the definition

of diversity metrics and data and after Recommendations 33, 35, 12 and possible 1, are completed.

So what – I think what we're trying to do here is to recognize that this recommendation is interrelated dependent upon several other recommendations and that this group to be accountable to the GNSO would wait to see what happens in those other recommendations. And then based upon that outcome determine if further work is needed. Comments, you know, concerns about that approach to this recommendation?

Any other comments? I know Avri was typing. Any other comments? Everybody okay with this one? Okay, I think that – I had that was our last recommendation to address. I think perhaps we could just double check, if you want to scroll down to the timeframe that was the only other place I had noted I wanted to just make a comment.

If you look at this, what we have here is that the Phase 1, which is the work already underway, would be tackled between January and May. I think that is probably a reasonable timeframe. And then if we look at Phase 2 with January to June, you know, I question if that is a reasonable timeframe when we start talking about high priority recommendations that could require a lot of discussion.

And then Phase 3 with – we have June of 2017 all the way through the end of 2018. So I'd just like to ask for comments, does this still seem like the timeframe is right? Because I think this is important for us as a working group that we feel like it's realistic because if this is approved by Council then we are going to be striving to meet these timeframes.

So at the outset if we feel like we need more time I think it would be better for us to ask for that or if we feel like this is too much time, you know, we could adjust it. But any comments from the group on these timeframes for implementing – for working through – recognizing, you know, that this last

piece we just talked about, there's a lot of things that will be kicked back to us, you know, and what is a reasonable timeframe, you know, if we have 2017 all the way to 2018 that's probably reasonable. But just trying to make sure I know where everybody is.

Julie, you have your hand up. Please, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie. Really this timeframe is in here as a sort of a point, you know, as sort of a jumping off point. It was discussed I think previously that it would be helpful to have a little bit more detail on what, you know, a sort of a Gant chart, so to speak, which is kind of what I – what we've tried to produce here.

And I think your point about, you know, the timeframe for the high priority items is an important one. Really what we were trying to do is just say, okay, well, you know, here's how these things could work, here's how they could overlap. But the – I think that we might want to change this and allow more time for the high priority items and go beyond June.

Just because it's probably better to have more time up front and then, you know, and then of course, you know, if you don't need it you can go back. It sometimes may be harder to say – to put this down and say oh well we're going to cinch this in June and then, you know, it's May or whatever and we have to go to the Council and say hey, what we had in the implementation plan doesn't work and we need more time.

So I guess the working group should consider, you know, whether we want to, you know, have this stretched out, say, to August or something like that. It's all fairly arbitrary because we can't really know how much time we're going to need until we're really in the thick of things.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. I welcome comments from the group on our timeframe. Does this seem reasonable? Do we want to – I think for the high priority we should

provide more time. I'm concerned that between January and June that will go very quickly. And we've got all the work to be done on the work already underway so I would think we should extend the timeframe for that piece probably to the end of 2017. But I welcome comments. Heath says he agrees. Any other comments on the timeframe so that we don't put ourselves in a position where we're running up against, you know, a self-imposed deadline that is not realistic?

A few people are typing in the chat. Oh Sara is asking can you scroll down so she can see the timeline better? Yes, and, Heath, you're exactly right. We can always finish early. If we're making good progress I don't think anybody is going to complain that we finish early. Any other comments?

Okay so, Julie, I think you could take back we want to extend the timeframe on that high priority work. Let's get ourselves a little more time. And then that way we've got – really we've got a two-year cycle ahead of us that we could move forward.

Okay, Julie, was there anything else on our agenda that we needed to address right now? I think just our next steps. And I don't know if on the notes if you want to – can I scroll back up? Oh, I can scroll back up there. Okay so if you - our next steps is that this document – this document will be updated and circulated to our group.

And our goal is that by November 21 it's sent to Council with a motion for approval so that we would meet the deadline for their December 1 meeting. On December 1 the GNSO Council would vote on the plan or they could defer the motion if they feel like they need more time. So depending upon the outcome of Council's review of this document, it might either be approved as written or they might request more time.

And then the plan is thereafter to deliver to the Board of Directors for the Board resolution by the end of the year. And, Julie, did you want to comment more on that? Please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. So, yes, the plan is then that staff will turn around this document with these changes today and send it out to the list along with a motion that would be then ready to submit by next Monday. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, I think being as he is on the Council, we could ask him to – if he would be able to make the, you know, make the motion in time.

And the other thing I want to note just so that people realize, you know, you know, the comments that, you know, that people made at last week's call have definitely been, you know, they've been included. You know, all comments so far have been included.

And I'll note for the diversity item, you know, the mention here of having the, you know, sort of consistency and ensuring that, you know, we're, you know, not overlapping say the work of the Work Stream 2 diversity group, that was actually also mentioned last week in a previous recommendation and there was language captured there. We'll make sure that that language is consistent.

So one of the things we'll be doing as staff is just making sure that everything is consistent throughout the recommendations before we send this out. And the only thing that I would ask then if the working group here agrees is that we would ask for any comments or if there are any, you know, any comments, concerns, objections, by no later than this Friday perhaps so that if there were any additional comments these could be incorporated.

We realize that this is probably not enough time for stakeholder groups and constituencies to go back, you know, for those representatives to go back to their groups and have a review. And that is precisely why we'd like to get this to the Council in time for that December 1 meeting because we do

understand that the constituencies and stakeholder groups would like to have more time to review this and are likely then to ask for a deferral to the 15th of December to allow for that much time.

So just pointing out as we also did last week, that the review does not have to – does not necessarily have to all happen within this working group. There will be that opportunity for a review once this goes to the Council. And we will indeed urge the councilor to immediately send this out to their groups, you know, next Monday, as soon as they get it, so that that review can begin. And that if there are any questions in the meantime that, you know, staff can address them.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any other questions about the proposed next steps? Okay, so, Julie, with that in mind, when would we need to meet again? I suppose we would be waiting then for Council response and then we would need to set up a follow up call thereafter? Yes, Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. We may not need to meet. It depends. You know, one would hope in the best case scenario that this goes to Council, you know, Council discusses it. And by the 1st or the 15th is probably more likely, you know, just votes on the motion.

The motion – what you'll see today – I'll send it around – is going to be a motion to approve the plan and then that, you know, it would then be, you know, going to the, you know, the GNSO Review Working Group to implement.

And then of course we would start up the implementation phase. We'd probably also, you know, repeat a call for volunteers for this working group since we do I think need more representation and particularly in the implementation phase.

Of course if the councilors, you know, were reviewing the plan, you know, prior to, you know, voting on it and had some questions that necessitated a meeting, we could certainly then schedule a meeting of this working group.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. That makes sense. So I think then in terms of all of the pieces that will come back to this group we're looking at probably not needing a meeting until after the first of the year, is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I think that's correct.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay. Well excellent. Well we got this done in about 50 minutes so thank you to everybody for joining. Thank you to all of you who, you know, read the materials and came prepared for the conversation. I think we've done a good job at creating, as we said, this macro level plan to how to begin implementation work and that we could move this forward on a two-year cycle to complete the implementation and see these improvements made.

So I appreciate everyone taking the time to join, for your continued commitment to this process. And if you have any other questions or comments we could take them up on list. And, Julie, we'll look forward to seeing, you know, the final document circulated and hopefully approved by Council. Any other comments before we close out?

I see there's a few people typing. Oh yes, Marika, is saying the Board timeline might extend, yes, so I think we all certainly understand the timeline could be extended and we'll see that. Okay. All right, if there's no other comments then we will close out this meeting. Thank you all so much for your time and continued work on this process.

Julie Hedlund: And, Jen, I see that Rafik does have a question.

Jen Wolfe: Oh, I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: He's asked, is the schedule still up for a motion to GNSO? Yes, the intention would be, Rafik, for the motion to go – the motion and the implementation plan to go to Council on Monday the 21st, which would be the motion and document deadline for the Council meeting on the 1st of December. And so then that item would get added automatically added to the agenda for that Council meeting on the 1st of December.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, Avri is saying who is making the motion? I think that's going to be Wolf-Ulrich, correct?

Julie Hedlund: That would be my sense, yes, as he is the vice chair and also on the Council.

Jen Wolfe: Yes. Any other question, comments? And Rafik can second, yes. Okay, well if there are no further questions or business to discuss, this will close our meeting. Again, thank you all for your time, thank you for the work in reviewing the documents. And we will move this forward and probably won't speak again until after the first of the year so I wish you all a happy holiday season. And we'll look forward to talking to you in the new year as we continue our work. Thank you so much.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Jen, so much for chairing. Thanks, everyone, for joining.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

Jen Wolfe: Bye-bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect remaining lines. Everyone have a great remainder of your day. Good-bye.

END