ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group
Thursday, 12 April 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-12apr18-en.mp3

Agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/LoPpB

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

Attendance

Members:
Jennifer Wolfe (RySG Primary)
Lori Schulman (IPC Primary)
Rafik Dammak (NCSG Primary)
Sara Bockey (RrSG Primary)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (ISPCP Primary)

Participants:
Kris Seeburn (NCUC)

On Audio Only:
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts (BC Primary)

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Emily Barabas
Berry Cobb
Marika Konings
Terri Agnew
Andrea Glandon

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the

                   GNSO Review call on the 12th of April, 2018. On the call today we have Kris

Seeburn, Rafik Dammak, Jen Wolfe, Sara Bockey and Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I show no listed apologies for today's meeting. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Andrea Glandon and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Also joining us from staff is Marika Konings. With this I'd now like to turn it back over to Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And actually I can go ahead and turn it to you, Jen. The agenda, if you want to run through it is up on the screen at this moment.

Jen Wolfe: Sure. Thank you. Thanks everybody, again, for continuing to take the time and commitment to this effort as we near the closing weeks and meetings of our initiative here. Just to briefly review our agenda for today, we'll start with an update of the latest status of the consensus call for revised implementation charter for Recommendation 22. And then we'll move on and talk about the status of action items for Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, and then move on to discussing the implementation charter for Recommendations 7 and 12, and 20 and 21. And then our next meeting is set for two weeks from today.

Just briefly before we get started, are there any updates to statement of interest? And I'll just note we were talking before the recording started that with the new WebEx system we are going to need to rely on staff to let us know if there's any hands displayed. So anyone with any updates?

Julie Hedlund: And Jen, I don't see any hands up.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, excellent. Okay then let's go ahead and move right into our agenda. Julie, could you give us an update of the status of the consensus call for Recommendation 22?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So the consensus call for the charter to implement Recommendation 22 closed on the 30th of March. And there were no objections noted. And so the recommendation is implemented via full consensus. And our status page on the wiki has been updated accordingly, so thank you all for that.

And just as a reminder, we did actually hold that one open for three weeks because it extended over the time of the ICANN meeting and we also reminded people at the call on the 29th of March that the consensus call was closing. And at least a few people on that call noted that they had discussed the charter within their constituencies. So we do think it got, you know, proper review. So that's where we stand with that one.

Jen Wolfe: Great, thank you. Let's go ahead and move unless there's any questions or anybody has their hand raised, let's go ahead and move on to the status of our action items.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thank you, Jen. This is Julie again from staff and there's no hands raised at the moment. So some of the work on Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 based on the actions from the last call is ongoing but we do have some updates so we'll go ahead and talk through those updates and see if there are any questions.

So staff is in the process of researching metrics relating to the Fellowship Program and we did just yesterday get some information that we'll send around after the call. But – and because there is also some more that we can gather in that respect. So just as a reminder, because this relates to one of the other items here that was an action, there is a Fellowship consultation that actually just ended, Fellowship Program Community Consultation.

And when we get to this action item we'll bring up the response that the Council – the GNSO Council sent in. But as part of that community consultation process a number of metrics and information were gathered and placed on a – on the Website where the consultation was announced. And so there are a number of metrics that ICANN has gathered relating to the Fellowship Program and then also posted those.

One of those, which I'll send around, is actually data on fellows that have gone on to actually participate in the – what do I want to say – in the various SOs and ACs, so one of the questions I asked the ICANN staff was, do we have data on whether, you know, tracking fellows who have been supported and then gone onto become active in the SOs and ACs. And there is data there broken out by SO and AC.

So and we'll also see if there are other related metrics associated with the Fellowship Program. But we will send around after this call a specific email noting, you know, all of the various links that we've gathered. And apologize for not having it ready today but we were just alerted to some of that information yesterday.

And then the second action item was whether or not there are metrics associated with the CROP program. So what we found is that there's been a series of reports produced since the CROP program has existed. So what staff sent around with the agenda and materials this past Tuesday were links to reports from FY'14, FY'15, '16 and the latest report which is FY'17. And to give you an example of one of these reports, let me go ahead and pull up – pull one up here.

So here is the report for FY'17, noting that the name of this program has recently changed and is now just – since it's not a pilot it's the Community Regional Outreach Program; for FY'18 it ceased to be a pilot. So just as an example of some of the results here, you can see the table of contents, the,

you know, the key deliverables, orientation and training, the implementation aspects, prior report and then results and outcomes so aggregate results, participation rates and regional distribution and then the program review, mission and purpose, structure and organization, operations and execution and outcomes.

So just to go as an example for the summary report, number of travelers from the different organizations, you can see here that, you know, in FY'16 and FY'17 those from the GNSO constituencies and then the number of travelers taken – allocated and then completed an the utilization rates, and then by the summary report here on Page 5, it's broken down for the GNSO by the various constituencies that participated and so you can see there's a variety of data here and they say here also, comprehensive analysis of CROP is presented in Section 4. So if we were to go through to that section.

And here are results and outcomes so trip proposal, drafts submitted, approved, trips taken, number of travelers, budgeted travelers, and then again the breakout by the different – the RALOs and the constituencies. And then another example of a breakout here and the regional distribution and so on. So you can see there's actually quite a bit of data here that's been collected, and this is the same structure that's been collected each year.

So at any rate, so with respect to the section in the charter, staff will update the charter to point to these data and call out these data as metrics that are already being collected, and we'll do the same thing for the Fellowship Program, because one of the things that we discussed at our meeting last week was the need for us to see if there already data that are being gathered and to point to those metrics so that we're not creating duplication by requesting metrics, say, as an implementation of this recommendation.

We do have an ongoing request into the SGs and Cs for additional metrics on participation that we will add into the charter. And then we will update the

determination portion of the charter to note that there are existing metrics and to call those out as we just mentioned.

And then there was a question from the last meeting as the best way for the working group to provide input on the Fellowship Program. Staff notes that actually the window for providing input closed – it closed I believe it was just last week so there really wasn't time for this group to provide a response, pardon me. And but what staff thought would be helpful is if we wanted to walk through briefly the response that the GNSO Council sent to the, you know, as part of the community consultation process.

And so I have pulled that up on the screen here and you can see, you know, some of the issues here that the Council has raised. And I don't want to necessarily just read through this word for word since I've also sent it around but I'll just highlight a couple of points.

In particular the lack of a definition for what is an "active fellow" and the request from the Council to, "Establish a set of metrics that will help to objectively monitor such participation and serve as evidence thereof." So regular participation in working group conference calls, participation in discussions and deliberations, participation in drafting or reviewing working group deliverables and reporting the working group's activities to the fellow's respective stakeholder group and constituencies and participation in public comments as a pen holder or reviewer.

And so these would be in addition to the metrics that are already being captured by the Fellowship Program, and I do think that they go into greater detail. What this working group could consider is that we could point to the responses to the community consultation in particular we could point to the GNSO request for these metrics and thus this particular working group would not need to make that same recommendation, so, you know, we would avoid duplicating where there's already been a request for additional metrics and this could be called out in the charter as well.

I'm just moving to the second page. And there the Council acknowledges the increase in the number of returning fellows but notes the need for further monitoring and follow up to determine whether and how they've become involved in the policy development work, and then pointing to better metrics, and then noting that the goal is still a priority but are there new goals and the Council notes that in particular skills that should be considered more closely in the selection of fellows. And then, yes, and some of the other things calling out here the contributions to the Council, some – noting that there's evidence of former fellows becoming councilors, but again, needing more objective metrics.

And noting that the Council doesn't conduct outreach per se targeting fellows but stakeholder groups and constituencies do have outreach and there is also the material for the ICANN Learn program to provide policy updates. And I'm just looking through. You know, I'm realizing that this is quite lengthy and so it probably doesn't really – it's probably not the best use of our time to walk through all of the pages here. But I hope that gives you a sense of the comprehensiveness of the Council's response.

I know that there was a great deal of effort that went into producing this response and again, the staff suggestion is that we point to this and you know, call out that these, you know, recommendations are – shall we say, complementary to the recommendations coming out of the GNSO review. So that's where we stand with Recommendations 1, 2 and 3.

Staff is continuing to follow up on efforts from gathering metrics on participation in the SGs and Cs, and will also gather and produce further metrics relating to the Fellowship Program and we'll update the charter according to these new materials that we've received and in particular will – we will write up the working group determination and send that out and call that out separately for the working group to discuss on the next call similar to how we have done with Recommendations 7 and 12 per the suggestion of

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben on our last call. So I'll stop there and see if anybody has any questions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi, Julie. It's Wolf-Ulrich.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, so I raised my hand so I'm just asking, well, who is going to follow the chat? And so is that possible because I learned last time that one – the leader or you, you can follow that? You can see my hands?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'm sorry, Wolf-Ulrich. And oddly the hands weren't displaying for me and it's because I hadn't clicked on something I was supposed to click on and now I see I have two hands up. I have yourself and I have Rafik. So apologies for that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No problem. So just well I'm fully in line with regards to what you have been saying about this report. I had not – have not read, you know, the CROP report yet in detail. But, you know, we have participated in the CROP comments and with regard to the Fellowship Program especially as a constituency and we have followed, you know, what's going on on the Council with the detailed comments and this is in line with what we are doing so I'm – I don't think there is anything to add.

So I really would support, you know, that we just point to this what is ongoing in this line and add it to what we have done with regards to additional parts of our question. So that's it, so I'm fully in line with that. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Julie. This is Rafik speaking. So I was going to ask first because you mentioned about the response from the staff regarding the Fellowship and including the metrics. So I will wait for the email, but however,

my first question here is that those data or metrics they collected, they are self reported or the staff confirmed the information? Because, for example, with regard to affiliation of fellows claiming that they joined an SO or AC or a stakeholder group and constituency, my experience there is kind of gap between the – what is reported and the reality. So just maybe checking about that so we need to kind of confirm the data we get, if they are self reported or the staff like confirmed against membership list or like for working group against, you know, also the membership of the working group and so on.

With regard to the Council response about the Fellowship, as I participate myself in the drafting, I think what also we can highlight is that we try really to list several possible metrics with regard to the participation on the PDP because the focus of the Council was really about that matter, it's not about the participation in the stakeholder group or constituency from the Council standpoint but it's really about how we can get in particular the alumni or returning fellow to be participating meaningfully or a meaningful way in the PDP. So we try to elaborate more about suggested metrics like attendance or participation drafting and so on so I think this is something we can use in our work. So thanks.

Julie Hedlund: So thank you very much Rafik. And to your first point, I think that's very important for us to – for staff to determine and I will check back with ICANN staff on that. My sense is that I think that with respect to participation that ICANN is probably relying on self reporting but probably not entirely I hope because I am aware of that gap; I've seen it myself in looking – in participating in the fellows evaluation where I have, you know, reviewed, you know, an application, for example, where someone has said that they are participating in a particular GNSO working group and I know that I have not seen that person participating. So I do think that that's a very important point and we'll follow up with ICANN staff to see how those data are gathered.

And I thank you also I think that it's important for us to note in referencing the GNSO comments that the participation is in the policy development making

process – policy development process as opposed to simply, you know, participation in stakeholder groups and constituencies. And, you know, to have that more granular and specific data is really something that, you know, the Council was focusing on.

What staff will do is review this, you know, this comment and try to pull out some of the top points and reference those in the charter. And Rafik, I still – I see your hand is still up, do you have further comments? And the hand is down.

I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. Jen, so I don't know if we want to move onto the next item just let us know.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, yes, let's go ahead and move on.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Thanks so much. Again, Julie Hedlund from staff. So we had a discussion during last week's – sorry the last meeting on Recommendations 7 and 12. And staff had made a number of changes to the charter which were accepted but we wanted to do some further work on the working group determination language. And so really this is the, you know, what the working group has determined as far as the implementation of the recommendations. And Wolf-Ulrich very helpfully kicked this off with some marked up text which we see here, the text that Wolf-Ulrich provided is in this fuchsia color.

And then staff has made a suggestion which will explain as well. So just to note Wolf-Ulrich's changes and of course Wolf-Ulrich, if you have others that you'd like to add as well let us know or any comments that you want to make. Just calling out in Recommendation 12 that that recommendation pertains to the feasibility of providing a real time transcription service. And then noting in the main text of the determination that the demand for these types of services may depend on the composition of the active working group membership and should clearly be defined within a rationale by the working group leadership.

This relate to a discussion we had on the last call where we talked about that there may or may not be demand for translation or transcription services and that that does depend on the composition of the active membership. And that that is important to show a rationale for that demand as well. So for example if you had a group that is asking for French and you have no active French-speaking members, then, you know, you would have to say why you needed to have French for instance, and it might not, you know, be – the rationale might not be accepted.

And, yes, and, yes, it should clearly maybe really should be clearly defined. Thank you, Lori, for that note. And something that staff has suggested then is that because any request for translation or transcription carries budgetary ramifications, staff's suggestion was that if a working group is making this request that the request should be channeled through the GNSO Council for consideration because of these budget implications so that you couldn't have, you know, a working group that is simply then asking staff to add, you know, potentially costly services, you know, that would affect, you know, the money that's budgeted for GNSO activities without the Council being involved in that request.

So that was new text that staff has suggested. And at this point let me open it up for any comments or questions. I'm not seeing any hands up.

Lori Schulman: Julie? Julie, it's Lori. I thought I put a hand up but I guess it doesn't compute. Anyway, I just have a thought, should we here be saying that these services don't necessarily need to be people-based? Like I understand that hiring like seven people to translate UN languages is super expensive as well know, but I'm thinking there might be automated systems, they're not great but they'd be better than nothing. And I'm wondering if we should say something like cost effective translation, which may include, you know, audio, you know, automated solutions or something like that so that we understand perhaps it's not just people translators, that there may be technical things we could do?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Lori, that's quite interesting. And I do know that there are those – this is Julie Hedlund again from staff – that there are those options as well. And I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up too. Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie and Lori. Lori, well I'm fully in agreement with that what you are saying so if you could just put that into the text that would be great. And I'm also agreeing to the text as it is. I'm just thinking about, you know, when we then, you know, leave this recommendation as it is so what is going to happen after this? So because why I'm asking is, is, you know, this may or will impact any budget, budget demand, so about.

So is there anything we should take into consideration here what you are saying going to say through – to recommend to the Council how they should deal with that, they should take into consideration any potential budget requirements for the upcoming years or so? So that's my – where I'm not sure about what we should do with that or just because as – if we leave it as is this question is open to me what's going to happen in future. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. That's a very interesting question because we're – in essence we're not – we're not mandating a necessarily a, you know, an action or an implementation per se, I mean, not a change to procedures. But since we are invoking the GNSO Council you know, how do we call attention to, you know, do we call this to their attention and how do we do that? But I see first that Rafik has his hands up – hand up so please go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Can you hear me, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: I see we have kind of (unintelligible) budget and so I – how to say – maybe if we – in the clarification how in fact those kind of services are budgeted. My understanding that they are separate – they are not necessary related to SO

and ACs and kind of let's say it's kind of shared pool resource. So maybe we can just – I don't want to volunteer someone but since we have Berry and he's familiar with the budget I think he can check and current proposal for FY'19 budget and to find out more details about what it's planned for all language service instead of here trying kind of to figure out because if it's not necessarily within the budget of GNSO or something that's shared maybe we – this is (unintelligible) any – how to say – any concerns about how much it will cost.

Still I think there is kind of we can put that that we have to be careful about that should be demand-based, we have to be sure that there is a real demand for such services and we can just outline that the possibility like maybe translation of executive summary and so on during the public consultation but it should be limited and we acknowledge that we cannot really have interpretation and translation for everything every time, so.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Rafik. That's very helpful. And I want – related to that – I see – Berry has his hand up. Let me go to Berry and then I'll also read out a couple of comments that Marika has put in the chat that I think are helpful and then I also see that Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up so Berry and then Wolf-Ulrich and then I'll read out Marika's comments. Go ahead, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Julie. Berry Cobb for the record. Just to respond back to Rafik and I don't have the budget up in front of me to make this completely informed, so within the draft budget and prior budgets, language services is called out specifically under the GSE part of the budget. I think for FY'19 it was – this is a pretty big – it was either $6 million or $9 million for the fiscal year and that's essentially – and they have a few projects broken out underneath that, most of which contain the real life transcriptions for ICANN meetings, translation of documents and one or two other projects that I think are outlined in that.

As it relates to policy development under David Olive or more specifically within the GNSO, there are no specific allocations as it relates to language services or translations or real time transcriptions other than to say that within the goal 1.3, which is mostly around policy development there's the aspect of our teleconference providers. And one of the services that they provide are these real time transcription or translation services predominantly used within At Large and under one specific provider, none of those are specifically called out or, you know, they're small enough that they aren't specifically called out as a specific project.

So if need be I can try to get some more detail about language services. I think the bulk of the expenses from ICANN are wrapped up under that particular portfolio and then of course, you know, spread across the cross functional nature of the organization. So hopefully that's helpful. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Berry. This is Julie Hedlund. That's extremely helpful. And next Wolf-Ulrich, please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. And Berry especially. Well that's helpful, well, to hear. I think well, you know, the request from our side is well to avoid situations that, you know, on the one hand, you know, we show people okay there might be the possibility that people or the opportunity well to ask for budget or to ask for translations or here or for transcriptions. And on the other hand that there – if it comes to that request for specific meetings in the next years, then it should be worded that people come – or staff comes back and says okay, no we forget this is not in the budget right now.

But I understand if the budget is shaped that way that it is more in a general way shaped, not specifically then that may be easier, well, to handle just not to forget, you know, this kind of item just to add, you know, that item not in a way that it is budgeted per se but is not forget as an item that is included in the overall transcription, translation and what else budget. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich, that's very helpful as well. So I'll just read out – this is Julie Hedlund from staff – some of the comments that I think are helpful out of the chat. So Marika Konings says, "With the current budget situation it would likely require the Council to decide what services would no longer be provided to be able to provide these services so basically the Council and/or working groups may need to decide what their priority is for resource allocation."

And Marika further notes, "I believe language services is one of the areas that was proposed to be reduced and be more demand-driven?" question mark. And then Sara has asked – Sara Bockey asks, "Is there any chance that ICANN is looking at Skype for business?" that I believe you or someone here noted it has translation services built into it. Kris Seeburn says, "It was me." And Marika says, "We could ask our IT colleagues to support this – explore this solution."

And then Lori has helpfully suggested a draft of some text to add, I think before the final line of the paragraph. And it's, "The working group notes that a traditional RTT solution typically includes professional translators, understanding that the costs for such translators may be prohibitive," sorry, no it got away from me, "for some uses, other solutions may include automated services, volunteers or translations of executive summaries of transcripts after public meetings." Kris notes that he likes that wording.

Berry says, "Stands corrected, FY'19 language services equals $2.9 million at 6.7 FTEs, and the bulk of this is – bulk of which is for project recurring activity language services support all services." And the description is "Provision of translations, transcription, teleconference, interpretation and scribing support throughout the organization including scribing support for Board meetings, retreats and workshops."

So there is a budget and it is reduced, I think from the current FY – fiscal year. And to get back to the question that Wolf-Ulrich had asked, and we can

– staff will add the additional – add the language that Lori has suggested here, but the question is do – for this particular charter, does the working group consider based on its determination that these recommendations are, you know, are implemented?

We – I don't think quite say that here. I mean, in that there are already services that have been identified that are being provided in a reduced way for future fiscal years but they are still a possibility. And, you know, we also are calling out less expensive options but we do have the recommendation that any requests, you know, not only have to be justified but would, if they have budget implications then they would need to go to the Council for consideration.

So my question to all of you is do – for this particular charter, once we have a consensus on the final language, should we call it out to the Council, not necessarily requiring action by the Council but it is, you know, we are making a suggestion for, you know, what the Council would do if there are requests for translation and transliteration. So that's my question to all of you. Kris Seeburn says, "I think we should call it out to Council." Any other comments? Not seeing any hands up at the moment.

I mean, one possibility is that, you know, we do have the function of regularly updating the Council from this group. We would not be able to get an update – well if we do a consensus call it wouldn't – the timing wouldn't work anyway, the next Council meeting is next week. But we could for the – let's say the following meeting note, you know, give an update on this particular charter noting that it has, you know, an action by the Council called out in it and then just update them.

And I see also Wolf-Ulrich says, "Call it out to Council." And Lori says, "That is fine to let Council know." So I think what staff would suggest we do at this point is put in the new language, accept the language, you know, that, you know, that we agree to here, put in the new language from Lori and staff

suggests actually that we could send this out for consensus call, you know, noting the language that was agreed to here today, and noting that if it goes to the consensus call and is accepted then we would put it on the, you know, next appropriate Council agenda to let them know what our determination was.

So that's a question to all of you. If you agree we could make these changes and send this out for a two-week consensus call. I'm not seeing any hands up. I see agree, Jen Wolfe says, "Agree." Wolf-Ulrich says, "Agree." Okay so then staff will take that as an action item. Kris is agreeing. Thank you, all. And then we can move to the next item. And Lori says, "Okay."

So Jen, I'll go ahead and move onto Recommendations 20 and 21?

Jen Wolfe: Yes, yes and I know we only have about 15 more minutes so this will probably be all that we can get through today.

Julie Hedlund: Exactly. And I think that this one probably will carry over to the next meeting which is fine, this is our first time seeing it, so I mean, it has been submitted now for the last couple of meetings and we haven't gotten to it but this is our first time reading through it.

So these are recommendations that relate to strategic objectives and industry trends. There are two recommendations. Recommendation 20 is that the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's strategic objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's strategic objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development. And Recommendation 21 that the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well represented in the policymaking process.

And so for our scope description, for Recommendation 20, that that GNSO Review Working Group would review if/how the GNSO Council has done this to date, if at all, and based on the outcome of the review the GNSO Review Working Group will work with staff to develop a lightweight process for the GNSO Council – excuse me – to participate in the development of ICANN's strategic objectives and guidance for planning future policy development that aligns with strategic objectives with GNSO resources.

And for Recommendation 21, staff to work with the GNSO to institute methods of information sharing of highly relevant research related to gTLDs to help the GNSO community members increase their knowledge base and ability to analyze potential impact. These could, for example, include regular staff briefings, implementing the recommendations of the DMPM Working Group and CCTRT data.

And then that the GNSO Review Working Group to develop a timeline for reporting on a recurring basis. This timeline could include regular reporting updating to the GNSO Council at every ICANN meeting as a status report to the GNSO as well as an item in the GNSO Council meeting agenda.

And then to move along, the staff analysis, on Recommendation 20, the GNSO Council does not currently have a formal mechanism to review annually ICANN's strategic objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's strategic objective and the GNSO resources available for policy development. There is, however, a vehicle that could be adapted for this purpose.

The GNSO Council Standing Committee on ICANN's Budget and Operations was chartered in December 2017 to, quote, coordinate and facilitate dialogue to fully understand ICANN's strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes in particular in preparation for the annual budgetary comment cycle as it relates to the GNSO Council's remit, unquote. The Standing Committee cannot initiate any action or decision on its own unless specifically

instructed by the GNSO Council. Any and all recommendations are submitted to the GNSO Council for its current – for its consideration.

Staff notes that it's currently chartered the Standing Committee provides a mechanism for the GNSO Council to provide input on ICANN's annual budget from a Council's perspective as a manager of the GNSO's policy development process and a decisional participant in the empowered community. While it's still in an early stage, the SCBO could potentially be the structure through which the GNSO Council develops input on ICANN's strategic plan once strategic planning for the next cycle begins.

And so the scope of the standing committee could be expanded so that it is also responsible for annually reviewing ICANN's strategic objectives and ensuring that the planning of future GNSO activities is in alignment with these strategic objectives. If this additional responsibility was to be added to the Standing Committee's charter, the analysis of strategic objectives would complement existing responsibilities relating to the annual budget.

And we'll note that if there are any changes to the charter, those would of course have to be approved by the SCBO and also by the Council as well. So moving along to – I'll move to 21 and then I'll see if we have any questions and then of course we'll take this up at the next meeting as well.

So on 21, staff notes that there are a number of initiatives underway within the ICANN organization to collect data and analyze trends in gTLDs to support decision making by the ICANN organization and the ICANN community including the GNSO. This data can be leveraged by policy development process working groups and the GNSO Council to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well represented in the policy making process.

The gTLD Marketplace Health Index is an ongoing project producing statistics and examining trends related to the health and diversity of the Generic Top

Level Domain Marketplace. ICANN will continue to publish these statistics semiannually to track progress against its goal for the Domain Name Marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted. Project has created a set of data metrics that will be used as a basis for further development of metrics in the future. And the December 2017 data report is noted here which features 26 beta metrics and 267 individual data points under three goals, robust competition, marketplace stability and trust.

And the current timeline for the planned work on this project is available under Section 2.3 of the Accountability Indicators webpage. And I'm seeing that – I'm not – okay, I'm not – I'm going to try to see if I've got any hands – track hands as well here.

So I'm not going to read through since we've only got eight minutes left but I'll just note that we – here are some other projects that are also collecting data. There's the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting Project, there's the Identifier Technologies Health Indicators, both of these are out of the Office of the Chief Technology Officer. And then there's a significant amount of data that was commissioned and collected under the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice, CCT review. And those are referenced here as well and those data and materials are at the link provided here.

And then – staff is – ICANN staff is responsible for collecting data necessary to produce these metrics which is part of a recurring CCT review and here's a list to the full list of metrics available. And then, you know, the Council requests and receives updates on data collection initiatives on an as-needed basis. And the PDP working groups take in account inputs from these data sources as they are relevant, for example, the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP considered the AM Global report on understanding limited global south demand in the most recent new gTLD rounds and options going forward in its deliberations on providing support for applicants from the developing countries.

And then just moving along, so the suggestion is that – let me just – I think – let me just – needed to scroll down here, sorry about that. Okay, so we do have a suggested working group determination and that the working group recommends that the charter of the standing committee would be revised to include an annual review of ICANN's strategic objectives and then given that there are a number – already a number of data sources available and research initiatives underway that provide information about trends in gTLDs.

That the working group does not anticipate a need for additional data collection and analysis effort and the GNSO Council already maintains ties with coordinators of these efforts and receives updates when they are timely which allows the Council to receive information as it becomes available rather than setting rigid timeframes for updates. And then should the Council decide different approach is needed it may consider setting up a regular review of data and analysis at set intervals.

So that is the – that is it for this charter. I see we only have five minutes, perhaps I could just ask if there are any quick comments or questions and thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thank you. With regards to the Recommendation 20, I think, you know, the most important thing is well to establish very, very formally maybe the link between the possibility of linking to get, you know, the development of ICANN's strategic objective and well for the policy development sort of objectives. And I think it's a good way to be done. I'm asking, you know, since there has been this meeting in LA for the Council – a two-day meeting on strategic issues as well as in San Juan, I think had also a strategic discussion, is there something which has been discussed in this direction which means to install the Standing Committee as a task holder for this kind of thing? Or were there different ideas? So I couldn't follow all these things.

That would be a question. If not, you know, from our point of mind, it would be the right way, well, just, well to recommend that the Council is going to do something in this direction if there are not better ideas from that point of view. Thanks. With regards to the other thing, the Recommendation 21, I think there is a lot of things has been developed over the last years. I remember that this recommendation was one with a very low priority and even we discussed that it was not clear whether we should you know, recommend anything about but it seems to me that there has been developed a lot of things in between which are very useful with regards to the market surveys and I fully support that. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And with respect to Recommendation 20, we haven't – it was not discussed in these, you know, in the LA meeting or San Juan in the strategic planning discussions whether to use the Standing Committee as a possible vehicle to review the strategic objectives annually. This is something I think that staff would probably want to explore perhaps with the Council leadership before maybe before having it be settled here in the charter.

As you point out, and because unless there is something that the leadership would suggest as an alternative to do this type of annual review. So I think staff could take back as an action to maybe try to raise this in discussions or perhaps maybe what we do is we include this in the update that we are anticipating doing for the Council meeting say next month after our consensus call is done on Recommendations 7 and 12, perhaps as part of that update we raise this as a suggested possible recommendation out of this working group.

So and, Jen, I don't see any other hands up. Just noting the last item on the agenda is that the next meeting is in two weeks on the 26th of April at this same time. But let me go ahead and turn things back to you.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, no, thanks Julie. And I think that makes sense to consolidate what we need to take to Council so if we can put that out I think that makes a lot of sense. So if there are no further comments we're right at the top of the hour. As Julie just said, our next meeting is two weeks from today at the same time on the 26th so we'll look to the list for any further comments and discussion. And thank you, Julie, for all your continued hard work, I know this is a lot to go through all of these charter and we appreciate all the work that you're doing.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jen. But also, many thanks to Emily Barabas who wrote up the charter for 20 and 21 that we're looking at here.

Jen Wolfe: Yes, thank you, Emily. Thank you. Thank you, Julie, thank you to all of you on staff.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Jen. And I'm just noting a couple – there was a question to staff from Rafik asking when we would be bringing this to the Council. Likely at the next Council meeting if, you know, if this working group agrees. And then – and noted Lori that you won't be available – likely not available on the 26th and of course we'll note your apologies. Thanks very much. And thank you, everyone, then.

Jen Wolfe: Okay great. Well if there's no further comments, I'm trying to see what's in the chat there. Next Council call is the 26th, okay so we'll check on when that is as well. Okay well thanks, everybody, again for your continued time. Julie, did you have something else? I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: No I didn't. I was just going to thank you and thank you Wolf-Ulrich for all your support as well.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, great. Great. Yes, thank you, thank you to everybody, and thanks for taking the time today and we'll look forward to talking in two weeks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, everyone. And…

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: …meeting adjourned. Thanks so much. Bye-bye.

Jen Wolfe: Okay bye.

                    END