ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
27 April 2017 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-27apr17-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:
Sara Bockey (RrSG Alternate)
Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (ISPCP Primary)
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)
Donna Austin (RySG Alternate)
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts (BC Primary)
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)

Participants:
Avri Dori (NCSG)
Pascal Bekono (NCUC)

Apologies:
Renata Aquino Ribeiro (Participant NCUC)

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Marika Konings
Amr Elsadr
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings are now connected. You may now begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Gino). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on Thursday, 27 April, 2017. On the call today we have Jennifer Wolfe, Sara Bockey, Lori Schulman, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and

Avri Doria. We received an apology from Renata Aquino-Ribeiro. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, Amr Elsadr, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind you all to please remember to say your names for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you so much and thank you all for taking time to be here today for this call. I apologize, I'm having a little technical difficulty putting the new add in to Adobe Connect so hopefully I should be in the room here momentarily, but I do have the agenda in front of me.

So what we have on our agenda for today is we will start as always with just an update of any statement of interest, a reminder of the consensus calls and any questions that might be out there with regard to our consensus calls, and then we will continue our discussion on Recommendation 16 and 18, with some updates from the GDD. And then we will continue on with our discussion on Recommendation 31, and that should probably take us to the top of the hour.

So with that I will ask, are there any updates to the statements of interest? And, Julie, if you can just let me know if anybody has raised her hand before and in. Probably not, so hearing none, the none.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, we'll go ahead and move right on then to the reminder of the consensus calls, we are looking for responses by May 4. We did just send out a note since I think there was general agreement but if we don't hear from you we are going to assume that that is a yes. But are there any concerns or questions regarding the consensus calls? And Julie, if you could just tell me if somebody is got their hand up?

Julie Hedlund: And, Jen, this is Julie Hedlund. I see no hands in the room, and just to let you know that Donna Austin and Rafik Dammak have joined the call.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. Okay, well if there is no questions or concerns about the contents of calls that are out there why don't we go ahead and move on to the discussion of Recommendation 16 and 18. And, Julie, did we have someone who was going to present some additional information to us today on that?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Jen, actually what staff did was staff did consult with our GDD colleagues. The request was for someone from GDD to come in to speak to us today about reviews that they've conducted under the new principles framework. But in actuality they are have not actually been any reviews under that new framework.

                   There is one that is being conducted right now, will be starting up, which is the one that we mentioned before. I'm just trying to see the notes in here as well, scrolling through the document, sorry, actually I'll take it. Sorry, that was the GDD consensus policy implementation framework to which I was referring. And so they don't really have anything new to tell us.

                   There have been – there is the expired registry recovery policy review, but no timeframe has been set for that. So what staff wanted to do was offer a couple of possible options for a way forward. And I just want to mention those to you here. Excuse me.

                   And essentially first suggestion is the remaining questions have to do with this issue of ongoing – the recommendation of ongoing reviews and how reviews are being conducted currently. And that is actually falling under Recommendation 18. And just as a reminder again of the two recommendations, there's two that have been coupled under this charter.

Recommendation 16, that a policy impact assessment be included as a standard part of any policy process; and Recommendation 18, that the GNSO Council evaluate post-implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis rather than periodically as stated in current GNSO Operating Procedures, and that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time.

So the first proposal that staff would like to make to the working group for consideration is that these two recommendations be decoupled. While they do relate somewhat to each other, based on a staff analysis, and as reflected in the charter, for Recommendation 16, that appears to have been completed. Staff had noted that while the current policy development process does not document a PIA, the review itself is documented.

And 16 – Recommendation 16 is addressed in work product templates that are now contained in the GNSO Operating Procedures that talk about how to conduct a review, I'm sorry, how to conduct the policy impact analysis and the various pieces of that. So the policy impact analysis is actually called out as part of the Operating Procedures.

And there is also now a decision tree and a metrics form that's also part of the Working Group Guidelines. And so staff would suggest than creating a separate charter showing how Recommendation 16 has been implemented and then separating out Recommendation 18.

And then staff would suggest that there might be a couple of ways to approach Recommendation 18. One might be to look at reviews that have been conducted, IRTP and there is also the Whois conflicting laws review, I'm not saying that right, I don't have it right up in front of me. There are a couple of reviews that have been completed.

Or alternatively, the working group could revisit 18 after the expired registry recovery policy review is completed, because that one would actually be sort of the first of the reviews completed under the new GDD consensus policy implementation framework.

And then the last issue for the working group to address is whether or not it agrees with the recommendation that came out of the GNSO Review Working Party that the schedule of reviews should be changed to ongoing as opposed to periodically. Data suggesting that the workgroup might want to revisit that recommendation, that piece of that recommendation because of the feasibility or lack thereof of doing ongoing reviews rather than periodic reviews.

So that's a lot to put forward right now to discuss but perhaps the first thing we could discuss is whether or not staff could indeed separate 16 from 18 and create a separate charter on 16 to show how that has been implemented for the working group to consider. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. And I apologize, I am still having trouble getting in. I've tried a couple of different things so I'll keep trying. Any comments or questions. And Julie, if you could help me out here and just call on people as they got their hands raised?

Julie Hedlund: I see that Wolf-Ulrich Knoben has his hand raised. Go ahead, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes fine. Thanks. Well thanks, Julie and Jen. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Julie, if I correctly understood for the decoupling of the both recommendations and the work on it, means – would mean that staff is of the opinion that the first one of the recommendations has already been covered, the question of policy impact analysis.

So my question here is, well, if I read the revised charter here, and the solutions under that, so if you could help us and guide us a little bit through what is – what has been written here, you know, that so the new sentence is

– and which is related to the PIA recommendation, which is covering the other thing so that we can see, you know, to what extent it has been covered already from your point of view. So that is – was not very clear to me at the time being, so before I would take – in more details, can you guide us a little bit through that? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So the Recommendation 16 was that a policy impact assessment be included as a standard part of any policy process. The staff had noted that, and this is sort of under this solution section, and maybe I will sync it so that you can see what I'm looking at right now. So I'm looking under Solution.

And so staff noted that while the GNSO policy development process does not document a PIA specifically in the policy development process, the review is actually documented elsewhere under policy resources. And there is a couple of links here. And maybe what staff should do is actually pull out text from those links to present essentially these are actual charts showing how policy implementation assessments would be conducted following the completion of a policy development process.

I'm wondering if there is a way – let me just – I'm wondering if there is a way that I can pull these out. I don't think I can show them on the screen per se to describe what's there. I guess that's why as staff I was saying that perhaps what we need to do is do a separate charter for 16 that actually calls out some of the language that's in those links, that might be more helpful to the working group to see what we have here.

And then also with respect to Recommendation 16 and 18, there were the – excuse me – there were the recommendations coming out of the final report of the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group and those recommendations have – do relate to the assessment. Recommendation 3 relates to having templates incorporated in the GNSO Operating Procedures

and products and outputs. These templates have been incorporated and into the procedures.

And in particular the charter template contains a new section directing the drafting team in the deliverables and timeframes. And this section concludes – says, "If the working group concludes with any recommendations, the working group must include a policy impact analysis and a set of metrics to measure the effectiveness of the policy change including sources of baseline data for that purpose."

And then there are several bullet points that need to be covered in this policy impact analysis such as identification of policy goals, identification of metrics used to measures whether policy goals are achieved, identification of potential problems in attaining the data or developing the metrics, a suggested timeframe in which the measures should be performed, define current state baselines of the policy and define initial benchmarks that define success or failure. And then there's a list of tips as far as what should be included in the metrics including ICANN compliance data, industry metric sources, community input via public comment, surveys or studies.

And then there is also a metrics request decision tree that's now in the policy development process manual. And in addition to that there is a metrics request form in Annex C of the final working group – I'm sorry, Annex 1 in the Working Group Guidelines. And that metrics request form also relates to A, that is Recommendation 3 and the policy impact assessment.

So there are several – so everything is basically up in the – sorry – in the charter. Items 1, Items 2 and Item 3 in the charter relate to Recommendation 16. When we start with Item 4, that relates to Recommendation 18. So Items 4 and 5 relate to Recommendation 18.

So I'll stop there and let me know if that's been helpful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, if I may? Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, thanks very much, Julie, well it's more clear to me right now. If we go that way, well, to decide upon to decouple that, that would mean, you know, the charter has to be restructured in that way that from Point 4 onwards this is going to be allocated to the new charter of the – for Recommendation 18. So that's how I understood it that way. Is that okay?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, that would be it. There would be now two charters, the charter for 16 would be the items in 1, 2 and 3, although staff will capture some language from the links that are listed in Item 1. And the new charter for 18 would be the items 4, 5, and 6.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. So for me personally I'm satisfied with that. I would also say that with regards to the PIA, that could be feasible and could be enough because it's mentioned that there where the requirements for a PIA are laid down in the document and that is what we need here. But that is my point of view. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And I finally have been able to get into Adobe Connect so thank you for your help while I was working through that. Any other comments or questions? Okay. Seeing none, Julie, was there anything further? Oh, Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Jen, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So there is then the question of how to further address 18. As mentioned, while there was a request to invite GDD staff to come to this meeting to talk about reviews that they've conducted under the new GDD consensus policy implementation framework, they have not actually conducted a review yet. There is one that is set to be done on the expired registry recovery policy.

So if the working group – there's a couple of alternatives. If the working group wants to wait and hold Recommendation 18 until the ERRP review is completed and then the working group could see how that review was done,

and then also perhaps revisit this recommendation of whether or not reviews should be ongoing as opposed to periodic as they are now.

Alternatively, the working group could look at reviews that have been conducted such as the IRTP and there is a Whois review. But these are not conducted under the GDD consensus policy implementation framework.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. I see Lori has her hand up. Lori, please go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I have some questions about this ERRP review. Is this a staff review that would then be reviewed by members of the community or is it intended as a working group review? I'm not clear about this post policy review, exactly who the reviewers are or how it's exactly done. I guess I'm asking is what is the sequence? Does the staff compile a report and the community comments on it or is it a staff community effort as many reviews are?

Jennifer Wolfe: Julie, do you want to – I see your hand's up. Do you want to respond to that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. So that would be conducted under the GDD consensus policy implementation framework. So it would be a GDD-led review. And let me separately I will have to try to pull up what that framework states because the framework does then give the, you know, it's the framework for how the review is conducted, so I could explain the steps.

And then I also – while I'm doing that, I also see that Avri Doria – there's a couple remarks in the room. Marika Konings noted that the new review plan – there is a new review planned on the conflicts with local law procedures requested by the GNSO Council. Okay so that is a review that is still upcoming.

And then Avri Doria asks, "I'm unclear on the degree of periodicity that is being requested, monthly, quarterly, yearly or even every N years." That is an excellent question, Avri. And this is why staff has raised the issue about the

wording in the recommendation that came out of the GNSO Review Working Party which just says "ongoing." So there is no periodicity stipulated, and that indeed is a concern to staff because it would appear that reviews would just be continuously happening without any particular period, you know, indicated.

So let me pull out – and I'll take a minute or two to pull up the GDD consensus policy implementation framework to answer Lori's question.

So this is Julie Hedlund. I've got the framework up. I don't know how I could show this. Let me see if I can download it then I can pull it in. It is a fairly detailed document, but if I can get this and yes, so I can get this as a – I can get this as a document and I can bring it up in the room. So one moment. Thank you. And I will bring it up here. Okay, all right the document is coming up.

Okay, let me make this a little smaller. Okay, so this is the GDD consensus policy implementation framework from – this is the final from May 2015. As you can see, there is a series of principles and just looking down at these, so for instance, to answer your question, Lori, who's involved and how is this conducted. If you look at E it says, "Staff will follow a formal transition process that will progress from the GNSO policy team to GDD; GDD implementation and GDD compliance checklist all for use by project sponsors for each implementation project."

It says, "Policy implementation activities should follow a lifecycle according to standardized implementation of phases or windows." I'm just trying to see if there's something more specifically. I think it's the second page that is of particular interest, Lori. The Council is – the role of the Council then is to develop and recommend the policies of course. Once of the policies are adopted, that GNSO serves as a resource for staff concerning the intent of the policy during its implementation and will, you know, can continue to provide input.

The policy staff supports obviously the policy activities and for handing off the GNSO policies for implementation to the GDD staff once the policies are approved. And it is a resource for GDD staff. The GDD staff are responsible for the entire implementation lifecycle including engaging the implementation review team, if there is one, consulting with relevant ICANN staff and outside parties, conducting outreach, etcetera.

The implementation review team, and I think this is where it's of particular interest, and I'm just going to make this a little bigger so it's easier to read, is convened, so if a review team is convened to review a policy it will serve as the resource, it will be convened by the GNSO Council to serve as a resource to implementation staff and policy and technical questions.

And the IRT will typically consist of that will not be limited to volunteers who were also involved in the development of the policy recommendations. And I think this goes back to one of the other recommendations, specifically Recommendation 8, which talks about how the working group that was responsible for developing a policy must also be – have the opportunity to be involved in the review of that – the implementation of this policy but also the review of that policy. And so here that is specifically called out that volunteers would be sought from those who were involved in the development of the policy recommendations.

And so the IRT is serving as a resource for staff, and let's see, looking down a little bit further, sorry, let's see. Okay. There is also I think a helpful table here under the Implementation Process and Milestones, and in particular the – moving down let's see. So under Support and Review on the table here – here we are.

So this is, you know, after the policy has been implemented, then these are the steps that would be taken, initiating the compliance, monitoring and enforcement, then there's the continuous improvement and measure of the policy effectiveness, then there is a formal review if applicable, and then, you

know, if there is a request for formal review, GDD and/or policy staff will initiate the process and then also then there will be a status report from that developed.

And that report would be provided – so to answer your question, what is the outcome, Lori, then that report is provided to the GNSO Council and, you know, showing the impact of the policy recommendations. And that could provide the basis for further review or revisions to the policy.

An now I'm just noticing too we've got quite a bit of information or some information in the chart as well relating to the ERRP review, Berry Cobb notes that that's in the data collection phase starting with the compliance data from the – complaint data from the compliance related to expiration of names, data collection may also include a survey of sorts from registrars, registrants. That's to be determined.

A report will be compiled from staff, and once complete will be delivered to the GNSO Council for their review. Again that's following what we just read off in the table. Should the Council determine and an additional policy work is required, the Council can then instruct staff to create an issues report for a possible PDP.

And that, Lori says, thank you, Berry, that's my concern that there is some substantial community review. Marika replies concerning periodicity, the question from Avri, "There may not need to be a one-size-fits-all. There may be different triggering mechanisms, for example, the original policy recommendations may have included a specific timeframe by which recommendations need to be reviewed. I believe IRTP is an example of that. There may be data that indicate that there is an issue that would trigger a review or maybe if neither of those have happened in X years an automatic review is kicked off. And remember a review could say everything is working as intended, no need to change anything."

So Lori, I hope that answers your question concerning how the review is conducted and how – what, you know, final report and outcome there is from that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Do we have other questions or comments? So can I ask what – in terms of this recommendation, would you like to wait to have the additional information before putting this out for a consensus call? Or do you think this Is ready to move forward? Any comments? Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: So what staff could suggest is separating out, you know, 16 and 18, as we've done. Perhaps with 18 putting in – making it clearer how the review is conducted and the roles, so pulling out some language perhaps from this framework so it's a little more clear.

And then perhaps with the two separate charters, perhaps for 18, the working group could decide whether or not 18 has been efficiently addressed with the framework that's out there, you know, with the, you know, the fact that there is this review mechanism and then the working group would also have to decide whether or not to take up the recommendation that periodically, as is stated in the GNSO Operating Procedures their reviews are done periodically, that terminology would actually be changed to ongoing and whether or not that's feasible.

But I think it might be easier for the working group to come back to this one staff has revised the charter somewhat, maybe pulled out some more information and then maybe called out the question of ongoing and listed some, you know, may be some feasibility issues concerning that recommendation.

My understanding is, and I know that Amr is much more familiar with this, but there was some discussion about the feasibility of ongoing reviews when this recommendation was being developed in the working party. I don't know, Amr, if you want to address that more. But maybe between us we can pull out

what were some of the concerns with that recommendation and include that as a question to the working group to consider as part of the charter, the new revised charter that would be just for Recommendation 18.

So there would be sort of two – two ways forward, separate out 16, have the working group decide whether or not 16 has been completed. And staff would suggest actually separating out 16 and perhaps putting it out – excuse me – for a consensus called so the working group agrees and then 18 would still be for some further discussion.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. That seems like a logical way forward. Does anyone object to that as our next steps? Okay, seeing none, why don't we proceed accordingly, Julie? And I see we're coming up to about 20 minutes to the top of the hour. Why don't we go ahead and move forward with the presentation of Recommendation 31? Julie, do you want to take us through that?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And I've polled 31 up on the screen. So 31 states that the GAC GNSO Consultation Group on GAC early engagement in the GDD policy development process continue its two work streams as priority projects. As part of its work it should consider how the GAC could appoint a nonbinding, nonvoting liaison to the working group of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.

Under the scope description, staff would confirm the status of implementation of the GAC Consultation Group recommendations and how this approach was considered. And then, you know, and then of course staff would, you know, with that guidance, the working group would decide whether or not this recommendation has been implemented. So the option analysis is to consider whether a liaison is necessary, whether a GAC member of our working group provides a sufficient level of participation.

So under the solutions, the GAC – staff determined that the GAC Consultation Group has actually completed its work. And one approach could

be for the GNSO Council to ask the GAC liaison to take this role or an alternative option that was identified was whether GAC as members of the PDP working group could fulfill the liaison role if only informally, for instance, there is a – well an active GAC member of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group, well, at any rate there is someone there, you know, the question to the working group is would that actually fulfill a liaison role if there are informal members, GAC members on a working group, or does there need to be a stipulation, say in the GNSO Operating Procedures that working groups need to have a liaison role? So a specified liaison role, because there is not currently a procedure for that stipulated in the Operating Procedures.

And Marika Konings is saying, "The CG considered this question but as no single member can speak for the GAC, apart from the Chair, there was no support for appointing a formal liaison. However, individual members are being encouraged to participate and additional mechanisms were put in place to facilitate GAC early engagement in the GNSO policy development." So Marika is asking, "So maybe that meets the objective of what the liaison role is trying to achieve," so that is the question then for this working group to consider.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. Do we have comments or questions or discussion on the question? Marika is typing. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, hi. This is Avri speaking. Yes, I understand that, but I'm not sure that it doesn't necessarily – having the individuals participate and the other things, I'm not sure that it actually meets a GAC liaison. We are noticing in, for example, one of the groups, the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Group, that we also have, for example, the GAC Secretariat participating, or a member of that.

And they don't necessarily give us views, but sometimes he does, and often takes issues back. So while we have a bunch of GAC members participating

in their own right, though often speaking of how GAC might go with something, we also do have that one solid connector. So I don't think either having to secretary or having a liaison is obviated by the fact that they can't speak for the GAC. I think that there is a lot of formal point of contact can contribute. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: So, Avri, do you think that more work is needed on this recommendation or would you think that we should do with this one? Avri, are you still there? Looks like she's muted.

Avri Doria: Yes, no I am still here. I was muted. But I wasn't speaking. I think that basically saying that everything is fine I'm not sure, but I'm not sure that keeping our head against a wall more at the moment helps, so this might be a thing that should be flagged for, you know, for further discussion at some point. But because there is one issue and that we haven't really tried at all these things in an organized manner where we can actually review how these things are helping.

But I think this one should be flagged as not solved but still needing discussion at some point in the future if that makes any sense.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, it does. Thank you. Thank you. So I suppose that we could look at things like this if we think we want to maybe flag them and come back to them after we work through these recommendations, that would be one way forward if we feel like this really isn't one that we can check the box and say it's done, and that wouldn't be, you know, proceeding in the right manner, but there is not much that we can do right now.

So I guess I would be looking for feedback from others in the group, if this one we could flag and say let's come back to this after we get through all of the other recommendations and revisit it? Or are there other opinions? Or, staff, if you have recommendations. Lori is saying check, yes. Anyone opposed to that idea? Julie, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie Hedlund from staff. I will just note that one thing the working group should consider then is that this, you know, this recommendation falls into Phase 1. The Phase 1 recommendations are sort of the fast-track recommendations, the ones that in the timeline, and the implementation plan were flagged as being, you know, completed relatively quickly.

I think, you know, we may find also with Recommendation 18, depending on how the working group wants to go, that the working group may need to formally state, at least in its quarterly updates to the GNSO Council, that it has moved, you know, recommendations into safe Phase 2, which has a longer timeline and the justification for that, because essentially been if we flag this for later until we've gone through other recommendations it may not then be completed according to the original suggested timeline.

And so it might make sense to say we are definitely putting this into Phase 2 because of the inter-relation, say, you know, among these, you know, many of these recommendations that relate to the workings of, you know, the policy development process.

And so, you know, so that would be the suggestion that perhaps, that's one way to go just so that it doesn't – so that it's called out to the Council that there's further deliberation on some of these that were expected to take less time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. And I think that would make sense and fits with what we were talking about which is just to come back to this one. So I think that that would make sense to move this into the Phase 2 particularly since I see, you know, there are some things going on in the chat talking about that it really may be necessary to actually appoint a liaison and to readdress this. So, Donna, I see your hand is up, please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Julie. Donna Austin. Sorry, Jen. I mean, this has been a long-standing issue for the GAC that goes back almost to the beginning of the, you know, the beginning years of the GAC. And I just wonder if we can break it down into the world that we expect the liaison to play and whether it's possible to have – I know there are a number of staff that are assigned to the GAC these days as support, whether there is any possibility that they can serve in some capacity, although I know that that is a challenge as well.

The GAC has long-standing advice on a number of issues, whether it's possible to, you know, for the GAC to provide some kind of, I don't know, compendium of that advice on a PDP at the time that it starts so the advice would be relevant to the PDP that an operation.

And maybe we look at a different terminology to try to get around, you know, the challenges that the GAC has with providing liaisons, and maybe it's more, you know, I don't know, but change the words from liaison so that it doesn't have a formal meaning. And because I'm pretty sure that the GAC participants in the PDP working groups are taking information back to the GAC about what is going on.

So maybe we need to – maybe if we change the terminology and don't collect the GAC liaison, but call it something else it might get around the problem. But very, very slim possibility that that will help, but maybe it's worth considering. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Donna. That's a great point that sometimes the terminology can throw people off and define it in a way that may not be what we are looking for. Wolf-Ulrich, I see your hand is up, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. Just shortly, thank you very much. Well I fully agree to what Donna was saying because if you look at here, you know, I was just asking myself what we are talking about. There is key dependencies written so depending on the willingness of GAC, well, to provide liaisons or members to

working groups, it's really about members. The first step, liaisons has a little bit of character of the kind of obligation, well, to do something.

And that is that may be – and something which avoids people standing for this job. So I would also be willing, well, to think about a new phrasing of that even so if the GAC just comes up with some simple members as every other member not being a liaison, we could provide the GAC and others as well with a member list so they can see okay, the entire GAC could send, some people available as members of those groups and then there may be a willingness within the GAC also well to provide some more information, to spread information throughout the GAC by these members.

But this is – we have to discuss more. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. So it sounds like this is definitely one where there is a need for some more discussion and some more work. Is there – if I could see if there is agreement that we move this into Phase 2 and we can back to this one with an intention of spending more time on it so that we could keep moving forward with our Phase 1. Lori is check. Any other – anyone opposed that way forward? Okay, I don't see any opposition. So, Julie, does that work for staff if we will – we'll move this one over to Phase 2 and come back to it when we dig in to those recommendations and we'll have all the notes that we just took.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Yes, that would work well for staff. And I will just note that again, there is a requirement for this working group to provide quarterly updates on its work to the Council and staff will of course assist in developing those reports. And, you know, therein it could be noted that, you know, that specific, you know, recommendations have been moved into Phase 2 and why, and again staff can help with that justification is while.

I know we are coming close to the top of the hour, but I had one other document that I could show just so that people have a sense of what we have

coming up for the recommendations, you know, they are ordered by priority as they were in the implementation plan. Staff have done just a summary document of the recommendations, and then indicating how these are being addressed, so which are in consensus calls and, you know, which still needs to be addressed.

And so if you don't mind I could take just a couple of minutes just as a preview of – preview of coming attractions, let's put it that way, so that the working group knows what charters will be coming up that staff will be working on and then present them to the group for discussion.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, please go ahead. I know we are coming up on the top of the hour but I think that would be helpful to give everybody just a heads up so that we are prepared for the next meeting.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So these are grouped of course as they were in the implementation plan. So in Phase 1 noting that Recommendation 8 is in a consensus call response is due 4 May, as is Recommendation 14 and 15, those were grouped together in one charter. Recommendation 16 and 18, as decided here today, 16 will be decoupled with its own charter and staff can present that for a consensus call. And 18 will require further discussion and will be moved into Phase 2.

Recommendation 31, as we discussed today, also has been identified as requiring further discussion and can be moved into Phase 2. So the recommendations that are coming up that staff will have charters ready for discussion for the next meeting, so the meeting in two weeks, which is 11 May. Staff can have ready the Recommendation 33, which is that stakeholder groups, constituency, Nominating Committee and such and their candidates for appointment to the Council should aim to increase geographic, gender and cultural diversity as defined in ICANN Core Value 4. And so we'll go ahead and present charter for that recommendation.

And also we will try to have ready Recommendations 24 and 25, so the intent is for staff to just continue to proceed with these recommendations and have charters ready for discussion at upcoming meetings, you know, at least have a couple teed up so that, you know, there's plenty of work to be done during the meetings and staff will strive to have the charters available, let's say, hopefully a week ahead of time so that the working group will have time to review the charters, you know, before the call.

So we've got quite a few here, I'm just, I'm not going to read them all off, but just so you see what we've got and I will send this off, this material with the notes from the call as well so that people can see. So there is quite a few recommendations still left in Phase 1, and then we have the Phase 2 recommendations that in particular we have a group of recommendations that are related.

And Phase 2 recommendations are supposed to be being addressed at the same time as a Phase 1 so we'll – what staff may do is, you know, work on preparing these charters as well so they can be taken up, you know, as quickly as possible or perhaps even, you know, switch to during Phase 1, you know, depending on how the workgroup wants to take up the work.

And in particular it may be that, and perhaps we discussed this at the next call, it may be that the working group will consider whether or not they want to have a smaller sub team, say working concurrently on to Phase 2 recommendations that are – these are Phase 2 but the high-priority recommendations in Phase 2. So it's just something to think about, nothing that we have to discuss today. But, just to give you a sense of what is coming up in Phase 1 and 2, and as we say we will go ahead and send this along with today's notes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Julie, that's very helpful. And I think we can put that on our agenda for the next call. We are about at the top of the hour so as Julie said, our next

meeting is scheduled for May 11, and I will just ask if there is any other business or comments from the group?

Okay, seeing none, thank you all so much, again, for your time and commitment to reviewing these recommendations and providing helpful insight as we continue to move these forward. We do have a lot to get through so we have a lot of work still ahead of us and appreciate all of your time. Just a final reminder that we do have the consensus call out for a few of our recommendations via email so please if you do have any objections or any concerns please do raise those. If we don't see any then we will report back for our next meeting that both have been approved and we will move forward accordingly.

Any other comments, questions? Okay, thank you all and have a great rest of your day. That concludes the call.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks, everyone. Thanks, Jen. Bye-bye.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Bye-bye.

END