

**GNSO Review Working Party Meeting**  
**4 May 2015 @ 15:00-17:00 UTC**  
**Chat Transcript**

Nathalie Peregrine:Dear all, Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party on the 4th May 2015

Chuck Gomes:Hi all.

Jen Wolfe:Hi everyone - welcome! We're just waiting for the Westlake team to join and then will get started.

Jeff Neuman (Com Laude):Hello all. I am a late comer to this group, but the registrars have asked me to join this group because they have not been able to give it as much attention as they want. I am just starting to get caught up and look forward to helping out.

Jen Wolfe:Thanks, Jeff, glad you are here!

Larisa Gurnick:Jeff, welcome! Please let me or Charla know if you need help with background information or documents.

Avri Doria:this is a very peaceful call.

Jeff Neuman (Com Laude):Thanks Larisa. I have the docs and am starting to go through them.

Avri Doria:it is the middle of the night were they are, isn't it.

Philip Sheppard BRG:NZ is 3.12 am -lovely

Avri Doria:is going to be spread ...? you mean it is going to get worse?

Philip Sheppard BRG:I see no issue with further delay if that helps better feedback

Avri Doria:a nice long comment period.

Philip Sheppard BRG:Support Chuck's suggestion and Jen's

Philip Sheppard BRG:But the key issue is that all recommendations are do what we do now a little better

Philip Sheppard BRG:A rather tame outcome

Larisa Gurnick:Jen and Chuck - would you be open to identify several Working Party members to work with staff to develop a template?

Larisa Gurnick:Thank you!

Nathalie Peregrine:Scrolling has been enabled for all

Larisa Gurnick:Chuck, we will take your suggestion and add all comments in redlined mode to the document, along with your comments

Larisa Gurnick:@ Philip - please note the response from the SIC to the Working Party at the start of the reviews -

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/48337499/SIC%20Response%20to%20Request%20for%20Clarification%20from%20GNSO%20Review%20Working%20Party.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1430750957179&api=v2>

Philip Sheppard BRG:@ Avri +1

Philip Sheppard BRG:@ Larissa - agreed. The key issue is a disconnect between the Board and its subsidiary the SIC. This disconnect should be highlighted.

Avri Doria:But if they do not have recommendations we think they should have, we can't wait until the implementation phase to add them.

Philip Sheppard BRG:Agree with Avri. There is no logic to believe you can add new substance in an implementation phase

Avri Doria:i am not asking that Westlake add the recommendations, but that we make them.

Larisa Gurnick:Staff will make sure that Westlake review in detail the transcript and all of your comments since they were not able to join the call.

Philip Sheppard BRG:@ Chuck - the world has changed since

Marika Konings:Shouldn't the GNSO work drive the strategic plan, instead of the other way around?

Philip Sheppard BRG:@ Marika +1

Larisa Gurnick:Staff will flag questions pertaining to Structure and Strategic Plan for Westlake to address at the next call, along with other key points that you will raise.

Nathalie Peregrine:Jennifer Standiford has joined the AC room

Philip Sheppard BRG:Thanks Larisa

Philip Sheppard BRG:BTW Rec 24 is very good!

Philip Sheppard BRG:Agree with Avri Rec 22 is overly simplistic

Jennifer Standiford:could people mute their phone s if not speaking?

Philip Sheppard BRG:Re Rec 38, I support Chuck. There is a pragmatic issue here too. The work does need to be done!

Philip Sheppard BRG:Page 17 is missing that Sep 2013 board resolution

Philip Sheppard BRG:...the page 19 footnote 7 is inadequate given the importance of the resolution

Philip Sheppard BRG:Late comment. Pgw 16 "At ICANN's inception in 1999, it was structured into supporting organisations –" This is not correct

Larisa Gurnick:@Avri re: recent improvements in diversity, particularly since ATRT2 - can you please point Westlake to the appropriate data to review this?

Avri Doria:there is no data that i know of. just an anecdotal experience of greater diversity. my point was they should have done that. or at least admit that they have not updated it to reflect any changes. they are basing recommendation on possibly stale data.

Larisa Gurnick:Thanks for the clarification, Avri

Avri Doria:leveraging work they did not update. that is a pity.

Avri Doria:my next is page 71/72

Marika Konings:For the record, very much agree with Chuck's comment. I am not aware of any instances in which the Council has drafted an amendment to a policy recommendation.

Philip Sheppard BRG:y comment may have been out of place after all !

Marika Konings:in recent history

Philip Sheppard BRG:Page 84 The GNSO's structure is designed to be adaptable and 'future-proofed' by allowing for the creation of new constituencies as needs arise, within the four stakeholder groups. This is inaccurate. Cs exist in one house only

Philip Sheppard BRG:Westlake recognise this in the following paragraphs but the opening sentence needs improving please

Philip Sheppard BRG:9.2 Merits inclusion of .brands as one third of TLD applicants

Avri Doria:i have comment on 113, 116

Philip Sheppard BRG:9.4 Diversity should include diversity of new TLDs

Avri Doria:i'd say it was closer to a Swedish model than a US model

Marika Konings:Voting typically only happened at the GNSO Council level.

Marika Konings:happens

Philip Sheppard BRG:P115 "Changes to structure may be among the most visible of changes to an organization, but amending the structure should not be confused with addressing core issues" This misses the point that the environment has changed dramatically

Philip Sheppard BRG:The changed environment is a "core issue"

Avri Doria:Well, if they agreed, it is not really us who need to send an apology.

Chuck Gomes:Thanks everyone.

Philip Sheppard BRG:Thanks all

Larisa Gurnick:Thank you everyone