

**GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 07 August 2014 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review20140807-en.mp3> **On page:** <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Attendees:

Klaus Stoll
Jennifer Wolfe
Philip Sheppard
Ron Andruff
Chuck Gomes
Stephane Van Gelder
Avri Doria
Rafik Dammak
David Maher

Guest speaker: Colin Jackson, Richard Westlake

Apologies: Michele Neylon

ICANN Staff:

Larisa Gurnick
Mary Wong
Lars Hoffman
Matt Ashtiani
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you so much, (Andre). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party conference on 7 August 2014.

On the call today we have (Unintelligible), Jennifer Wolfe, Philip Sheppard, Ron Andruff, Chuck Gomes and Stephane Van Gelder. We have guest speakers (Collin Jackson) and (Richard Westlake) with us. We received no apologies for today's call. From staff we have (Larissa Gurnick), (Matt Ashgioni), Glen DeSaintgery and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks. This is Jen Wolfe. Welcome to you all. Thanks again for taking time for these calls every other week, we really appreciate it. And I appreciate all the discussion on the list. I think we continue to have really good feedback and appreciate everyone taking the time to test the survey and provide some meaningful feedback.

On our agenda today we're going to get an update from staff on the launch process in terms of timeframe and what's happening, the webinar that's scheduled, and then (Richard Westlake) will be providing an update as well in terms of the documentation review and interviews, and then we'll have an opportunity to provide any additional feedback.

So with that, I will turn it over to (Matt) to give us an update on the launch process.

(Matt Ashgioni): Hi, everybody, this is (Matt Ashgioni). I just wanted to give everybody a quick update on what's happening. So we've successfully launched the GNSO 360 review. I say successfully because we actually have already had some surveys completed. We had quite a few completed within less than 24 hours of the survey, so far it looks as if everything is going on track. As a general reminder to everyone, the survey closes the 10th of September, so please share the Survey Monkey link, which I'll place into the chat in a second, with your constituencies and help spread the word.

In terms of the GNSO webinar, we're actually going to have it next week on the 12th and 13th I believe, and it's going to be a duplicate session so please be sure to join that. I'll put the event times and dates into the chat in one moment. I think the more attendees we have that, that would be better to help increase participation. And also again, please feel free to spread the word amongst your constituencies.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, (Matt). So are we still open to extending that time if there continues to be concerns about the August holiday timeframe?

(Larissa Gurnick): Jen, this is (Larissa Gurnick). Absolutely. The (Westlake) team and staff are obviously monitoring the responses very carefully. We're just at the start of it, and we'll continue to get regular updates and provide this group with some statistics on a regular basis. And then we'll determine where we're at in early September and if need be we will absolutely extend the survey.

Jennifer Wolf: And do you know is there a specific number that you've determined is the appropriate number to receive by that point? And then I see we have some hands up too, but I'll just pose that question and then...

(Larissa Gurnick): I will ask (Richard Westlake) if you would take on that call. We've had some preliminary conversations about this and I think he's in a better position to respond to that. (Richard), would you be able to...?

(Richard Westlake): Thank you. Thank you, Jennifer. It's (Richard Westlake) here. Firstly can I just introduce my colleague, (Collin Jackson), who's also on the line whom some of you might have met before, some of you may know him. (Collin)?

(Collin Jackson): Hello, everybody.

(Richard Westlake): We have had several discussions on what is an appropriate minimum number but I think it's difficult to just say a single number because it's the depth as well as the breadth as well as the experience and who is

responding. At the moment, just to give you a little bit of background, we've had about -- I had a quick look this morning -- about 33 people have at least started the review. Some of those are people who are clearly just having a look and have either clicked through or started and then gone away again.

It looks as if many people who had a look at the first time are, for example, young fellow or people like that who don't have a lot of experience or exposure to ICANN but are just curious. But we have as far as I can see somewhere about a dozen people who have made a serious attempt and have gone right through the survey at the moment. We're seeing a spread by constituencies and by groups, and I think as we watch those build up whether we can say there is a valid range in each case is difficult at the moment because once you start to break it down by both constituencies - groups and constituencies, you're potentially getting into very small numbers.

And I think it also depends on the consistency of the responses. So we're reluctant to put a single number through at this stage, but just we're following this, (Collin) you and I we've had those discussions. And could I ask you if you wanted to comment any further on that?

(Collin Jackson): Yes. Thank you, (Richard). This is (Collin Jackson) speaking. Obviously there are quite a number of subgroups that we would wish to see responses from. So saying we would want to see 50 or 100 or 200 responses overall isn't really the point. The point is how can we ensure that we get at least a few different constituencies, stakeholder group, et cetera so that hopefully we can build some kind of overall picture of what's going on. Ideally we'd like obviously several hundred responses but I don't think we can be any more specific than that.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you. Chuck, I know you've been waiting. Chuck and Ron are in the queue, so Chuck you're up first.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen, and thanks, guys, for the update. I confess that I'm surprised that the survey is scheduled to end on September 10. I'm glad that it can be extended, but based on the comments I saw on the list, we all know from experience of many years that August is a terrible month for participation, so I think it's unfortunate that we cut it off so early. I thought we were going to use most of September. But anyway, we can deal with that via an extension.

I'm glad to hear they're looking not only at numbers of responses from total responses but I think it's just as important as was just pointed out to do it by the different categories so that we have hopefully statistically significant participation from each of the major categories. So I'm glad that we're looking at that, because I think that's really important. Thank.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Chuck. Ron?

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Jennifer. I want support what was just said by my colleague Chuck. I'm concerned about that date, the 10th. I think we should just immediately open it up to the end of September. I don't know why we'd want to wait and why we would put the September 10th in the United States and (unintelligible) North America we have Labor Day weekend coming up also in the beginning of September. So August through the first four or five, six days of September these are - all of Europe is away in August and certainly Labor Day weekend eats up a lot.

So I think what we're doing is shooting ourselves in the foot with that. So my recommendation to the committee would be that we would extend it immediately to a later date in September. I think that's really important. And then I think in the beginning of September after the Labor Day weekend particularly in this part of the world, we could ring the bell again and say, you know, this has been open for awhile, we really are going to be closing in a couple weeks, we need everyone to come in and give us our comment.

And that kind of leads me to my second point. I'm a little surprised - I don't know, I didn't have any number in my mind when we started this work, but a few hundred responses for a GNSO review sounds like a very small number to me. I don't know how my colleagues on the committee feel about that, but it seems to me that we should be - I would have hoped we were seeing many more hundred. But I don't know the answer to that question, and so I'd like to see that discussed a little more in detail. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Ron. I think there's definitely been some consensus on the date issue, so (Larissa) and (Richard), I mean I think we should be prepared to extend that timeframe, because I think that was a pretty big consensus from our last call as well. So unless there is any opposition to that, you know, it sounds like the recommendation of the committee would be to move forward. Stephane, I see you have an X symbol up. I'm not sure what that means, but let me go ahead and turn it over to you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jen. What I'm trying to do is raise my hand but I seem to be failing at that, which probably brings into question my ability to comment on anything, but I'll try and clear that. Anyway, I wondered a couple of things. I wondered first of all if whilst we have the independent review on the phone if there's any avenue for modifying the survey on the fly.

What I mean by that is that I've seen some comments that the survey does not take any account of working groups and without going into what the group feels, whether the group feels that it's correct or not correct or something that we should address, it made me want to ask the question of, you know, if there's any stage we feel that we've missed something in building the survey, can we add to it or is this once it's started it's a train that can't be stopped. So that's one question.

The other thing is I would agree that this is probably not the best time to do a survey anyway and so I would just support what's been said about the extending the deadline. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Stephane. (Larissa), I see you have your hand up.

(Larissa Gurnick): Thanks, Jen. This is (Larissa Gurnick). I wanted to respond to several comments. First of all, the next item on the agenda that we were hoping to discuss is actually for (Richard) and his team to provide some feedback and some rationale on various aspects of the survey that were included perhaps differently or reflected differently than some of the discussions and recommendations that this group made. Working groups was one of those areas, and I will let (Richard) take you through our rationale.

But I also wanted to remind everybody that the survey is one of several data collection elements and in addition to the survey, which will inform the rest of the work that the independent examiner's conducting, there is a review of key documents and information as well as interviews. So it's those three components together that will be used to make sure that the independent examiner has a broad and full set of information to make their conclusions, in terms of the working groups in particular because of the complexity and the balance between trying to get answers to fairly complex issues that may not be well understood by everybody responding and the desire to keep the survey reasonably brief to encourage the greatest participation. So with that balance that resulted in what (Richard)'s going to walk you through.

So as far as the timing of the survey, would the group - how would the group feel about waiting until the webinars take place next week and some other outreach and engagement activities take hold and perhaps revisiting the postponement of the deadline at the next call within two weeks. So that would give us a chance to see the kind of responses that are being collected and reassessed. And part of the reason for, in my mind, for keeping the deadline as it is now is just to let people know, encourage people to take the steps and complete the survey sooner rather than later. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, (Larissa). Ron, I see you have your hand up.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jen, and thanks (Larissa) for those clarifications. A couple of things came up in my mind as you were speaking, and one is that speaking to your last point first about webinars and waiting on the timing to extend until the webinar, I think a lot of people aren't going to even be around for those webinars.

If they're Europe or North America most people are just kind - this is the downtime and they're not checking mail and they're certainly not looking to do surveys or go to webinars in this time period. I think we're going to probably have to do webinars in September just because people are away and they're just going to come back and delete large blocks of mail, right, out their mail systems. So for my part, you know, I really feel that whatever work we're doing now we're going to have to replicate it in September. There's little doubt about that, just because people are away.

The second point I wanted to bring forward which Stephane had mentioned, and I don't want to - and maybe I'm jumping ahead here -- but Stephane had mentioned about working groups. And that was kind of how we left it just before we closed the assessment, the survey itself. Chuck and I were kind of working through -- and others -- trying to find the language for that we could include with regard to working groups and so maybe it is already in the survey, and so I just would like to make sure that we have included working groups in the survey.

And if we haven't then that is something we need to get in there because we moved from the last review to a working group model, and it would be kind of absurd that we wouldn't ask how that model functioned in this review. So perhaps you can give me just a quick answer on that, and in fact if it is further in here and (Richard)'s going to go through that, that would be great. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Ron. Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, you can hear me, right?

Jennifer Wolf: Yes we can hear you now.

Stephane Van Gelder: Right okay. Yes thanks, Ron, for that. I didn't know - I wasn't on the last call so I didn't know that working groups had been discussed, which is probably - my understanding is that they're not in the survey so that's probably amiss somewhere. I think the - our discussions so far also beg the overall question to be asked of what do we deem successful results for this survey? I mean is - there may not be a metric for success. It may just be something that we feel should be done and we are - we either don't feel it qualified or equipped to determine whether it is a successful exercise or not.

But with all this discussion about poor participation, timeline and content, I think it may be up to this group to also determine some kind of measure of success of this survey. Otherwise it may just be seen as an empty exercise. I have no idea how to do this, it's just I'm brainstorming. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Jen, can I get the answer from the question I asked -- this is Ron speaking -- with regard to (Larissa)? Did we include the comment - the questions about working group or not? Thank you.

(Larissa Gurnick): This is (Larissa). There was one question included on the working group and then I would like to have (Richard) step in at this point and walk you through the rationale and the logic on the working groups. (Richard), are you prepared to do that?

(Richard Westlake): Yes certainly. Thank you, (Larissa). (Richard Westlake) here, and again I will against (Collin) to comment further. We had a lot of discussion on this following the last of these conference calls, and we had included, as (Larissa) says, we have included one relatively broad question about working groups. But everything we had understood is that the range and the style of working

groups varies quite significantly and it was very difficult to capture we felt in a small to reasonable number of questions or statements, enough that would give us valid responses without breaking the survey down into an almost infinite number of subcomponents.

So we believe that there are two things we plan to do. One is the desk review to look at how they had operated and looking at a range of the working groups. And secondly, we think that is absolutely one of the key aspects that we wish to cover during the face-to-face interviews. Thank you, (Larissa). (Collin)?

(Collin Jackson): Yes. Hello, everyone. This is (Collin Jackson). I'm ready here to talk about the survey and about some of the detail here about the decisions that were made in the ramp to its launch about what has been included and what's been excluded.

I would acknowledge my colleague (Richard)'s comments about the working groups and note that in the quest for some kind of significant breaking it down as far as working groups that make that even more problematic. We already have a questionnaire of some 90-odd questions. If we tried to split it down even further, it would get a lot more complex and large, and we had a considerable concern about compliance on that and whether or not people would simply throw up their hands and say this is just too much.

I'm happy if the group would like me to do that just to talk through the decisions that were made based on the feedback from this working group and the feedback from staff members. And this is largely based on spreadsheets (unintelligible). So I should note that first of all we had some discussion about the privacy question that opens the survey. How that has been left now is that we ask people's permission before they do anything else to - for us, meaning (Westlake), to identify them as authors of their own feedback.

We will be collating their feedback and using it anyway but what we're asking them permission is to actually quote them by name. And that comes before anything else for the reason that we just feel that this was something that you should understand before you proceed into the questionnaire. So that's one of the questions we were given was why isn't this mixed up with the general demographic option.

Moving on from that there were a number of textual changes that we've done which were largely just capital letters and so forth that we have dealt with and that I don't propose to talk through. One balance we had here was a lot of the information that we hoped to gain will be we believe textual material but comments that people make on the way past. As the working party would have noticed the questionnaire effectively invites you to agree or disagree with various propositions and to comment on that.

We have tried to balance the length of the text question, the text fields, with again with making the questionnaire just too daunting. We've tried to make that various scope to write something but not an entire essay under each of these questions. That's a theme throughout the entire survey, again, as I say.

There's a number of other items I'm just going to walk through here. The GNSO communications, we had a question about whether we should deal with that and is it confusing. We're talking about GNSO seeking community feedback on proposals. With - in many cases we've adopted the view that we're providing a hook, if you like, for people to submit comments based on and if people necessarily understand the whole thing, then that in itself is worth a comment.

We would like to see respondents say something like well this doesn't work for us or we don't understand what's going on here and will comment on it. That itself in itself will prove something that there is a lack of shared understanding of our specific points, and that would give us something with which to probe on in subsequent questions.

Moving on from that, we have left - there was a question from I think Stephane said saying (unintelligible) we believed covered by advisory committees because the GAC of course is composed of governments. There's - I'm just again working my way down a long list here. Are you an observer or a member of...

Jennifer Wolf: This is Jen. I just wanted to make sure with Avri and Philip if you had questions pertaining to what he's talking about, do you want to stop and pause and ask your questions?

(Collin Jackson): That's a good point. I'll pause now.

Jennifer Wolf: I just wanted to make sure if they wanted to stop at any point before you move on. Avri or Philip?

Avri Doria: Yes this is - sorry, this is Avri speaking. My question came up before we started this walkthrough and I just was still going to harp on the issue of the working groups. I think it - that was one of the biggest structural changes that were made in the last review. Now I think it was terribly remiss of me. I was an idiot to have not thought of it, that that's something that we absolutely need to have and that without it we won't be getting a complete picture, because that's where the bottom up process starts. That's where the whole interaction between the GNSO and the working groups is one of the clear components of the whole policy process that we're trying to review the effectiveness of.

Now I completely understand how adding it onto this survey at this point would be an extremely difficult thing to do especially since the survey's out, but is there - and I also wanted to counter the point of they're all so different. Within the PDP, within the working groups of the GNSO, there's incredible uniformity. They all work on almost the same charter basis. They all go through the same processes. They all have the same relationships to people,

stakeholder groups and constituencies. Certainly their topics are radically different, but the structure and process of them -- and I've been on far too many of them to count -- is extremely similar.

So I'm wondering perhaps if the better part of completeness doesn't motivate us to do a separate working group-specific questionnaire. It can be shorter, you know, and it can be something like that. So I'd like to basically put that on the table. As I say, I feel terrible that being as active and as involved and as supportive of working groups as the focal point of the GNSO, more important than our SGs and SCs, that I didn't bring this point up and I had to rely on one of our past members to remind me that I had been remiss. So please take into consideration. Without it we will not have a complete view. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks, Avri. And I see in the chat that Chuck is agreeing with you on that point. And we do, just to remind everyone, we do have the ability as this working party that if we think any additional research or surveys are necessary we can do that. So I think it's a good question to pose to (Westlake). You know, is this an additional survey we could put out, you know, in the scope of what we're doing and if not then within our working party we could certainly look at putting something out on our own. So I think that's a great point, Avri, thank you.

Philip, I know you've been waiting, and (Larissa) and Chuck. I want to make sure you get an opportunity to speak and then we'll get back to the (Westlake) walkthrough of their materials. So Philip, please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Okay thank you very much, Jen. And just for the record, I support indeed doing some further work on working groups as they're clearly a fundamental part of the policy development process. We have been successful including I think one question in this survey which is forward looking and I have a question really for (Richard) and for (Collin) that you'll be aware that the ICANN board was keen on the overall results of this review being forward-

looking and in particular looking at the question of factoring in how ICANN's new stakeholders would be a part of future policy development.

And of course you'll be aware of the huge change that's taking place in terms of moving from a handful of registries to thousands of new registries of which - many of which are significantly in different type and basically brands or geographically-based registries.

And I just wondered what you're planning was in terms of taking a little bit of feedback you'll get from the survey on forward-looking questions and then developing that in a way that the board, the ICANN board direction was keen for you to do for it being forward-looking in terms of the involvement of ICANN's new stakeholders who are only just coming into the process.

Jennifer Wolf: Well where you looking for Westlake to answer that or for staff or...

Philip Sheppard: Yes Westlake, yes.

Jennifer Wolf: Okay.

(Richard Westlake): Jen thank you. Richard Westlake here. I think (Philip) your point's actions absolutely right. Because forward-looking we thought that that was far better to address the type a question about the if you like exponential increase in stakeholder base during our interviews particularly with those who had been involved for some time and those who really do understand what is going on.

The danger about putting something like that in something as broad as a survey of course is that for those who haven't been involved in the process of the new TLDs coming on and that massive increase there will be a lot of speculation and probably dare one say not much more than personal opinion.

So I think it is better addressed with those who have been more deeply involved when we come to do the interview process.

Philip Sheppard: Okay thank you. Right.

Jennifer Wolf: And (Larissa)?

(Larissa Gurnick): Yes I wanted to respond to Avri's point. And I see that there's a couple of a chat back to the working group discussion.

It seems to me that since the 360 assessment by its nature was intended to be broad and applicable to a diverse group of responders, not just people within the GNSO.

I would certainly suggest that the staff and the Westlake team take the questions and the feedback that we're hearing today to come up with a plan for the best way to collect information, detailed information on the working groups from the exact audience that's in the best position to provide substantive information and feedback whether it's through survey or whether it's through some other methods as that's something that the Westlake team can provide some recommendations.

But it sounds like that is a separate component of the review process that would not necessarily work best under the 360 umbrella which is intended to be broad and applicable to a large audience. So we will take that on as an action item.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks (Larissa). Chuck your hand is up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. First of all I want to reinforce what Avri said. I was really puzzled when I heard the statement that working groups are of different styles.

First of all I'm no idea what that means and wonder how you came to that conclusion.

So that seems really strange to me.

The second thing that I have requested this in the chat would you be I - I think many others haven't had a time to look at the final survey yet. So would you please speaking to Westlake or to (Larissa) -- I don't care who does it -- would you please read for us the one working group question that has been included? And then I'd like to comment after you do that.

Jennifer Wolf: (Larissa) can you respond to that?

(Larissa Gurnick): Sure Chuck, just give us one moment. We'll pull up the questionnaire and we'll be happy to do that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: While they do that in the interest of time why don't we allow Westlake to go back to their presentation?

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

(Collin Jackson): Yes hello. This is (Collin) again. I have a number of other questions that I've dealt in that were submitted to us during the test.

One question - one questioner or commenter said just being an observer in a group allows you to claim that you're informed enough to comment in all subgroups which I don't necessarily agree with.

But the way we had - we did - it shows the language that said are you involved with or a close observer?

And we were allowing people to qualifying themselves to answer a whole load of detail questions about a subgroup. And by a sub group I mean a constituency or a stakeholder group. And we - our response to that was to

actually clarify that in the survey that if you answer yes to this you're going to face some detailed questions on the sub grouping question. If you answer no to it then the survey will skip on.

But we still think it's reasonably important that people effectively self identifies being able and prepared to answer questions about the specific part of GNSO.

I'll post the comment.

Moving on from there we have again we've had comments about text fields. We greatly increased the size of the final text field.

We still provide people with the option of sending us email. And we suspect we will that we provided as I said a middle size dialog box on most questions and a very large one at the end with a - as large as we can get on Survey Monkey with a direction to the effect that if you had more to say than what fits in the (unintelligible) dialogue box you can put it in the final comments.

There was a question about again from - that was submitted from a tester that says there is no question that asks about how many members who want graphic distribution a constituency has.

And it goes on to comment that we didn't ask (unintelligible) presumably stakeholder groups.

And our view is that we don't think it's a good use of respondent time to ask some questions that essentially are knowable either by test research on the Web site or by asking staff for that.

So we've tried to avoid simply asking people factual questions. It only really makes sense to ask people what is their view of how such and such that may have been involved with operate so is resourced, et cetera.

Again we have a question about being considered by the committee at the moment. We - I understand (Larissa)'s (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: (Collin)? Excuse me (Collin) I beg your pardon. I beg your pardon. This is Ron Jen. I'm just wondering if we might weigh in and just respond a little bit to what (Thomas) just spoken about.

Jennifer Wolf: Yes sure. I know I was just looking at the queue. I see (Larissa)'s hand is up and Chuck I think those might be old hands though. Is that right (Larissa) (Chuck)?

Chuck Gomes: No...

Jennifer Wolf: Or are those new?

Chuck Gomes: No it's fine for Ron to go ahead. But my hand - remember I wanted to respond because I saw the question?

Jennifer Wolf: Okay. I was thinking that that was a (unintelligible) too. I was try to wait for it a good moment.

So Ron do you want to respond to something that was just said or do you want to respond to what's on screen?

Ron Andruff: Yes I want to speak to what (Collin) just said.

Jennifer Wolf: Go ahead. Why don't you speak to that and then we'll switch to what's on screen?

Ron Andruff: Thank you (Collin). I think if I heard you correctly what you're suggesting in is that we want to make sure that people respond to things that they know.

So for example I am not a registrar. I've have not been part of the registrar constituency and so therefore as a member of the BC and a member of the CSG I can't speak to the registrar situations.

And I think it's really important that we don't have people come in and start speaking to things they don't know about because that would really skew the survey.

So this is a very important point that people speak to things that they know about and not things that they know nothing about because that would send this survey completely sideways. It would not give us any of the data we're looking for.

So is that - have I understood you correctly in that sense?

(Collin Jackson): Yes Ron it's (Collin). Yes thank you for that point. Yes I agree with you have to - can I put it we try to encourage people not to answer things that we don't know about.

But also we do have their names and we can and will check their - check the affiliations they claim. And so that's something we can do with the survey results as they come in.

So if John Smith claims to be a member of the registry constituents and nobody here's ever heard of them then we will bear that in mind when we're analyzing his results.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much. That's excellent. Thank you Jen for letting me to jump in the queue.

Jennifer Wolf: Sure. Thanks Ron.

Why don't we pause since they found the question and it's up onscreen. I know Chuck and probably Stephane may have a point in that issue. So Chuck you're up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jen. With all due respect I think we're - this question is so broad that it's useless. It - that someone who's - knows something about Whois working groups would probably - and that may be all they know may strongly disagree.

Some have - and then some effective working groups may strongly agree. We won't have a clue why they strongly disagreed or strongly agreed or what was their framework for that. And there is no text box for any clarification.

So my apologies for being blunt but I personally think we'd be better off without that question than having one so broad.

And I actually made a comment to that effect on what was in there before. So that I just wanted to point that out.

(Collin Jackson): So can I just jump in here? (Collin) here. Chuck thank you for the feedback. And I accept what you said about working groups in specific and in general.

But I do want to comment that there's no text box. I believe that the PDF version that (Larissa) I think has put on the screen here doesn't show the text boxes. But I believe it to be present because you can see the text that says please expand if you wish.

That's as far as I'll follow-up on that comment Chuck for now.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks Chuck. With that Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay yes thanks Jen. Slightly worried about what I heard that we would not allow people that don't know what they're talking about to express themselves.

Because I just simply don't know how to measure - how we can measure whether people know what they're talking about or not.

And I don't believe that not having being a past member to use the example that was made given and not having been a past member of one constituency means you don't know anything about that topic.

I mean to use Ron's example I know for a fact because I'm in the same group as him that he knows a lot about registrars and indeed about registries.

But he's still a BC member. And I would still contend that his input on those two subjects would have some use in the context of this survey.

So I'm slightly worried that we would try and determine ourselves or the surveyors would try and determine whether people are shall we say qualified to respond or not.

I think that the basic idea of this survey as you put it out it's a huge fishing net and you see what you catch. And it's up to you guys as surveyors and I presume this is why this is part of your expertise and why you were chosen by icon to then sort out the rubbish from the good stuff I guess.

But I would, you know, I would be wary of excluding thing those that we consider ignorant. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks Stephane. Richard I see that your hand is up next.

(Richard Westlake): Yes thank you Jen. The reason I put it up was simply to say we're not so much telling people they can't participate but we are giving them the option to jump past areas that they don't - that they are comfortable to say they don't know about.

At the start of each for example group or constituency state of questions are you involved with or a close observer of the XYZ group or constituency? If you answer no you skip past the detailed questions on that particular group or constituency.

So it is a self assessment as to whether an individual knows about a particular area. There is no intent. It was perhaps slightly loose language, no intent to stop people doing it. But people do have to say consciously yes I am involved or a close observer of.

And I'm hoping that a close observer of would be an adequate answer for someone who may not be directly involved but as the last person speaking just said does know about a particular area. I hope that clarifies that a little bit.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you Richard. Was it - Stephane do you have a follow-up to that or...

No?

Stephane Van Gelder: No I just I put in the chat that that helped a lot. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolf: Oh sorry. I missed the chat. Sorry about that.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, not a problem. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you. And (Collin) I think I see your hand up this up as well.

(Collin Jackson): Yes hello. Thank you (Larissa). I would also comment that when - because we know who people are responding hopefully for several reasons one of which is they have presumably given a surname and who may have also told us what their involvement would be in SOS that was one of the early questions.

So absolutely if they are from outside the XYZ constituency as Richard just gave an example if they're outside that constituency and they give us opinions on it then they may well be - they may well have validity.

And they almost do have some validity. And we would see them as somebody (unintelligible) as opposed to somebody on the inside who might have some idea about say resource levels and so force that some - that presumably somebody's not involved in the constituency because you will take a view from the outside in terms of what it actually meant and just to achieve in the time available more, et cetera.

So I wouldn't - I didn't mean to give the impression that we will discount the views of people who are not involved or at least you expect.

We will bear in mind whether they are on the outside looking or vice versa when we consider their feedback. That was all I was going to say on that point.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you (Collin). I don't see the other hands up at the moment. And I know we have about ten minutes left in our call so I want to turn it back over to (Collin).

Did you have more that you needed to get through in your presentation and we'll turn the floor back over to you?

(Collin Jackson): Thank you (Larissa). And there are not too many more questions that I want to provide here unless there are questions.

We largely via the feedback items I have here are things that we accepted and just moved on with.

One question that I will - I think I'll confine myself to one further question which is question three. (Lewis) I don't know if you'd be able to put three in the survey on the screen. This is the one that effectively is about your allegiance as a respondent.

It says - no that's not actually the one I was looking for. It's obviously later question three. It's the one that says who do you represent?

So what we've done is we're trying to flesh out where the people are speaking on their own behalf or whether they are speaking on behalf of some part of GSNO or whether they're speaking on behalf of a company who is external to ICANN all together.

And so we came up with a form of words that which I can't see on the screen here (Larissa). But it's effectively we invite or identify on is to assert spoke for themselves or that they spoke for e.g. the ALAC or a private company such as a register, et cetera, et cetera.

We felt that that was at least a bit relevant that they could - an opinion with a company was behind it as opposed to an individual.

Man: Hi (Collin).

(Larissa Gurnick): (Collin)? (Collin) excuse...

(Collin Jackson): ...or whether an individual who work for a company or - yes?

(Larissa Gurnick): I'm so sorry to interrupt.

(Collin Jackson): Hello?

(Larissa Gurnick): This is (Larissa). I'm really sorry to interrupt but I think it's important to clarify that the question that's on the screen which is - which has been added Question Number 5 does not - it's not about on whose behalf the individual is speaking on.

Because in most cases I think there was agreement that people responding to the survey will most likely be speaking on their own behalf.

This question is intended to indicate which group the individual falls under. And obviously they will self identify whether they are member of one of these, a community groups, a fellow, a staff, a board member or just a member of the community not specifically affiliated with any other group.

So it's not so much that the question is intended to find out if they're speaking on behalf of that group. It just is that they come from that group. And I think that really, really important distinction.

And if someone wants to speak on behalf of a group than that would be reflected in Question Number 4. So I just wanted to clarify. Thank you so much.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks (Larissa).

(Collin Jackson): Thank you (Larissa). Yes that is effectively questions of what the original question are being split into.

Because we're looking at a PDF it's hard to see that there was actually a text box under Question 4. But effectively says if you wish to speak on behalf of somebody please give its name here.

Jennifer Wolf: Great. And I see Ron you have a question on that in the chat. Is that what you're hand's up for as well?

Ron Andruff: Yes it is Jen.

Jennifer Wolf: So go ahead. Go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. I'm just confused about that question. If you responding on behalf of a group such as a part of ICANN or a company please give its name. I don't understand the question.

I am responding on behalf of a group perhaps. I'm not sure if I'm responding on behalf of the BC. I'm really responding as an individual who's a member of the BC which is a member of the GNSO.

But I'm not responding on behalf of RNA partners. So I don't get that question at all. It doesn't make any sense for me. And I'm struggling with that.

But Question 5 it asks where do I participate? Okay I'm participating in the GNSO but I - you'd have to drill down to a couple of layers to get to where I'm at.

So I'm not sure if we get to the specific answer that we might - that we may be looking for or I may be completely misunderstanding. So I welcome any clarification. Thank you.

(Larissa Gurnick): This is (Larissa). So Question Number 4 is simply intended - it's an optional question.

If someone chooses to respond on behalf of a larger group so that it's not an individual response but a group response they have the opportunity to flag that.

Most people I think this group agreed on the last call that most people would probably be responding. Surveys are usually responded on your own behalf. You speak for yourself.

And in Question Number 5 is just a demographic background question to help the independent examiner understand where the responder, what community the responder is coming from to put some context around the comments and the feedback that they provide within the survey. I hope that helped.

And then once we clarify this point I was also going to suggest that perhaps if the Westlake team could briefly walk you through what their next steps are in doing the review and the kind of feedback and information that would be useful as they embark on the other elements of their review processes to make sure that they look at documentation and speak to the right individuals to help them collect the kind of information that they're looking for. That's the last item on our agenda. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolf: Thanks (Larissa). And so I - we've only got about five minutes left in our time today. So if Richard or (Collin) if you want to provide a brief overview and then we can quickly wrap up.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you Jen. It's Richard here. Now you did see up earlier on the screen you saw the list of the further information that we believe we require.

And one thing that we would be very keen to see from the working group from this working party I should say -- there we are thank you -- is we would seek input and further information that you believe we should asking for or looking for. Because as reviewers we know the things that we don't know but I hate to use the cliché we clearly don't know what we don't know. And there is only so much you can find by walking through the elaborate Web site.

The next stage when we've established this inventory or even sort of in parallel with it is in fact to try and find it as what we believe are as relatively informed observers of ICANN and the GNSO.

We will be looking for this information first. And the ease for access for that - of that information is clearly going to be a material part of what we we'll be commenting on. Because it doesn't matter if the information is there if nobody can find it then what use is it to people? That is one of our if you like process points on the way through.

The other two things that we will be looking for is well obviously what is the review of this documentation when we get it?

And the other is then progressively both in conjunction with our own understanding of who's involved where and working through is whom we should be interviewing but also looking through the survey responses who do we need to just follow-up with further and try and seek an interview with them if they are points that we believe we need to either expand on or probe more deeply.

Thank you Jen. I don't want to prolong it but that's in summary is how it's essentially the best review and the interview process getting underway as of now.

Jennifer Wolf: Thank you. I appreciate that. And perhaps if that can be circulated on the list as well then everyone can give us (unintelligible) and start to respond to some of specific questions and points.

And we're coming right up at the top of the hour and I know we've had a lot of discussion and appreciate everybody's comments.

I'll just try to frame up a couple of the open issues that we discussed.

In terms of the timing I think there's some clear consensus we're going to need to extend the timeframe and potentially, you know, re-promote the survey in September.

But I think there was agreement that we could wait until our next call which will be two weeks from now and at that point look at where we are and make a final determination if that should be extended.

But it's a clear understanding with staff and with Westlake that if that's the consensus we can certainly extended it through the end of September.

And then on the point of the working groups I think we didn't find resolution there so I'd like to make sure that we put that on the agenda for our next call.

And just within this working party if we openly find we don't think the survey addressed working group sufficiently we can certainly create our own specific survey to put out there just on working groups and make that part of how we continue forward with our own self assessment.

So I want to make sure we keep that on our agenda for the next call and then of course continuing to provide feedback to Westlake on these points raised will be part of our agenda next week as well.

(Larissa) and that I know your hands are still up. Was there anything else that you needed to say? No?

Okay. Well thank you. That brings the call to a close. I'll look forward to talking with you all two weeks from today.

Man: Thanks bye.

Man: Thanks everyone.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks Westlake. Good job.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you very much everybody.

Woman: Thank you very much (Andre). You may now stop the recordings.

END