ICANN Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 22 June 2017 at 1600 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Review Working Group call on the Thursday, 22 June 2017 at 16:00 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 found at: https://community.icann.org/x/MVLwAw
The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-22jun17-en.mp3 AND

https://participate.icann.org/p656u0cveff/

Attendees:
Members:
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (ISPCP Primary)
Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)
Heath Dixon (RrSG Primary)
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts (BC Primary)
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)

Participants:

Apologies:
Marika Konings (staff)

ICANN staff:
Julie Hedlund
Amr Elsadr
Berry Cobb
Michelle DeSmyter

Coordinator: Recordings have now started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thanks, Jane. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 22nd of June at 12 o'clock UTC. On the call today we have Jen Wolfe, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Heath Dixon, Rafik Dammak, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Lori Schulman. We have apologies from Marika Konings. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Amr Elsadr, Berry Cobb and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and I will turn the call over to Jen Wolfe. You may begin.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. And thanks, everyone, for taking time to be here today for this call. We appreciate it. I know many of you on the group who may be listening to the recording later may be en route traveling to the ICANN Johannesburg meeting so for those of you who tune in later thank you for taking the time to come back and listen to the call today.

So just to briefly review our agenda, we'll start with our typical administrative business, any updates to statements of interest, want to just briefly review the status of the consensus call that will close on July 3 and then we'll continue our discussions on the charter recommendations for 10 and 11, and hopefully time permitting, continue on to Recommendation 13 and then just take a look at our schedule going forward.

So with that I'd like to ask if anyone has any changes or updates to their statement of interest? Okay, seeing none, why don't we go ahead and move forward.

Julie, do you want to give us just an update on the open consensus call for Recommendation 24 and 25, I believe that is open right now and will close on the 3rd of July. Is there any updates that we need there?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen. Yes, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. We actually do have an update. Yesterday, Wolf-Ulrich sent in some comments. And let me just run through those. The first that he noted was that with respect to Recommendation 24, in its analysis, staff noted that it might be helpful to have both the current and historic information available on one page. That's the information pertaining to the constituency application processes.

And so what his recommendation was, was to actually include that as a recommendation from the working group. And so I'm just moving down to the working group determination, the suggestion would be that we could add a third point that the current and historic processes should be combined on one web page. And then the other point that Wolf-Ulrich made was just an editorial change in Item Number 1 underneath the working group determination. He just noticed that there were some typos, suggested changing the text to that the processes are detailed above in Recommendation 24 and that they are effective and accessible.

Staff would like to suggest a possible change to that because in reading that sentence I think what was originally meant was that Item Number 1 would mirror Item Number 2 in that the processes – the current processes address Recommendation 24 and that they are effective and accessible.

Because the processes aren't detailed per se in Recommendation 24. I know what Wolf-Ulrich was trying to say. But I think what we really want to say is that the processes are – the processes do address Recommendation 24 and then that they are effective and accessible. So staff would then like to suggest that we accept the edits from Wolf-Ulrich and send a redlined version as part of the consensus call.

And the only question then is whether or not to extend the consensus call or to keep it on the same schedule and that would be a question then for the you know, for you, Jen and the working group. And actually I see Wolf-Ulrich

is entering the room so perhaps I should just run through this again or at least mention to him that we have covered his item and how we've covered it.

Wolf-Ulrich: Yes, thanks. I'm on the phone as well. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, wonderful. So Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund again from staff. We did note your suggested changes to the charter for Recommendations 24 and 25. We suggested adding a third working group determination that the current and historic processes should be combined on one web page. And then staff suggested a slight change to the wording that you had suggested for Item Number 1 in the determination and that is that I think what we meant to say is that Item 1 would sort of mirror Item 2. And so it would read, "That the current processes address Recommendation 24 and that they are effective and accessible."

Wolf-Ulrich: Great. That's exactly, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: And then the other question for the working group is whether or not we think we need to extend the consensus call. Staff can send out a redline of the revised charter and, you know, we can extend or not depending on what the working group would like.

Lori Schulman: Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes please go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Oh I'm sorry. It's Lori. I should have raised my hand but we're a small group. I would appreciate it if you would extend it because I'm just going to own the fact that I didn't put the call out to the IPC, I completely forgot about it. So it would help me out. I don't know about others. But we've had so much prep for this particular meeting in Johannesburg. I mean, if you can't extend it, I get it. But it would be helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori. This is Julie Hedlund. I'll just say it's entirely up to the working group if you want to extend. There's no particular rule that says you can or cannot do it. It's just if you, you know, if the working group wishes to do that. I mean, since there's a request to extend, Jen, unless, you know, anybody objects to that I think…

Jen Wolfe: No, I think that makes – I don't think anybody's going to substantially object to give everybody a little more time. And I know in the US is a holiday on the 4th so…

Lori Schulman: Exactly. I don't get back to the US until July 4 and – I will say something in the IPC meeting in Johannesburg, but I would want the whole list to be able to look at it.

Julie Hedlund: So what – when should we extend to? Do we want to – if we send it again today two weeks from today would be the 6th of June. Is that sufficient or should we make it for longer?

Lori Schulman: This is Lori again. I would be forever indebted for the 10th of July, which is the Monday after the week that people take off. You know, we're going to have that quiet week after Joberg.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much…

Jen Wolfe: Yes, I agree. But a lot of people are off that week of July 3 so particularly with Johannesburg and the timing let's give – let's try to get actual feedback.

Julie Hedlund: Okay then staff can run it and – through say COB the 10th of July.

Jen Wolfe: I think that works great. Lori, does that work for you?

Lori Schulman: Yes, that would help. Thank you so much.

Julie Hedlund: All right, we've noted that action. Thank you so much. This is Julie Hedlund again for the record.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, great. So why don't we move on on the continued discussions of Recommendations 10 and 11. And I apologize, I was not able to be on the call last time so if you could just update us on where we left off and pick up from there?

Julie Hedlund: Sure. Thanks. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So just as a reminder, because I think you know, not everybody necessarily was on the call last time, I mean, we got as far as talking through the – talking through what the recommendations were. I don't think we really talked through the analysis. So I'll just remind everybody what this recommendation is, it's two recommendations that seem to be connected.

                  Recommendation 10 is that the GNSO Council develop criteria for working groups to engage a professional facilitator/moderator in certain situations. And Recommendation 11, that the face to face PDP working group pilot project be assessed when completed if the results are beneficial, guidelines should be developed and support funding made available.

                  So moving onto the description, staff will provide the results of the evaluation of the facilitated PDP face to face working group pilot project and the recommendations on PDP improvements and the GNSO working group – Review Working Group will review these results. Staff will provide a status update on the development of guidelines for facilitated PDP face to face working group meetings.

                  And staff will work with the GNSO Review Working Group to determine the best method to allow for unspecified/contingent funds such as for a facilitator and face to face PDP working group meetings. The working group will determine whether the intent of this recommendation has been met or whether further steps need to be taken.

The assumption is that the PDP face to face working group pilot project is complete and that the results of the PDP improvement process are pushed. Deliverables could be to determine if procedures are required to arrange for facilitated meetings or additional PDP working group support.

So staff did some research. And I don't think that we got into running through the possible solution – the research and possible solutions or implementations of the two recommendations. So I'll start with this and go ahead and run through it unless anybody wants me to do this differently.

So just to recap, on the 9th of June, 2016, the GNSO PDP Improvements Implementation Discussion Group produced the GNSO PDP Improvements Process End Report. And that provides the following background and recommendation. Here's the link.

The background is that starting in 2013, the Council in collaboration with ICANN staff, gathered a number of ideas and suggestions to be explored to improve and streamline the existing policy development process. These ideas and suggestions were translated into 10 PDP improvements. Many of these improvements were also closely aligned with the recommendations of ATRT 2 in relation to the GNSO PDP.

Staff was tasked to explore and implement next steps for each item including in pilot format. Since then, staff has been providing regular status updates to the GNSO Council in conjunction with ICANN meetings. And then just excerpt, this memo, the excerpt, from this June 9 memo, is intended to provide a final status update including proposed next steps and how to transform some of the GNSO improvements that have been determined successful into permanent features of the PDP and close out this project until such time the Council identifies new improvements that are deemed worth exploring and/or revamp some of the improvements that were not deemed suitable for the implementation – for implementation at this stage.

So this is the final report of the PDP improvements implementation discussion group. So this is actually a reference in if we look back up in the scope where staff provides the results of the evaluation of the facilitated PDP face to face working group recommendations, in particular, recommendations on PDP improvements. So this then is the report on the recommendations for the PDP improvements.

And the second recommendation that as part of this – as part of this memo – this final report – is that staff recommends that the Council direct staff to develop guidelines for the use and application for face to face facilitated PDP working group meetings on the basis of the experience of the pilot project, that is the face to face facilitated PDP working group pilot project. These guidelines should be submitted to the GNSO Council for review and adoption.

So moving along, the pilot project was conducted so that happened. It was a GNSO face to face PDP working group pilot project. It was conducted for three working groups, PPSAI, and that was twice, October 2014 and October 2015, and for the IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights in March 2015.

So the pilot project was run. The results – the results were captured in a survey that was conducted. So all five pilot project working group chairs participated in the survey and the survey was published. So there's a link to the survey here. And then on 14 July 2016, the GNSO Council voted to approve the permanent integration of successful PDP improvements into the GNSO PDP per the recommendations in the GNSO PDP improvements process end report.

And then finally, staff notes, however, that guidelines have not been developed for the use and application for face to face facilitated PDP working group meetings although funding currently is being provided for a request for facilitated PDP sessions held during ICANN meetings. Most recently for professional facilitator for the Geographic Names sessions held under the

auspices o the GNSO PDP working group on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures at ICANN 59 26-29 June 2017.

So the GNSO Review Working Group should determine whether ad hoc funding is sufficient or whether or not staff should be directed to develop draft guidelines for facilitation and I should say also – we should say not just facilitation but for face to face meetings for review and approval by the GNSO Council. And this just going back to the – two recommendations, so Recommendation 10 is that there be criteria for working groups to engage a facilitator or moderator. There currently are no guidelines but this support has been provided.

And Recommendation 11 that the face to face working group pilot project is assessed when completed. That has been completed, the assessment has been made. But the next step, guidelines, developing guidelines and support funding, that has not happened. Again, we had only an ad hoc process for holding face to face meetings and for facilitating them.

So I'm going to turn things over to you, Jen, and I see that Lori has her hand up.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Julie. Lori, please go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I want to say that I was in one of those pilots. I was on the IGO INGO Curative Rights Working Group facilitated meeting. I was a remote participant, not a face to face. I don't know if that would have made a difference. I'm going to be very blunt by saying I didn't feel it was especially helpful. And I don't know that it really altered the outcomes or the dynamic of the group in a way that would have been, you know, value for the money. So that's a personal opinion.

                  That being said, is the assessment generally positive? I mean, I don't recall seeing the assessment. I see the link there and I will look. But if you could

just tell me in one line was it considered positive? If it was considered positive then part of my question or comment would be I do believe that there should be guidelines. This can be a very expensive situation when you hire a facilitator. And again, just my own sense of things is I don't know that it added a lot of value.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And, Jen, I can answer that question as to whether or not – what the comments were. The comments were mixed. Along the lines of what you had noted, Lori, some respondents said that it was generally helpful to have a face to face facilitated meeting, some said they weren't sure if it made that much of a difference. So it's – it wasn't a resounding yes, we thought this was, you know, a wonderful helpful thing. It was, you know, a mixture of comments. So I don't think we can say that there was sort of one single conclusion.

And I'll, you know, I'll note in that just a little bit of context for how it happened for the current request for the facilitated face to face Geo Names session at ICANN 59, that request went – there were two ways that that was handled. In the first instance, the request was made to the SO/AC chairs who were coordinating the cross community sessions at ICANN 59. It went from the chairs, the cochairs of the New gTLD PDP – new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group made the request to the SO/AC chairs to have two cross community discussions at ICANN 59. And that request was accepted.

And then further, the cochairs worked with staff and staff worked with David Olive to get approval for, you know, for the funding to be able to have a facilitator or moderator contracted to run the two sessions. Again, there were no guidelines; this was just made in the form of a request you know, that was evaluated by staff, determined that there was the budget and so approval was made. So I hope that answers your question, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Thank you. I think it sort of does. I would – I still think I would lean – oh I don't know. I guess now I have mixed feelings about this. If the leaders request it, there's probably a very good reason of requesting it. But I still think there should be some rough criteria as to when this would be an acceptable solution. But I also don't want to limit options for people who are trying to reach consensus. I guess at this point I'm not sure. If others have thoughts about it?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I don't have any more comments on this particular item. I guess just to open it up for discussion, we've had Lori's request that there – that guidelines should be developed so that would be if we put that in here then, you know, that would be a possible working group determination that staff should be directed to develop draft guidelines for facilitation and face to face meetings and then that those guidelines would be reviewed and approved by the GNSO Council.

And I see that Amr adds, "Perhaps add a recommendation to conduct another review of this program at some point in the future to assess the extent to which it's adding value." I'll just – we don't have a program now. The pilot project has ended so right now we're just on an ad hoc basis. I mean, there are – a number of improvements were put in place but one, you know, there were no – there was no implementation of the recommendation that came out of this. The recommendation that came out of the GNSO PDP improvements implementation discussion group Recommendation 2 where staff recommends that the GNSO Council direct staff to develop guidelines for use in application for face to face facilitated PDP working group meetings, that step has not been taken.

So I guess the question for this working group is is, should that then be a recommendation or a direction or determination coming out of this working group. And I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well for me it's also the question, you know, I personally have never, like Lori mentioned, participated in this pilot project or in a group which was facilitated. So here the question for me seems to be you know, you never know in future what is going to happen so if there might be a need for facilitator, so sometimes this question comes up so when a group is going to be established, when the issue is going to be raised and then it comes up and within the working group maybe it started work and then it comes to a point where well they might need a facilitator or to continue or to start with.

So for me is that question then if we just leave it as it is, what could be done in the case if it comes up? So is that enough what we have at the time being as an experience, so and then to collect people who have got experience in the past, well, to help these people they might have problems and might need a facilitator in future, or how we can – how we can do so if this case comes up.

So this is an unsolved question for me, and that could be done in order, well, to start with a kind of this project, well, to establish kind of framework and framed conditions for such a case or we leave it as it is as we are of the opinion that, you know, the experiences might be good enough for the time being. So I don't have a solution, I don't have a final answer to that, but it seems to me that is a question of everyone. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks. Julie, is that your hand that's back up.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I had a – this is Julie Hedlund from staff. I just had a suggestion for one – for some steps that might help us determine how we want to implement these two recommendations. We have an example at hand that will happen very soon that we could evaluate in almost real time. We will have next week, two facilitated sessions on Geo Names. We haven't had facilitated sessions since the pilot project.

So it might be helpful if staff did perhaps a very brief survey to say the PDP working group you know, for which these sessions is being held, that's the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, to assess after the fact if they felt that these – that these sessions were helpful both in the fact that they were face to face as well as the facilitation and perhaps also staff could document how, you know, how these two, you know, how the request and determination for these face to face facilitated sessions occurred so that the working group could say well, looking at what has happened, you know, were these useful and, you know, or would guidelines – would guidelines for these sessions have been useful. So that's just a suggestion. And I see Lori has her hand up as well.

Lori Schulman: Yes, hi, Julie. I was going to suggest a similar solution. I think evaluating this process would be very helpful to this group. I think given that we had a mixed evaluation before, my thought would be maybe what Wolf-Ulrich is really saying is ad hoc might work. That if we (unintelligible) that might become bridges and maybe this is a program if it's got mixed results, we would want it to be rigid. We wouldn't would want people to know what the past (unintelligible) but still have the option open to them but maybe then when – if we do think about criteria, maybe they're very broad, not narrow.

That would be my suggestion to keep it loose because this is not a – we're not sure that this is a proven technique.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Lori. So it sounds like there is the consensus may be to take Julie's recommendation and hold off until we have some additional feedback on this one? Is that what I'm hearing, maybe table this one and come back to it.

Lori Schulman: Yes. Lori. I would say yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Anyone opposed to that idea? I don't think it's – it certainly doesn't hurt for us to get more information so that we can come back and accurately address it. Wolf-Ulrich is checkmark. Anyone opposed? Okay. So Julie, why don't we flag this one to circle back, you know, in a few week's time or whenever it is that we have that feedback following the upcoming meeting. I assume it may take a few weeks to collect all of that I assume.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. And in fact, will – you know, we'll need to get an approval from the cochairs of the PDP working group if they're okay with staff running a short survey. I'd be surprise if they weren't, but, you know, doing that, you know, obviously we want to wait a little bit, people traveling after the ICANN meeting, I think then we'll just run a very short survey you know, run it for a few weeks and get the results. So I think you know, we could probably say revisit this, you know, in a month or so.

Jen Wolfe: Right, okay. Perfect. All right so we'll cycle this one back in at the appropriate time. We're at about 8:30 Eastern Time right now so about halfway through our call. Let's go ahead and move on to the charter for Recommendation 13. Julie, could you go ahead and take us through this one?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So this is a new charter that staff has developed. And actually I see a typo here on the headline. It should be Recommendation 13. And this is related to technology solutions for collaboration. And staff for strategic alignment finds that it fits into promoting the role of clarity and establishing mechanisms to increase trust in the ecosystem rooted in the public interest, also evolve policy development and government process structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient and responsive. And then you see here the goals related to that objective. And then moving along to the recommendation.

So Recommendation 13 states that the GNSO Council evaluate and if appropriate, pilot a technology solution such as Loomio or similar, to facilitate wider participation in working group consensus-based decision making. The

scope description is for staff to provide information concerning the types of tools available and in use and associated costs, if any. And then the GNSO Review Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented or whether further steps need to be taken to meet the intent of the recommendation.

The assumption is that there's a desire for collaborative tools to be available to working groups if they need them. And a deliverable could be guidance on collaborative tools if the working group agreed.

So moving along to the staff research, staff looked at how working groups are currently collaborating and whether or how they are using any technology tools. Staff found that GNSO working groups and staff supporting those groups primarily used Microsoft Word as a tool for collaborating in the development of documents but that there is an increasing use of Google Drive products, particularly Google Docs – thank you.

So for example, the policy development process working group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures is using Google Documents in both its collaboration in the full working group and its collaboration in its work track sub teams. This actually – I'll just note since I'm supporting that PDP working group, that there really is quite extensive use of Google Docs. I would say that any draft – initial drafts of documents start out in Google Docs. And may remain in Google Docs as long as there's discussion and these Google Docs can be edited by any of the working group members and they are. The sub team work track chairs also are using – are actively using Google Docs.

This particular PDP is extremely complicated and at least from a staff point of view, it has been extremely helpful to be able to get active engagement from the working group members via this tool. And then staff has – once the, you know, changes and edits have been made in Google Docs, and the document is close to finalization, then it moves into Microsoft Word where

edits can still be made but generally staff then has the pen and can do version control. So that is at least an example of current usage.

Staff did do some sort of general analysis on collaborative tools and found in general that any technology solution for collaboration and the development of documents such as a document management system, should have at least some, if not all, of these attributes. Should support both online editing and offline editing with the ability to resolve conflicts in both online and offline version editing; allow at least near real time reflection of the comments and edits received on the document; have a version control mechanism; have an issue tracker to catalogue questions and comments, their discussion and their resolution; the issue tracker must support multiple people being able to manage the issues in the system.

During a multistage review process, the document management system must be able to reproduce and display the changes made from any version of the document to any later version; the changes must include showing what comments were received and how the comments were addressed alongside of the relevant text. These capabilities would offer a redline and strikeout feature with added sophistication.

Staff evaluated Google Drive and Microsoft Word concerning the above attributes and produced a table showing the results. Number 1, Google Docs allows some minor offline editing with conflict resolution. There is limited conflict resolution and that you have to actually set someone up as a reviewer like a staff person and then that person has to be able to review opposing edits and decide, you know, suggest which ones to accept.

At least in the experience in the PDP working group I'm supporting, I haven't seen a need for conflict sort of resolution. Microsoft Word does not allow this; when people are making edits, the edits are tagged and identified but people can make edits to other people's content.

Concerning real time reflection of the edits, yes, in Google Docs you can get that. You would not get that in Microsoft Word. Version control, qualified yes for Google Docs but not versioning. And then a qualified yes for Microsoft Word but that's a manual version control in that, you know, one would have to indicate you know, v1, v2, you know, on the document. Microsoft Word will not do that automatically.

Issue tracker, neither one has an issue tracker. A redline from a version to another version, no, Google Docs doesn't allow that sort of combined redline comparison. Yes, Microsoft Word does. And then we'll note also one issue that staff has seen with Google Drive is not everyone can access Google Drive. Staff will note that this actually is also true for Microsoft Word. Some people, while it is extremely common, there are instances where people may not, you know, have Microsoft Word. And that's – that could be an issue too because while Google Drive is free, there is a cost associated with the Microsoft Office Suite which can vary between $149 and $339 depending on what type of, you know, what version you use.

So just going back to the analysis, at least from staff experience, when working groups are collaborating to develop reports, comments, proposals or other documents, it is particularly important to encourage as much participation and input from members as possible and not to overly rely on staff produced drafts. And Google Drive appears to be more useful tool than Microsoft Word in this respect.

However, the production of drafts where staff is gathering input and creating a new final or final version, Microsoft Word appears to be the better tool. Finally, it appears that Microsoft Word is quite commonly used though not used universally so in the GNSO community and has noted Google Docs is becoming more commonly used but not everyone has access. And then as far as cost, we just mentioned costs and how they vary.

So that's the analysis. And so the working group – the discussion for the working group is whether or not this is a sufficient analysis, whether or not there needs to be further tools identified and explored that might be useful. Loomio was mentioned although we'll note that no one appears to be using Loomio as an option. And, you know, whether or not there need to be further steps to address this recommendation such a piloting a technology solution as opposed to just an analyzing what's currently being used in PDP working groups although I suppose one could argue that in a way the use of Google Drive extensively in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group might be considered a pilot and it might be that staff could run an analysis of how that tool is working, maybe with questions or survey, you know, to that particular working group.

Over to you, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Any comments or questions from the group? Rafik, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. So when I was the chair of NCSG, I had discussion at that time with (unintelligible) who is the – I think the vice president for the – all the online service in ICANN and discussing with him about collaborative tool to help for policy discussion and so on. And I recall at that time he told me that the SSAC also did some work and research on to kind of requirement about a tool they can use for – because – for their drafting and so on.

I think, Julie, as you also support the SSAC, was there, I mean, is it possible also to get those information from them and their own experience and also maybe discussing with (unintelligible) from the staff and see what was already done, I think so that will be really helpful to see – to kind of what other groups try to find out and what are the best solution. But I have the feeling that the Google Drive or Google Doc is kind of what really respond to many of our needs and is kind of widespread used within the community and many people are already familiar with it.

Julie Hedlund: So, Jen, this is Julie…

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: …happy to answer that – Rafik's question. So I have the – so the fortune of supporting both obviously this working group but also the SSAC. And in doing the – in doing the analysis on this particular recommendation, I looked back at the SSAC's analysis, which was not a public document, it was an internal document so unfortunately I can't share it with you. But it was quite brief.

It did – it also talked about, you know, the needs of specifically SSAC work parties, as they call them. It came to basically the analysis you see here on document management systems is along the lines of what the SSAC determined its groups need. And the SSAC also evaluated the Google Docs and the Microsoft Word. And their evaluation really mirrors what you see here.

They determined that – they also explored another tool but this was a proprietary tool, an exceedingly expensive proprietary tool, that they – after some evaluation they dismissed out of hand because it was determined that there were security issues with the tool that really made it unusable, at least in the SSAC context.

So their determination was that the two most useful tools currently are Google Docs and Microsoft Word and the way that they are proceeding is that each work party chair, or each work party, will determine what is the most you know, what tool they want to use. And usually the way it works now is that a work party that, you know, staff or – if staff is assisting and producing a draft, that draft will usually occur first in Google Docs. And then the work party members can collaborate with that – that Google Docs document and then when the document gets closer to the final version, then staff takes the Google Doc and turns it into a Word doc and then staff holds the pen from

that point and incorporates any further changes from the working group or from the SSAC as a whole. So it is a combination of tools in that respect. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. Rafik, is that a new hand to follow up to Julie's comments? No? Okay. Other comments? Or thoughts on this particular recommendation? (Unintelligible). Okay, any – yes, Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Jen. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, Julie. Well, thanks very much for the summary and the evaluation you did already here. For me one question, in any of these types of systems, are they – how to say that – is the access limited or restricted to these kind of systems or the question behind it is, you know, when I look at, you know, each – it is clear that each working group member has to get access to that.

But maybe there are beyond that also public interests, well to relax the documents and the question is how that is going to be handled. Is there any – I'm not – I cannot see that from this evaluation if there is any restriction. Is that a restriction just with regards to buying these – this system and getting access to that or how is that done? So that's – maybe that is a totally one question but that is my question here. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Julie, did you want to respond to that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. There's sort of two access issues. First of all, there's – you can limit or expand access generally like say for Google Docs access is given, you can give access to edit, you can give access to view, you can give access for people to provide comments but not edit. There's several different levels that you set and then you send a link and whoever gets that link gets that level of access.

As far as public access, well working group lists are of course open only to working group members and observers so they would be the only ones who

would then get these links and have access. You know, of course a working group could decide whether or not, you know, if they wanted public access they could, you know, make the link public. But as noted before, not everyone has say, a Google account, which you need to be able to use Google Docs. And so access there is, you know, do you have a Google account, yes or no? That may limit your access.

And then with respect to say Microsoft Word, your access may be limited on whether or not you can afford, you know, to buy a version or whether, you know, your company provides it or whatever. But I hope that answers your question. And I see also Lori has her hand up.

Jen Wolfe: Go ahead, Lori. Lori? Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Actually I should take my hand down. This is Julie Hedlund. But I'm not hearing Lori. If you're speaking…

Jen Wolfe: I thought maybe my call dropped again. Okay so I just wanted…

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Oh there you are, Lori. Okay.

Lori Schulman: Sorry. I'm a (unintelligible) thanks, I'm on a computer that has today apparently a very long day between mute and unmute so I apologize. So this was my comment, my comment was when Göran was talking about the state or the organization, and in March in Copenhagen, he did mention that he's looking at implementing a document management system throughout the ICANN organization and I was wondering if this is something that really needs to be looked at in coordination with that because many document management systems, I've worked with them in large corporations, do have editing and file sharing capabilities that could potentially replace Google or Microsoft.

And I know there might be an issue – the thing about Google that's nice is it's completely open and there's a lot of control there. There might be an issue of looking into anything that is organization versus community since these lines seem to be being drawn. But that being said, if there's going to be an investment in a document management system, I would say that this particular recommendation should be viewed in light of that.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Lori. And I note in the chat there was a discussion about Google drive not being accessible in China and Rafik responded that it's only Chinese-based tools in China so just wanted to put that into the recording as well. Julie, I see you8r hand is up. Please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund. I'm just noting that we'll take – staff will take the action item to look into what ICANN might be proposing as far as document management systems. I think that may be different from collaborative tools but I think Lori is right, we need to take that into consideration as well. So staff will look into that and as an action.

Lori Schulman: Julie, I will chime in that many – this is Lori – that many state of the art document management tools do have collaborative ATIs or collaborative ways of working with documents so I just – I would just throw that out there.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you, Lori. And we're coming up on the top of the hour so – oh, Rafik, I'm sorry, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. Maybe just to add to one comment, because hearing the one from Lori about finding (unintelligible) so on, I think maybe we need also a kind of criteria to have in mind is also the familiarity of the people from the ICANN community use those tools. We can find really many nice tools that do a lot of things but people are not familiar. And there is what we call the user acceptance to any new tools, because in fact, we could like for example use Confluence, which it do a lot of things in term of collaborative work or

versioning and so on. But is not that much used because many people don't have that familiarity with it in their kind of daily work and so on.

So I think this is kind of maybe kind of not (unintelligible) that we need to have in mind if we are looking for tools. We can find many state of art tools but it can be – we can then face a problem of acceptance or familiarity by the user and pl tend to be kind of conservative with regard to tools. Otherwise, people would have stopped using Word in working groups so long time ago but is not the case here so.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you, Rafik. Lawrence, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead. Lawrence? Oh go ahead.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: So this is Lawrence. Sorry for the delay, I was trying to get off mute. A little insight from working experience from my constituency end, I see that one thing that basically works for those of us within the developing region, you know, couldn't have, you know, as much privilege to unlimited Internet access. A feature that works well for us is what you have with Microsoft Word where you're able to work offline not particularly in real time.

The features that Google presents to a large extent also has its own advantages. You're able to not just, you know, not just have the edits or see what comments people are making, it's also in real time.

So for me I think there – it's really both of these platforms have advantages and if we'll be looking at or rather if ICANN, for instance, is looking to a document management system of its own it has to be something that has the best of both worlds, the offline features, that's what the BC uses to a large extent in its policy development process, not just because members don't have access to, you know, Google and online features, but the fact that for some of us we will have to, you know, maybe take some time out to have this – or have comments fashioned and stuff like that and really don't have the luxury of that Internet presence to keep you online all the time.

So I just wanted to chip that in that whatever we're looking at as a body it should be something that primary should be able to put those two considerations into form. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Lawrence. Those are all great comments and helpful information. So I think we're at the top of the hour and I think where we've left on this is that we're going to ask staff to provide some additional feedback on what other documentation management systems ICANN is looking for and then we'll pick back up on this at the beginning of our next call. And hopefully make a determination on this recommendation so that we can keep moving forward.

If there's no other comments, I think our next meeting is scheduled for the 6th of July. And I don't know if that works for everybody. I know that's the week after Johannesburg and it's also – tends to be a holiday week in the US. If we think that that is – I know Lori's saying she's not available. Julie, maybe we want to just do a quick survey of everyone to make sure that that date is still going to work so we don't come together and…

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. Actually I'll note that generally staff do not schedule calls the week…

Jen Wolfe: The week following.

Julie Hedlund: …following in fact. I know of no calls right now that are scheduled for other groups that week. I would suggest that perhaps staff could suggest to the list changing the call to the following week, the 13th, and if there were no objections to that we could go ahead with that.

Jen Wolfe: I think that's a great idea because I know a lot of people may not be available or may be fatigued at that point so why don't we put that out on list and see if

here's no objection we could just sort of shift out biweekly schedule down a week.

Julie Hedlund: I've noted that action. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Looks like in the chat we're seeing agreement with that. So okay well with that, we'll send out a note but we'll probably be moving our call – next call to the 13th. Any other final comments? Lawrence, I see your hand is still up, is that old hand or a new hand? Old hand. Okay, seeing no other comments, thank you again for your time today and we'll look forward to picking up on this on teh13th of July. That brings the meeting to a close.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. Thanks, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: That concludes today's conference. Thank you for your participation. You may now disconnect.

END