

**ICANN Transcription  
GNSO Review Meeting  
Thursday, 17 August 2017 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording GNSO Review Meeting on the Thursday, 17 August 2017 at 12:00 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 be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/vAghB>

Recordings may be found at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-17aug17-en.mp3> AND  
<https://participate.icann.org/p1poexoey5r/>

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Review Meeting on the 17th of August 2017.

On the call today we have (Chris Steven), Jen Wolfe, Rafik Dammak, Sara Bockey, Pascal Bekono, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. We have listed apologies from Amr Elsadr.

From staff, we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to our chair, Jen Wolfe, Please begin.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Terri, and welcome everyone. Thanks for taking the time for the call this week. I know last week we ended up having to cancel, so thank you to

those of you who did show up last week. We appreciate all of you being here today.

I'd like to just briefly review the agenda and then we can move right into our business. In just a moment, I'll ask for any statements - updates to the statements of interest, and then our top business item is an update on the consensus call regarding the charter for recommendation 19. That's going to end on the 21st of August, so we'll give a brief update there.

We'll continue on with our discussion on the charter for recommendation 13 - or 30, excuse me, for 30 and then move on to recommendation 31. Finally we want to take a few minutes before the close of the hour to discuss whether we need a meeting slot at the upcoming ICANN 60 meeting, and then we'll close out the agenda.

So briefly, does anyone have any updates to their statements of interest? Okay. Seeing none, we'll go ahead and move on. Julie, other than just letting everyone know, is there anything else we need to address in terms of the consensus call for recommendation 19?

Julie Hedlund: Jen, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. No, not really, just to let people know that that is out there still for consensus call, as you noted, closing the 21st of August. And so people should pay attention to that. So far no objections have been received.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. And just a reminder to everyone, the way we've been proceeding is if there are no objections, it's just approved and we move forward. So if you do have any concerns, please do be sure to raise those. Okay. Why don't we go ahead and pick up on recommendation 30? And I think that's going back to the call where I was not able to be there. So, Julie, could you pick us up with where we left off?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie Hedlund from staff and let me just make this document a little bit larger here in the window and get it queued up from the beginning - at the beginning of the document so it's easier to see. And it's not cooperating for me very well here. Hold on for a minute. And this document does not like me here today. Okay. Let's see. There we are.

So just as a reminder, we did have an initial discussion on recommendation 30, stakeholder group and constituency support. I see there's a typo in that first line. It should say recommendation not recommendations. We'll fix that. And just as a reminder, this is - the recommendation is that the GNSO develop and implement a policy for the provision of administrative support for stakeholder groups and constituencies and that stakeholder groups and constituencies annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of the administrative support they receive.

And in our initial discussion we talked about first of all that there was a GNSO toolkit and pilot program that had been developed to provide administrative support and there were a number of administrative activities identified under that pilot project. That was started in 2014. It has since completed and there's quite a bit of information online as far as the services that were identified and provided under the pilot.

And I will note the changes from our last discussion are redlined in this document and in the updated version that I sent to the list. Essentially if you like Jen, I'll go through the new information that was added to this charter and we can discuss that and then decide the next steps.

Jen Wolfe: Yes that would be great. Thank you, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So again, this is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. So the pilot is completed and I will note that the pages with the inventory of support were initially created to - for staff to conduct some basic assessments and initial

inventory of secretariat support services provided by the community by ICANN org.

While they were not intended to be regularly updated, the hope was that they would be built on in the future. And now more recently, these efforts will be reinstated by developing a much broader community services inventory that will be consistent with ICANN's strategic goal 1.3.

And one of the questions then that was raised with respect to support, and this was raised by Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, and that was, you know, where do we stand now with support and do we have the possibility of evaluating the current support. And so staff did some more research and consulted internally, and the current procedure for requesting stakeholder group and constituency support is via the annual additional budget request, ABR, process.

For those who may not be familiar, this ABR process happens now each year where the community, the various groups within the ICANN community, can identify areas where they need support that are not covered under the regular budget. And these could be anything. They could be support for training, additional face-to-face meetings, publication production, various administrative support.

And I'll show you we have actually the requests that were approved for FY '18 to give you an idea of the support. And in addition to the additional budget request process and outside of this the administrative support for the commercial stakeholder and noncommercial stakeholder groups are now provided by full-time ICANN staff. So that support now is actually part of the regular budget and so the secretariat, the administrative support for those two groups, is simply ongoing and does not have to be part of an additional budget request.

So I'd like to go to the attachment to illustrate the types of (unintelligible) that were requested by the GNSO, the groups within the GNSO, for fiscal year '18. We are now in fiscal year '18. That started on July 1. So I won't go through the full descriptions of these but you can get a sense of the type of support that was requested and also approved. So these were the determinations made by the finance team and approved by the ICANN Board of Directors for support for the GNSO.

So we have a request for an additional registry stakeholder group slot for the leadership program. We have a request for ongoing support of the document development and drafting pilot program in the Registry Stakeholder Group. We have, let's see, we have in the Business Constituency leadership development and support from the developing countries, enhancing business leaders' participation in ICANN.

The Business Constituency leadership travel, outreach events for the Business Constituency, which is a request for the community regional outreach pilot program, and actually this CROPP, this program, was also something that was part of the pilot program that has now been completed. So this support is ongoing, as requested.

Then we have a request from the Business Constituency for a policy consultant, for outreach materials, continuous multi-stakeholder engagement program to support leaders or potential leaders from developing countries to promote the multi-stakeholder approach, policy practicum and policy advocacy training for the NCUC, and also for the NCUC drafting materials about non-commercial registrant rights and responsibilities.

You can see that there's really quite a lot of requests here that have been made and that have been granted. Communications support and so forth, a retreat, the PDP working group chairs leadership team support pilot project, and I think that was new this year, the GNSO Council strategic planning session. There's many more. I don't want to take up too much time here, but I

hope that gives you a flavor of the types of support requested and also granted.

So the question was is there (unintelligible) reviewing and evaluating support. We have someone with an open mic. All right I think that's taken care of. So then the benefits of the additional budget request process that it ensured that needs are evaluated on an ongoing, i.e. yearly basis. Another benefit is that the decisions as to what is most important to each community group is decided by that group as part of the decision to put in ABR requests from year to year or not.

In addition, all ABR requests and decisions are published with the decisions, including detailed rationale for approval or rejection. The finance and SO/AC engagement teams collaborate very closely with the stakeholder groups and constituencies on the entire ABR process from beginning to end as well to make sure the community has the information they need and questions answered as they make those decisions.

It is also important to note that while community groups have full flexibility to decide what forms of additional support for which to apply, and most requests are quite persuasive, the staff teams and ICANN Board of Directors ultimately agree on the availability of resources each budget year. More and more of the support projects or capabilities that are approved come with reporting conditions attached. Those reports could provide a basis for future assessment and evaluation capabilities that are currently not fully realized.

So looking back at the original recommendation -- hold on, sorry, okay there - - that the GNSO develop and implement a policy for the provision of administrative support for stakeholder groups and constituencies and that stakeholder groups and constituencies annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of the administrative support they receive.

So one of the discussions that we had when we first looked at this charter was the use of the word policy in the recommendation and whether that's really an appropriate word given that policy has -- excuse me -- a particular meaning within the GNSO and ICANN in particular. So I - you know, we talked a little bit about that and I think there were some concerns raised last time as to whether or not the intent was really to have a policy or whether or not the intent was that there is a mechanism for the provision of this support and a mechanism to review the support.

So currently there is a mechanism to provide the support through the annual budget request process, and that process also enables the groups to evaluate the support they received and whether they want to continue that support or request more or less support.

So I'm just going to stop here, Jen, and open things up for a discussion.

Jen Wolfe: Sure. And just to make sure I'm understanding as to how we're framing this conversation, a piece of this is to determine have we - is this already completed, can we just mark this one off as complete or is more needed, correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct, Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay, so let's open that up to the floor for questions or comments. Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes hi thanks, Julie and Jen. Julie, well that was very comprehensive and that was I was expected when I raised this question. And as you know, I was also reviewing the when we did prioritize the recommendations and were already discussing, you know, some months ago, you know, how we see these recommendations.

And we were also of the opinion at that time that the first part well has already been done through these different - so it is to develop and implement a so-called policy. And, you know, I'm sorry that I misunderstood about the term policy from that time. So I'm fully with you at the time being right now that it's a kind of process or a kind of, yes process, available now in all the different groups, stakeholder groups and constituencies, can rely on. And that is very helpful.

I think that is really exhaustive and really completes my view on that, so. And I'm fully in line with that. And from my point of view and both from the constituency's point of view, that is - covers, you know, what was required from this recommendation. So thank you very much.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Do we have other comments or questions? No other comments? Just giving everybody a moment here if there's anything else or any other comments in the chat. So if no one is in disagreement...

Pascal Bekono: Hello?

Jen Wolfe: Hello? Yes?

Pascal Bekono: Yes hello?

Jen Wolfe: Yes. Who is this on the line?

Pascal Bekono: (Unintelligible)

Jen Wolfe: Oh yes please go ahead.

Pascal Bekono: Can you hear me? I have two questions. The first one is concerning the scope (unintelligible) and the second point is that the GNSO review group can recommend whether a recommendation has been implemented? I mean



my question is how do we (unintelligible) which will the working group will have to bring all this - everything has been put in place has suggested.

And the second one is about at the end, let me think, yes at the end concerning a timeframe, is also presentation. Is it possible to put - to start with a requests which have been accepted and we close with those that are being rejected so maybe we can see very well the differences of - it's just a proposal, sorry, just a suggestion, sorry. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: I'm not sure. I don't know, Julie. I'm not sure I understood what you were asking for. Julie, did you get it? Did you catch it? I was having a hard time hearing. It was breaking up a little bit.

Julie Hedlund: I think so. Pascal, see if I'm correct. With respect to, and I'll just go to the attachment, I think that's what you were referencing, so staff had included as an example the requests that had been granted for FY '18, those that are listed here. I think that you were asking whether or not we could also see the requests that were rejected for comparison. Is that correct?

Pascal Bekono: Yes I think that's it. So we can see those who have been accepted in the first step, in the first part, and the second part those who have not been accepted, I mean that is just the second point, yes.

Julie Hedlund: So we don't actually have that usually at hand. We'd have to - staff would have to do a cross-comparison with all of the requests that were submitted and then with - against the requests that were approved and then determine which of those that had not been accepted. I'm not quite sure though how that gets to this particular recommendation in that the recommendation is simply asking that there be a mechanism for requesting support and that also that there be a mechanism for evaluating that support.

So we are noting that there is a mechanism in place now and there is also a mechanism for evaluation by the groups themselves for the support they

receive but also in any report that are required in the provision of the support. So perhaps you could - and I see also Marika has put a in a link here that has further information on community budget requests and we can certainly include that link as reference is this document.

Perhaps, Pascal, you could explain, since I'm afraid I don't understand how making that comparison would help us to meet this particular recommendation. And I apologize if I'm not following. And I'll just note that Marika has also posted the decision and that is in fact where staff has pulled just the decisions on the GNSO requests, which is what we have here as the attachment.

Jen Wolfe: Pascal, did you have any - did you have further questions or comments to Julie's point? I'm not sure if we're not hearing you or if you want to put...

Pascal Bekono: Yes hello? Yes to that point.

Jen Wolfe: Go ahead.

Pascal Bekono: Yes I mean it's okay for that point. So for the first one, I'm still thinking I was (unintelligible) I will let you know during the meeting. Thank you. Thank you it's okay.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. All right. Thank you. And certainly I understand your question of wanting to understand if there have been requests that were rejected and why but I think to Julie's point is that that's not within the scope of what this recommendation is. And so I would suggest, unless there are any objections, that in the interest of moving us along through all of these recommendations that we agree this one has been accomplished, that this - that there is already a procedure in place to meet this recommendation. Is there any objection to that?

Okay, seeing none, why don't move forward accordingly, Julie, with that one and move on to recommendation 31 with just a note that that was now in phase two carried over from phase one. And, Julie, would you be so kind as to -- oh I see your hand's up -- but would you be so kind as to either, go ahead, sorry. Do you have another comment before we move on?

Julie Hedlund: I just - just that staff then, just to understand the action item, staff for recommendation 30 will go ahead and accept the additions to this version and then shall we go ahead and send it out for a consensus call?

Jen Wolfe: Yes absolutely.

Julie Hedlund: Excellent.

Jen Wolfe: And then, Pascal, if you continue to have concerns, you can raise those of course. Perhaps if you take a look at the budget requests and you have - if you have remaining concerns we can raise that and we can come back to this, if there are remaining concerns. I think that would be a good way to ensure we've addressed his concerns but also keep us moving forward. Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. Moving along to recommendation 31. We talked about this recommendation in phase one. We're now - we've now - I was on recommendation 10, 11, which is actually awaiting a further evaluation of the - that relates to the provision and facilitator for face-to-face meetings. We did have a facilitator for the geographic names session at ICANN 59 and there's an evaluation report that's being done on that session.

And I know that there was one brief mention in the survey that followed ICANN 59 that someone noted the effectiveness of that particular session, but we are trying to gather some more information so we can make a determination on whether there need to be specific guidelines on providing facilitation. So that one is on hold from phase one. But other than that, that

really is, with the completion of recommendation 30, that is the completion of all of the phase one recommendations.

So we'll now move to phase two and starting with ones that we had already discussed. And this was one that we decided to move to phase two as one that didn't need to be decided as quickly or that perhaps some additional work needed to be done. So I'll just remind everybody what this recommendation is about.

It relates to the GAC liaison on PDP working groups. And then just moving to the recommendation, it is that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC early engagement in the GNSO 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 non-binding, non-voting liaison to the working group of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.

Moving to the scope, staff will confirm the status of implementation of the GNSO-GAC Consultation Group recommendations and how this approach was considered by the CG. The GNSO Review Working Group will determine whether this recommendation is implemented. If it has, the working group would detail how it has been implemented. If not, this working group would detail what parts of the recommendation are still outstanding and recommend how those are expected to be implemented.

The assumptions that the current GNSO-GAC liaison can take the approach recommended by the GNSO-GAC Consultation Group to assign a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the working group of each relevant GNSO PDP. A deliverable would a plan for the assignment of a non-binding -- sorry there's a typo there -- non-voting liaison to the working group of each relevant GNSO PDP.

I'm just going to note something that Marika Konings has posted. Do note that this an issue that was also considered by the GAC-GNSO Consultation

Group. The GAC is of the view that no one, apart from the GAC chair, can represent the GAC and as such they are not willing to appoint liaisons to other SOs, ACs, or working groups. And that is an important point.

Go ahead, Jen, please.

Jen Wolfe: Yes. Does this render this kind of moot if they're not willing to do it? Am I understanding that correctly? That's what they're - they're saying they won't do this so if they're saying they won't do this then is it not - I mean do we...

Julie Hedlund: Right. So I think this was where we came to a halt.

Jen Wolfe: Last time?

Julie Hedlund: Avri Doria in particular had specifically I think requested that we put this one off. It's - there - what we wanted to do was see if there was perhaps another way that the goal here could be accomplished without there being a specific liaison. So Marika Konings says, "It may be worth asking the question again to meet this recommendation but the response will likely be along similar lines unless perspectives have changed in the meantime."

I think one of the things that we discussed when we first discussed this item was ways that the GAC could participate and was participating that might fulfill the spirit of this recommendation while recognizing that it's likely, as Marika notes, that we cannot fulfill the recommendation as written in that the GAC, you know, because of the way it operates cannot have a liaison that would speak for the GAC. But this does not necessarily mean that the GAC cannot have participants in PDP working groups.

So I know one approach that had been discussed previously was for the council to ask the GNSO GAC liaison to take on this role, but an alternative option that was identified was either GAC as members of the PDP working groups could fulfill the role of liaisons but informally.

For example, there's an active GAC member on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group and this person does appear to be endeavoring to represent the interests of the GAC while not operating as, you know, specifically as a liaison.

So this is - so where we left it I think, if I recall correctly, that Avri Doria, who is co-chair of that PDP working group, was not sure if that approach having, you know, individual GAC members serve as informal liaisons or contacts was effective and felt that we needed to discuss this further. And unfortunately I don't see Avri on this call today.

Jen Wolfe: No, thanks, Julie. And I think that was an important way to frame this is that do we need to suggest in our charter that this be rewritten to have the informal role. So let's open this up to those on the call. Do we have comments or questions or thoughts on how - I think to frame it, it's either we say this is not - we're not - this is not going to be possible, based upon GAC response, or we'd like to see some sort of alternative commitment that is less formal. Lori, please go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Yes. I have an opinion that I think we should go through the less formal.  
(Unintelligible)

Jen Wolfe: Lori, it's really hard to hear you. Can you turn up your volume? Are you there?

Lori Schulman: Yes sure. Yes, hold on. Can you hear me now?

Jen Wolfe: Now we don't hear you.

Lori Schulman: Hi. Can you - all right. I just want to make - now you don't hear me.

Jen Wolfe: Now we do. We hear you now. We're good. Now we hear you.

Lori Schulman: Okay. Sorry. I'm on my mobile app, I'm not on my desktop and I apologize. What I wanted to say is I think it's really important that we find some negotiated way to have GAC involvement and if we can't ideally have what we'd like with a liaison that we ought to really work towards some informal role if the GAC doesn't feel like one (unintelligible). I think that's really important. The GAC can't stay above it all, you know? Because...

Jen Wolfe: Are you still there? Lori? Okay. Just making sure.

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me?

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

Lori Schulman: Okay. So all I was going to say is I think we need to work a way to rewrite this for informal involvement. I think that's important. That's all. Brief comment in support of informal involvement rather than no involvement because I don't think we'll ever get them to that liaison point.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Very good. Thanks, Lori. (Unintelligible) Lori is saying we shouldn't just say okay they're not going to agree to this, let's just, you know, call it quits on this one. Can we come back and recommend some sort of commitment for informal involvement. Do we have other comments or suggestions on how that might be drafted? I see a few people are typing in the chat so we'll watch for that.

A couple things. We can recommend informal or not formalize - Lori, did you want to keep going?

Lori Schulman: Yes I was just going to say maybe you draft it as an observer status or an observer, period.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Lori Schulman: That might be the only thing they agree to.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Thanks, Lori. Do we have other comments? I see a few people are typing. I think observer status could work. Any other hands up? I see Pascal is typing. So while folks are typing in the chat, Julie, do you think we could draft something before our next call that everyone could take a look at and react to?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Jen, this Julie Hedlund for the transcript. Yes absolutely -- excuse me -- I can draft some suggested changes to the recommendation. I think we'll have to also include our justification for why we would not suggest going forward with the recommendation as initially presented and agree to, you know, presented by the GNSO Review Working Party and then also approved by the GNSO Council. So we'll have to include some language there as well. But I'll - I also notice that Rafik has his hand up.

Jen Wolfe: Rafik, go ahead please.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. Rafik speaking. I'm kind of confused here about the proposal because the work, I mean we had discussion within GNSO about how to involve the GAC. That happened I think it lasted for a long time and we had this consultation group that includes members from GNSO and the GAC. So I'm kind of wondering here what we are trying to achieve. Are we going to recommend a new way to the GAC after the consultation group finishes its work and delivers it? I'm not sure about really the let's say the relevance to do so.

My understanding about the issues with regard to GAC involvement is that in several times they expressed that they don't have the bandwidth, they cannot really get involved in PDP and also they have a representation problem, is that a GAC representative cannot be really represent the whole view of the GAC because the GAC members of ICANN, so they are representing their



government or I would say the IGOs. So they cannot really speak on behalf of the GAC.

And so I'm wondering here what we are really trying to achieve since we have this consultation group that they spend enough time to try to work on different option and mechanism for involving the GAC and PDP. So.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Rafik. And I see, Julie, you have your hand up. Did you want to respond?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So I'm wondering if we have a way to - sort of a way out on this one. I'm looking again at the recommendation. If you look at it closely, the recommendation when it was drafted, the GNSO-GAC Consultation Group was still in operation at the time that -- at least apparently -- at the time that this recommendation was drafted.

Because it says, you know, it says that there's a group, a consultation group, and it says that the group should continue its two work streams as project - as priority projects. Then it says as part of its work, it should consider how the GAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison, et cetera. So the GAC, as noted, the GNSO-GAC Consultation Group has completed its work.

So unless this working group were to recommend -- and the recommendation really doesn't say this -- that that group be reconstituted, there isn't really anything - that group really is not an operation and so can't really take up the issue of the liaison, and we've already raised the question, you know, through that group the question of whether or not there could be a liaison.

And we know the answer, as Rafik has pointed out, and I think that's an excellent point, Rafik, what can we do at this point given that this group has completed its work and given that we do know now, based on that work, that the GAC cannot take on even an informal liaison, a GAC member cannot

take on even an informal liaison role and the GAC - the GNSO-GAC liaison also would not be able to take on this role.

So I'm wondering if perhaps we recognize that, you know, that this work is completed. We could go in and look at the recommendations that came out of that and - but then we could perhaps suggest that while the goal is to have as much representation as possible, the GNSO cannot, you know, cannot require, you know, GAC participation in any particular form. I mean it has to be based on, you know, the GAC's rules and that instead perhaps what we do is we think of other mechanisms to encourage GAC involvement.

For example, one - I know one proposal that, you know, an invite has gone out and the proposal is being - has been presented and is being considered by the various SOs and ACs is the Work Track 5 proposal for the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group on Geographic Names.

The invitation has gone out to SOs, ACs and in particular to the GAC, including the GAC to - for them to appoint a leader, a co-chair to Work Track 5 so that there would be multiple co-chairs for that work track: GAC, ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC, and that those together would operate, jointly operate that particular work track and then also those groups would be encouraged to appoint members, you know, representative members to that work track. Rafik is saying they're called co-leaders. Yes, thank you, Rafik. I think the terminology is sensitive.

So perhaps what we could do is staff could revise and come up with some language that talks about various ways that GAC involvement could be encouraged in ways that the GAC, you know, under its own terms is able to participate. I'll just throw that out for discussion.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. And, Rafik, I see your hand is up. Is that a new hand or was that from before? Okay, looks like that was before. Julie, I think that makes sense as our next step and then -- excuse me -- that gives everyone a

chance to react to it and to think about this a little bit more. I think we are in a difficult spot. We can't force the GAC to do anything but we could certainly look at how do we encourage some sort of way to accomplish this recommendation.

Do we have any objections to taking that as our next step? Any other comments that you want to give to Julie before they move forward with drafting something? Okay. Seeing none, so as our action item, Julie, we'll look to staff to draft a revision to this accordingly and be able to react to it and then hopefully finalize this one on our next call. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund. I will go ahead and take that as an action item.

Jen Wolfe: Okay fantastic. Okay so moving on in our agenda, our next item up is to discuss whether we want a formal slot at ICANN 60 and/or whether we want to update the GNSO at this meeting. I'll just open that up for any comments. I know I will not be there in person at the next meeting. I don't know how many of you all are participating. So maybe we start with that or if perhaps we want to put out a quick poll to see how many on this working group will be there in person to drive our decision-making on whether we request a formal meeting slot.

Any comments on that portion of this discussion topic? Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Now the first question would be what is our usual timeline we have here? We have - now we've changed it a little bit because, you know, of this meeting right now and then we'll have the next meeting in two weeks.

So how does it fit to ICANN 60 that is our normal schedule? That would be the first question to Julie to see about whether, you know, the - between two

meetings and there will be a big gap or so. That might drive, you know, a decision to ask for a slot in - at ICANN 60. Otherwise I would say well a report should be necessary.

I think we are reinforced by our charter to deliver a report once a year or so or are we going to deliver to the, how to say, this committee from (Renalia), the organizational committee? I'm not sure about that. I think we have to report to the council on one hand the status, give them an update, and on the other hand we have also to report to that committee. So let's have a look, you know, and make it practical. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And, Julie, I see your hand. And I'll just comment. I know I was just sort of counting on the calendar and I think we would be - that would be an off week, the week of it. I don't know if, Julie, that's what you were going to comment on.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I wasn't as fast as you, Jen, so I hadn't actually worked it out yet and so I will definitely check that. But I do agree with Wolf-Ulrich in that there is a requirement in this group's charter to periodically provide updates to the GNSO Council. I think - and I think by extension to the board, the committee's name of which I forget at the moment, but that has oversight of this effort.

So at the very least, I think it's incumbent on us to provide an update in the usual, you know, and staff can make that request as part of the GAC - I'm sorry, the GNSO Council working sessions that will be held on that first and second day of the meeting. So I would ask - thank you, OEC, thank you very much, Marika and Wolf-Ulrich. That is the board committee.

So I would recommend that, and staff can assist with this, in preparing a brief update and, you know, for that meeting and preparing it ahead of time so that the GNSO working group can review it and make sure we're comfortable with it. And obviously that can be done as we get a closer because we'll hopefully

have even more recommendations completed, you know, and more progress to show by ICANN 60.

Then maybe I can suggest - I'll confirm where we are in the schedule and maybe perhaps do - I don't know if we want to do a formal doodle to find out who will be there or not. I would suggest that perhaps if it is - it does end up being an off week that perhaps we not try to do a face-to-face meeting because I'm - it already seems fairly evident that there's going to be a very packed schedule.

Even notwithstanding the fact that this is our longest meeting format, it's still quite full in that, you know, the first two days are GNSO working sessions. The Monday is given over to the cross-community sessions. The Tuesday is the constituency day. We can't schedule against that. There are various activities already slotted in for Wednesday. And then once you get later in the week, you know, maybe it's not as efficient to have a meeting, especially if not all people are going to necessarily be at the meeting for, you know, till the end.

I mean it does goes till Friday the 3rd but I think we're trying to avoid scheduling, you know, sort of things that we want, you know, a lot of community involvement in on that last day. And then we have of course the public forums and board meeting and so on on that Thursday I believe.

So the - let me take the action for staff to look at where we fall on the schedule and suggest perhaps on the list that we, you know, we do have the obligation to do a report, and staff can make that request, but that if it is indeed an off week and given that it will be hard to schedule, that we perhaps not schedule a face-to-face meeting and then see whether or not, you know, ask unless there is, you know, a desire, a strong desire on the part of the working members to have a face-to-face meeting. I mean because obviously it is up to the working group to decide this.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks, Julie. I think that makes a lot of sense. I think we can, you know - we tend to have a smaller group anyway and we know it's a very busy week and, you know, we're not sure who - how many people are going to be there. So I think that makes sense. If there's a strong desire on someone's part that we have an in-person meeting, please raise that, but otherwise we'll take a look at it and if it's off week, we can just continue with our schedule. And the of course we need to continue to do the updates.

And I don't know how frequently we were supposed to be doing those updates. I know we just finished phase one so, you know, if there should be a short update or if we should just wait until the formal in-person session to give them a full update, I think, you know, we can work towards giving the council that update.

Any other comments or questions? Okay. All right, seeing none. Our next meeting will be in two weeks, which is the 31st of August at 12 UTC. And we will continue to pick up on our recommendations, as we have been, and continue to move this forward. We do want to try to continue to stay on our timeline.

And, Julie, perhaps we take a quick double check on our timeline during our next call and just see where we are, particularly as we look at reporting in. We'll want to report in on how we're doing with our timeline. So perhaps we take a quick look at that at the beginning of our call and then move right into the next recommendations.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. We'll prepare the timeline and update it according to what we've accomplished so far. I will note that essentially where we are in, you know, we're at the start of phase two, you know, so recommendation 31 we're taking up. There is a recommendation 18 that actually is on hold awaiting the question - the results of the questionnaire on diversity, the questionnaire that came out from the cross-community working group, Work Stream 2.

And then there are - there's a charter that's sort of an omnibus charter that is 26, 27, 28, 29 recommendations and there is recommendation 6. Those are the rest of the recommendations in phase two. So staff will take the action to draft up the charters for that sort of omnibus group that they're all related and also for recommendation 6 so that the remaining charters in phase two are all ready for review and discussion.

Jen Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Julie. And just to note, thank you so much for all the work that you do. I mean you really tee this up for us to have good conversations and we really appreciate it. I know it's a lot of hard work on your part and we appreciate it very much.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Thank you very much, Jen. I appreciate the support.

Jen Wolfe: Fantastic. Okay. So any other comments, questions or business? We'll finish just a few minutes before the top of the hour today then. Okay. Seeing none, we'll bring this meeting to a close and we'll regroup in two weeks. Thanks everybody and have a great weekend ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thanks everyone. Have a great morning, afternoon, evening. Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, if you could please stop all recordings. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END