ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 18 January 2018 at 13:00 UTC
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-18jan18-en.mp3
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p1xtx9xj8p3/

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/dg9yB

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

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. And welcome to the GNSO review meeting taking place on the 18th of January 2018.

On the call today we have Sarah Bockey, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Jen Wolfe and Lori Schulman. We have listed apologies from Rafik Dammak and (Kris Seeburn). From staff we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Emily Barabas, (Barry Cobb) and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purpose, 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 Jen Wolfe. Please begin.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you and thanks to everyone again for taking time for this call. I know this was a two week in a row call, so thanks again for showing up today and being a part of our continued effort here.

I'll just briefly review our agenda, and then we can move right into the charters. Momentarily I'll ask for any updates to your statements of interest. And then we'll move on with discussing the revisions to the implementation charter for Recommendation 34, and then the revisions to the implementation charter for Recommendation 22. And then we'll move on to a new discussion on Recommendations 1, 2 and 3. And then we'll just talk about our meeting schedule going forward into February.

So just very briefly, are there any updates to statements of interest? Okay, seeing none. Julie, could you go ahead and show us the revisions to Recommendation 34?

Julie Hedlund: Hi Jen, this is Julie Hedlund – from staff - and thank you. And I'll just also note that Pascal Bekono has joined. Welcome Pascal.

So we discussed last week Recommendation 34. And that was the rotation of PDP working group meeting start times. And we just had – let's see, why are my – okay, here we are. I was going to say where are my originals showing up?

So we had a couple of changes that we wanted to – things that we wanted to call out I should say in the charter. And in particular we wanted to make it clear that there's currently no mandate or rule regarding meeting rotation, and that the decision is left to the working group based on the composition of membership and utility of rotation. And actually I've just changed the document so you can see where I'm reading. I'm on the second page of the document, underneath the sort of disocclusion or the implementation section.

So we also thought it would helpful to put this language into the working group determination section. So if you look there, we've added that. In particular the working group has determined that at this time it does not appear necessary for there to be a mandate or rule regarding meeting rotation. Instead the decision as to whether to rotate meeting time should be

left to the working group based on the composition of the membership and the utility of rotation.

And just noting back to the recommendation itself, it does say just that PDP working groups rotate to start some of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world. It doesn't say – it doesn't require that the GNSO establish a rule or mandate that rotation should happen, just that it's recommended that working groups should rotate. And yes, I think last week we noted that we should be more clear on that point just in case somebody was expecting us, this working group, to create a rule or a mandate.

So that was the change from last week. And I'll just open it – turn it over to all of you for discussion.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. Any comments or questions about those changes? I see Wolf-Ulrich Knoben is typing. That was Julie Hedlundfrom staff. And I think it was Wolf-Ulrich who had raised the issue. He says I agree, thanks Julie. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: So again, this is Julie from staff. Jen, I'd like to suggest then with this change that staff would accept these changes and send the implementation charter out for the usual two-week consensus call. Although let me ask this one thing.

Because we – the week after next, I know that there are at least a couple of community meetings. I'm wondering if we should extend that or if we should just leave it at two weeks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Julie, this is Jen. I think – Lori's saying she'd extend it. Okay. If there's a desire to extend it, let's go ahead and give it another week.

Julie Hedlund: Sure. So we'll go ahead – thank you Jen, this is Julie again. We'll go ahead and put the – accept the changes and put the charter out for a three-week consensus call.

Lori Schulman: Hi, it's Lori.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Sorry, I don't see the queue for some reason on my screen. So I apologize for barging in. But I wanted to say the reason why I think it's important to extend it is I'm, you know, generally I – as I'm required to, I surface all of the consensus calls to my leadership. And, you know, we – I don't think we've ever objected.

With that being said, I think that the underwhelming participation in this review is concerning. And what I'd like to do is maybe use the time, I know on my end, to maybe not just bring this to my leadership, but maybe try to get some discussion going, particular around something like this which, you know, affects the entire, you know, GNSO.

And I don't know. I just – again, you know, I'm looking at the number of people on this call today. I'm looking at the important work we're doing. And I feel like we need to proselytize a little. Or do you think that's misplaced?

Jennifer Wolfe: Hey Lori, this is Jen. I think to answer your question about why I think we have a lower turnout, I think part of this is because we're now in the implementation phase. And this was fully vetted through the review working group. I think we had a lot more participation during that phase. And then there's just other things going on right now. I think that's why we have lower turnout.

But certainly – we certainly recognize that. And if you think there's something we can do to try to further engage folks, we can. But I think that's probably

why, is because a lot of this has already been vetted and we're sort of just documenting the implementation at this point.

Lori Schulman: All right. I mean that makes sense. I mean this was fully vetted for well over a year if I remember correctly. All right. I'm just willing. I'm just trying to think of anything. I just thought by extending the time, you know, maybe there's a way to socialize this a little better among my own constituency.

But I mean it's not – if that's not the case, I don't know that I feel strongly one way or the other, except that I'm going to be part of those meetings next week. And in terms of clearly communicating and asking any questions, I personally would appreciate the time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, I agree. I mean I think more time, you know, if you're needing to socialize it with other folks and try to get more feedback, absolutely. I don't think it hurts us in any way to generate more time. I just think the reason we don't get more feedback, you know, on all of these things is because a lot of it – people maybe feel like a lot of it's already been vetted.

Lori Schulman: Yay.

Jennifer Wolfe: So…

Lori Schulman: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: And Julie, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Jen, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, as far as the vetting, keeping in mind too that a lot of time has passed since the start of the review. I mean this is a review that started in – essentially it's the 2014 review. So what, you know, has happened as we've seen is during the time period that the review was occurring, there have been a number of procedural and

process improvements in the GNSO that have addressed a lot of these recommendations.

So not only was the review process fairly lengthy and also vetted within the community and the GNSO, but there were ongoing process improvements as well. So we certainly from the staff side do want to give ample time for the community to review these implementations to these recommendations. But I think as far as this group goes, we have a fairly dedicated core group of participants who have been participating all along in the review, and have a lot of institutional knowledge.

So we perhaps in that way can move a little bit faster with a smaller group while still giving in-depth, you know, thoughts to the recommendations and their implementation.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. Okay, so I think we'll give that an extra week so that we've got plenty of time for everybody to circulate this and get any feedback.

Why don't we go ahead and move on to a discussion of the revised implementation charter for Recommendation 22? Julie, can you take us through the changes?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Thank you so much Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So Recommendation 22 was – the charter was first discussed at our meeting last week. This is on development needs and opportunities, specifically that the GNSO Council develop a competency based framework which its members should use to identify development needs and opportunities.

In our discussion last week we, the working group thought it would be helpful and staff too, to have some background, particularly on how this recommendation and its language was developed, and whether or not there was any guidance from the independent examiner's report with respect to the intent of this recommendation.

So I'll read through the background that staff has gathered, and then we can turn things over for discussion. And also the other item that staff was asked to add was whether or not there was training on tech – on technology relating to the policy development process and to ICANN in general. So we also did put in links to that as well.

But so for the background, note that the working group requested guidance on the background concerning – excuse me – the term or the language "competency based framework" in the recommendation. According to the final assessment report of the GNSO review working party, the intent of the recommendation was to provide a framework for training to insure that GNSO councilors and GNSO policy development process working group members have appropriate skills and background to participate effectively in the PDP.

Although the recommendation was not intended to address technical training, working party members noted that such training also would be helpful. And then in the final report of the independent examiner, the reference to training is related to training of GNSO councilors and to concern raised in the survey of the need for training in technical expertise, project management and governance. The reference to a "competency based framework" appears to reference the need to insure that GNSO councilors and working group members have the training they need to be competent in their positions.

So I'll stop there if we want to discuss those additions. And then we can move on to the other addition.

Julie Hedlund: And Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thanks Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. That's helpful for our understanding here. And so to fully understand, I have a question. So that means that we have two parts of – we'll have two parts of training let me say or skills to be developed. That means the one is the procedural part with

regards to the PDP itself – how PDP works, how it is done in a procedural way according to the PDP manual.

And the other thing would be any specific technical knowledge related to the specific work a working party or working group is doing. So that would be my understanding here, not only a kind of general technical education for everybody concerned, like councilors or so. And for the full understanding, if you go down in your – in the paper here, there is a new chapter which you I think you inferred that the DNS infrastructure basics.

Is that what you mean as technical training? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. That is my understanding, that there needed to be some basic information that related to the domain name system so that people could understand at a very high level the – sort of the structure of – it would help them understand the structure of ICANN, the technology, again at a very high level, of behind the domain name system.

And so, you know, so that – excuse me. My understanding is that's the intent of these modules. And these are actually linked through the GNSO part of the ICANN website. So if you go to GNSO, it's specifically linked for GNSO community members.

I don't know if that's helpful. Yes, I see Lori Schulman says yes, I was confused too. Technical training could also mean using ICANN's technology to enable the work. That's technical training. Thank you Lori for mentioning that.

That aspect of technical training is something that is also encompassed in the ICANN Learn, where as you know it talks about basic web skills, you know, use of wikis and so on. And I see that Sarah Bockey said could technical

training also be for staff to have a better understanding of registry/registrar technical issues?

That's a good question Sarah. Staff do have training available to them in a wide, you know, variety of options. And in fact also has a requirement to incorporate training, you know, into performance. I don't know if that really is encompassed in the scope of this recommendation however. But I'll just note that yes, that option is there as well.

But what I've included here is really specifically for the GNSO community, although of course there's no reason that staff couldn't access these training modules as well.

Julie Hedlund: Further questions, comments? Please go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie for the question. I'm thinking, you know, how this is going to be implemented, and really what does it mean, you know? In future work, how can we act on this on the basis of that? So we have been asked to provide for a framework. So what does it mean, framework?

Is this just a list of ideas? Or is this something which we should think about how it is going to implement? If you look for (unintelligible) to your list of (unintelligible) for such a basic, so (unintelligible). And so that could be four, that could be six (unintelligible). I would add a few things.

Is that something what we are thinking it should be implemented? There should be training courses provided for that? So that means that somebody has to start to organize that from that. Or how are we going to deal with that? So it's a question of a framework for this.

So the question for me is the other is not clear. But I would like to discuss that. So what is your opinion here in this about that, because that means we

depending on our answers. So we should do something more with this. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Let me see if there are further – if there are other comments or questions with respect to the question Wolf-Ulrich has raised. Please go ahead Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, hi. I think Wolf-Ulrich raises a valid point. But I think what would be challenging for me as a member here would is if we decide that framework really means more than a list of – like sort of conceptual way of approaching a problem, I don't feel qualified to – I don't know how I would recommend developing that. I mean I don't know how we do that at ICANN.

Unless I didn't understand what Wolf-Ulrich was saying, which is possible. But I think what I understand the comment to mean, it's more than just suggestions. It's actually a way of approaching a problem. You know a framework usually means like it could be a curriculum type thing or it could be a series of questions that when you have the answers at the end, you should be led to some sort of logical conclusion. And that's what I think of, like an academic framework versus a list of (unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: Please go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Lori. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes, I'm also uncertain how really to deal with that, you know? But I'm thinking, you know, we have been mandated by the GNSO for the council now to come up with framework. So we will come to the original report on that, the evaluation. And then maybe we can say okay, here is a list we were thinking, which could be useful to cover – to implement in kind of training courses maybe in general, maybe depending on the specific requirements of some working teams, and that it's – and that's what we bring back and leave it up to the council to accept that and then to decide case by case.

So I couldn't say more at the time being. So otherwise we have really to dive into more specifics than that. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. And this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Jen, I put myself in the queue. That's okay?

Jennifer Wolfe: No, of course – absolutely.

Julie Hedlund: So thank you Wolf-Ulrich and Lori for this very interesting and helpful discussion. So one suggestion staff might make is clearly there's a lot of material available. But what we seem to lack is a way to – I think as Lori says – to sort of conceptualize it or to – or as possible Wolf-Ulrich was noting, that there isn't a way to – a path, a clear path.

You just have a list of items, but you don't – let's say I'm a new councilor. And let's say I want to know, you know, precisely what I need to do to get up to speed. You know is there a framework for that that I should do this training, this training, this training and, you know, look at these materials, and that is sort of the framework for me to be prepared to do my job?

Or let's say I'm a new PDP working group member. Again, what is the connection between the list of all these, you know, the links to all these various trainings and the, you know, what I need to achieve the training I need to have to do my, you know, to be in my role?

So I'm wondering if what is missing is not so much a need to reinvent or duplicate what's already out there, but a way to make – to put a framework on what we have and to say – and to make it a clearer connection between the training that is available and the competencies that we need and the framework around that so we know how we can, you know, we can be trained for what we need to do.

That's just a suggestion then for a discussion. And I'll look in here. Sarah Bockey says I think ICANN topics are complex, and the history related to issues too deep to really be effectively addressed in brief classes. Perhaps something that goes deeper dive over a longer period of time, like a semester say would be helpful. I've done a good bit of this training with varying degrees of feeling like I took something away from it. Thank you Sarah. And then back over to all of you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes, thanks so much. You know I'm just – I wanted to be clear that after we are going to leave this, you know, here this charter and leave it as it is, that we are clear what's going to happen with them. So maybe, and I understand that, so for all these listed items we have, there are already – let me say, a training, a kind of training or potential training has been already institutionalized. It has to be – let me say specifically done, you know, in case it is needed.

But there is an institution where we can do that. And we have this list of several kinds of training possibilities like ICANN Learn, ICANN Academy and so on (unintelligible). So there is something available to that. That is my opinion. So why shouldn't we – is that reflected in the charter this way?

You know the connection between, you know, the request for some training and the implementation which is already done. Is that clear in this charter? Then we can leave it as it is. That's my opinion. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Other comments? And I'll put myself in the queue again. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. I think that's a really helpful point Wolf-Ulrich, that perhaps what's missing here is just a clear connection to the implementation of the recommendation.

So that – I mean because it's here but it's perhaps not as clear as it could be. For instance you have GNSO 101, that is training for new councilors and PDP working group members. The modules sort of, you know, clearly delineate the various aspects of these roles that they cover. And yet there's nothing really in this charter that says okay, for this aspect of this recommendation, this is the connection, you know, the framework to the training itself.

So perhaps what staff could try to do is make that clearer in this charter that, you know, how the connection between the recommendation and the implementation of that recommendation. And perhaps that might be sufficient. I mean, you know, if we show the framework itself in the charter, then, you know, perhaps that would be enough to show that we do have the implementation of the recommendation.

And I see that Wolf-Ulrich is typing. So we'll wait and see what he has to say. Wolf-Ulrich says this would be helpful and sufficient. Then Jen, I would like to take the action item for staff to go ahead and add further clarification to the charter, making that connection between the recommendation for the framework and the implementation of that framework through the existing training.

And we could send that revision out in advance of the next call. Let's say we could give it, you know, the next call is on the 8th of February. And so we could try to get it out then like a week before that so that there's plenty of time for people to review it before the next call.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that would be great Julie, particularly since we have a lag before our next meeting. If this can come out early, then everybody has a chance to read it and formulate their opinions. And then hopefully we can, you know, finalize this charter at our next call. Does that sound good to everybody as the next step? Or anybody opposed to that?

Okay. Let's go ahead and move on to the implementation charter for Recommendations 1, 2 and 3. Julie, could you take us through that one?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Thank you very much. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So this is the first time we'll be seeing these recommendations to this charter, draft charter, so we'll spend some time going through it.

This one staff will note appears to be one that isn't necessarily already implemented. And as I walk through the recommendations, you can see why that might be. At least from the research staff has done so far, it appears that there would be steps that would need to be taken if this working group agrees to implement these recommendations.

So far we've dealt most commonly or I would say almost exclusively with recommendations that had over time been implemented. And we've really had to do the research to go back and make the connection between the existing material or processes with the, you know, the fulfillment of the recommendation.

So just – this – just to note that I have the wrong title on this. It's not on rotation as working group meetings start time, so we'll change that. So there's three recommendations here. Recommendation 1 is that the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO working groups.

Recommendation 2, that the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP working groups, given the vital role volunteers play in working groups and policy development. And 3, that the GNSO reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups.

So I think we could – the title for this would probably be more properly GNSO outreach and working group participation. But in any case we'll give this a

more appropriate title. And with respect to the strategic alignment, we were suggesting that this could relate to the policy development government processes structures with meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective, and responsive, and the goals associated with that.

And just as a reminder, this is just part of the standard structure of these charters. It's actually part of the (unintelligible) accountability mechanism that we built into this. So for the scope description we suggested that staff will provide an overview of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO working groups.

The GNSO review working group would determine what metrics to develop and monitor to evaluate ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs. The GNSO review working group would determine whether the GNSO should develop and fund more targeted programs beyond those already offered.

And the working group would determine how best to reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups and policy development. And then finally the working group would determine whether this recommendation has been implemented or whether further work needs to be undertaken to meet the intent of the recommendation.

So a couple of things to consider here. The first recommendation is on the development and monitoring of metrics. Staff, at least from a cursory review, turned up a number of programs. But it's not clear that there is a GNSO mechanism or a GNSO set of metrics that is being used to monitor and evaluate these strategies and pilot programs. So perhaps first we could – I see Marika is typing. So Marika might correct me there.

Yes. And Marika says the working group may need to define what current cost barriers are, as policy development is largely done through online means which do cost time and effort, but no other costs as there are usually free dial

in numbers or otherwise dialup provided. Thank you Marika. That's a helpful point.

So just to first look at the outreach strategies and pilot programs, staff identified the following current outreach and volunteer development initiatives. Some of these do have their own evaluation processes, but there's not a GNSO specific evaluation. So there's the Stakeholder Journey Project. That's building pathways for interested stakeholders to become active participants in bottom up policy processes.

There's the ICANN Academy Leadership Program, which provides training and leadership facilitation skills for members of the ICANN community across the ACs, SOs and SGs. There's the ICANN Academy Chairing Skills Program Pilot. And you'll note that these are – there's a crossover with these from the Recommendation 22 that we just discussed.

Preparing community members to take on leadership roles in working groups and stakeholder groups. There's the Volunteer Engagement Project that seeks to improve ICANN's ability to identify and attract new and productive community participation while retaining existing participants who dedicate their time and efforts to ICANN's work.

There's the NextGen at ICANN which responses young adults to attend ICANN meetings, focusing on individual ages 18 to 30 from the region which the meeting is taking place. There's the ICANN Fellows Program which offers sponsorship to ICANN meetings and capacity building activities for select participants, focusing on individuals for underserved and underrepresented communities.

There's ICANN Learn, the free and open learning platform for members of the community. And then other activities within the GNSO – several activities support onboarding and newcomers, monthly webinars for working group newcomers cohosted with GNSO Council members, PDP Working Group

Member Onboarding Programs, and then membership enrollment portal currently in the planning stages.

And Marika notes, challenges that many of these programs do not have a specific GNSO focus or criteria. And that's exactly an important – one of the points we have to consider here. And particularly then, what staff has done is pulled out through the key issues to consider for each of the recommendations and presented them for discussion.

And so the first is the metrics to develop and monitor and evaluate ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs, whether to develop and fund more targeted programs, and how best to remove – reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in working groups and policy development.

So and Marika Konings says what may be missing from the list is SG and C specific outreach programs. That's a very good point too. We can certainly research what the SGs and Cs are doing. Yes, and I think that might fall under other activities as well. But it would be important to call those out.

So I'm going to – that's just a rundown of what we have in here. You notice the gaps because we really do need to now spend some time discussing. And Marika says that it may be worth getting more details on those that are presumably specifically focused on GNSO. And Lori Schulman says I like the idea of outreach – agree with Marika.

So staff can take that on as an action item to do some additional research as far as what the SGs and Cs are doing with respect to their outreach efforts and training. And I see Sarah Bockey is typing. And in any case Jen, I'd like to go ahead then and turn this over to the group for discussion and some thought, perhaps initial thoughts on the information that we're gathering here.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, absolutely. And just one quick question before we open it up to the floors. Did you say that these programs already have some evaluation in place?

Julie Hedlund: I think that's – I think some do. And I have to say that that's another action that staff can take to do a little bit more research. I know that for example the Fellows Program, which I'm involved in from a staff point of view, is constantly evaluating the, you know, the participation, the, you know, the processes that they use to evaluate the Fellows.

And so at least there I think that there are some ongoing efforts for process improvement and to review effectiveness. And Marika says – I'm sorry. Sarah Bockey says I've never heard of the Stakeholder Journey Project. Is there a link to that? Thank you Sarah. We'll get that information.

Pascal Bekono says good point Marika. And Marika says I believe there are also discussions on conducting a community wide review of the Fellowship Program. Thank you Marika. I think I did hear that as well. So staff can look into that also.

I do also think that with respect to the Academy Leadership Program and particularly the program pilot, I think there was some evaluation conducted there before continuation of the pilot. Again though as noted, these aren't specific GNSO necessarily, just GNSO training opportunities. Certainly GNSO, you know, potential on GNSO community members, you know, can and do participate.

I know in the Fellow Program many of our, you know, now participating GNSO community members and even councilors have been through the Fellows Program. And in fact I think Rafik in particular would be very interesting – he's not on the call – to get his opinion on this as well.

But yes Jen, staff will take the action to delve a little bit more deeply into what effectiveness evaluations or metrics might already be being captured from these programs. And also I tried to find out more about the Stakeholder Journey Project, and then also what the stakeholder groups and constituencies might be doing with respect to outreach and training. So there's three – at least three actions there.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. That would be very helpful, particularly in, you know, addressing point number two, just to know what's already being done. And then, you know, perhaps the question is should there be something in the aggregate that's looking at the holistic results?

Other comments from the group? I guess let's take these one by one in terms of point number two on the issue of metrics. Do we feel like right now we're – we need to gather more information or do we have other comment on that point? Okay, I'm not seeing anything in terms of hands or comments. So why don't we take that as any action item, and we'll circle back to that.

Oh, Wolf-Ulrich, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Sorry to come late. With regard to outreach, so to my mind and to my experience, you know, in the past now, it seems to me that outreach is done on constituency or stakeholder group level. So that is at least what we are doing for RFPs. I don't know how the for example within our stakeholder group the IPC and the BCs doing.

I think what that each constituency has its own kind of, you know, the target audience and the audience, you know, people, you know, to outreach to. But this is one point. This could be summarized, you know, it could be – let me say in a kind of list of so who is doing some things on request.

The question is then the metrics, how to evaluate success. For example, we are not doing specifically with regards to working groups which is asked here,

which I understand is here. Otherwise I don't understand why this asked specifically with respect to outreach effect to working groups because, you know, at first you need people joining the ICANN community.

And then you can well educate them or you can make them trained, you know, to join working groups or to volunteer for working groups. So it's a little bit a contest between both of these, you know, the outreach from constituencies and then the working group aspect. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. Julie, your hand is up. Did you want to respond to that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. I think of the – I think there's two interesting points. First of all that we really do need to look at what the stakeholder groups and constituencies are doing. And I know that there was recommendations that came out of the first GNSO improvements implementation process relating to outreach.

And that specifically went to the stakeholder groups and constituencies. And staff can pull that as well. With respect to, you know, and perhaps aggregate what is already being done in the stakeholder groups and constituencies as part of this charter.

I guess, and here Sarah and Pascal are getting to my question for the working group. Sarah asks, I'm not sure re metrics. What exactly are the metrics looking at? And Pascal Bekono says metrics can be done through a survey. So this is the question, at least from a staff point of view, is what does this working group think would be useful metrics?

I mean how would we evaluate effectiveness of outreach strategies and pilot programs, specifically with regard to GNSO working groups? Are we looking at – do we look at populations of working group volunteers, and determine whether or not we have new people joining and participating? This is just off the top of my head.

Do we look at any working group assessments that have been done after PDP? There have been areas of difficulty or needs for improvement. Do we develop a, you know, a type of survey whereby we ask working group members what trainings they've participated in and how effective they think it is?

So these are all questions I think you know, we could lay out for the working group to consider as far as what type of metrics might be useful for an evaluation, recognizing too that we probably don't want to burden the community volunteers with a lot of extra, you know, work to, you know, develop these metrics or to complete whatever surveys or evaluations we may develop to gather the metrics. So just some thoughts there.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. Any comments on that? I think from where we are, we're going to be looking for some additional information, and then we'll circle back to this topic during our next call. But are there other comments or thoughts to offer right now? Julie, go ahead please.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. So this is Julie Hedlund from staff. Perhaps what staff can do is provide, in addition to the additional information that we've identified as actions for staff, is maybe to – just to put in some questions or some, you know, some of the things that I just mentioned as far as what some suggestions of what the working group could consider as a way to gather some metrics, you know, in addition to what may already be being gathered.

And then also, you know, with respect to Recommendation 2, keep in mind that the working group could simply decide that we have targeted programs. And, you know, so we don't need to find more. You know looking at the list, you know, do we think that that provides enough, you know, training for working groups? How would we determine that, and so on?

And then with respect to the third recommendation, one of the other recommendations that where staff is gathering information that may come into play here is with Recommendations 7 and 12, staff is working with our language services group to identify the cost associated with providing real-time transcription, and also with translation of those materials, which in many cases is already being done.

So that if you have, you know, working group materials, you can have those translated, you know, to be available in however many languages you think is useful for your working group, and what is the cost for that. That might be a way to reduce/remove cost barriers for volunteer participation if, you know, if people can access, you know, free translations to make it easier to participate.

We already as Marika notes, have, you know, free telecommunications and remote participation. So it might be that staff can identify what is being provided already that does help to remove cost barriers. And the working group can decide if there's something additional that needs to be done.

So perhaps then we can try to help frame these a little bit better for a fuller discussion on our next call we do have. And again, staff could shoot for trying to get, you know, at least the recommendation out at least the week before so that there's plenty of time to digest this information before the call on the 8th.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Julie. I think that would be very helpful. I think to gather just a little more information as we've talked about and help frame this up. And seeing that we only have a few minutes left in the hour, that probably makes sense as our next step. And again, if we can get that out a week ahead of time, then perhaps we can all try to make a commitment to read it and come in prepared with ideas to discuss on these recommendations.

Any other comments? Does that sound okay with everybody that we're going to wait for that additional information, and then we'll dig in to this during our next call? I see Sarah is typing – sounds good. Lori – yes. Okay.

Okay then let's stake that as our next step with this implementation charter. And since we're about at the top of the hour, I have our next meeting down as February 8, which is a few weeks out. Is that correct? Do I have that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. That's correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So we will look for the materials to come out about a week ahead of time and regroup again on February 8. So I thank you all again for taking the time to work through these issues and work through getting these implementation charters drafted and put out. We appreciate all of your time and commitment.

Any other final remarks? I see Wolf-Ulrich is typing. Let me just make sure he doesn't have anything else. No, it looks like he stopped. Wolf-Ulrich, anything else there?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Okay, just checking. And I think Sarah's typing. Okay, thanks. Okay, thanks everybody. Everybody have a great rest of your day. And we'll look forward to talking on the 8th of February.

That brings this meeting to a close.

Terri Agnew: Thanks everyone. Thanks so much for joining. Have a great morning, afternoon, evening.

Coordinator: Thanks everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator (Jennifer)…

END