GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 24 July 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-review20140724-en.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
David Maher
Wolf Ullrich Knoben
Ron Andruff
Klaus Stoll
Philip Sheppard
Bret Fausett
Michele Neylon
Chuck Gomes

Guest speaker: Richard Westlake

Apologies:
Stephane Van Gelder
Avri Doria

ICANN Staff:
Larisa Gurnick
Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Lars Hoffman
Matt Ashtiani
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much (Andre). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party call on the 24th of July, 2014. On the call today we have Philip Sheppard, Jennifer Wolfe, Ron Andruff, David Maher, Brett Fausett, Michele Neylon, Klaus Stoll, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. We have an apology from Stephane Van Gelder. And from staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Marika Konings, Matt Ashtiani, Lars Hoffman, Glen de St Gery, 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: Thank you and thanks everybody for taking time today for the call. I really appreciate a great turnout. Our agenda is pretty straightforward for today. I do appreciate everyone getting their feedback in by our last meeting on the 10th and today I think (Larisa) you're going to introduce the folks from Westlake to present an update on where we are. You may have seen an email come out yesterday with a link to test the survey. I think Chuck and Ron I've seen some comments from you. I haven't had a chance to go through that yet and I'm sure everyone hasn't either. So we'd certainly appreciate feedback from those who have gone through it and then we can all take time between now and our next call to review it and complete our feedback. But (Larisa) I'll turn it over to you provide an update from staff and from Westlake.

(Larisa Groenig):   Thanks Jen. This is (Larisa Groenig). I am waiting for the folks from our Westlake Governance to confirm that they've been able to dial in. It's they're calling in from New Zealand so it's a bit of a thing. Oh hello?

Richard Westlake: Hello (Larisa) this is Richard Westlake speaking. Good morning or hello.

(Larisa Groenig):   Oh great Richard. Thank you very much for dialing in. So let me just summarize a couple of points that I've already included in the email yesterday for those that may not have had a chance to read through all the details. So we have the first version of the user acceptance blessing if you will, a UAT version of the 360 assessment that I circulated yesterday. In interest of

time I wanted to make sure that you had a little bit of a chance to interact with the survey before today's call, recognizing that a number of changes and edits had already been noted and provided to Westlake by staff even before we shared that version with you. So I wanted to assure you that additional changes are in the process of being made as well as the feedback that Chuck, Philip and others have already provided and will continue to provide at today's call.

That will be considered and then made within the next couple of days and our goal is still to launch the survey around August 1 and seeing that that is Friday then we will discuss what the most opportune timing is to launch a survey like that and really defer to the folks from Westlake to advise us whether we're best to launch on a Monday or a Friday or such details. So at this point I will introduce Richard Westlake from Westlake Governance and I will ask Richard to provide kind of a brief overview of how the survey is structured and specifically explain a couple of areas that I know a number of you have articulated as questions.

How does one respond to more than one survey? If someone wants to evaluate several GNSO groups how does one do that? That's still an outstanding question. As well as we have some options for how to skip through questions and how to consider the fact that some people responding may not have an in depth knowledge of the GNSO and may want to do a shorter version of the survey. So at this point I will turn that over to Richard and Richard thank you so much for joining us at this time.

Richard Westlake: Well thank you (Larisa) and hello everybody. Thank you for the trouble everybody has taken to provide the feedback and to go through the testing on the first version and the second version that came out to you yesterday. Since then we've carried on working with some of the edits that you have been asking for. We've had a look at them. We went back yesterday again with a reasonably full set of responses to (Larisa).

I was away yesterday and we haven't had a chance to work through all the changes in the last 24 hours but I have just in the last few minutes sent through to (Larisa) one third set of updates which allows a logic to allow you to complete the survey on behalf of two groups or constituencies for the GNSO and it's been very - and the logic will not force you to make your way through if you only want to go to do one of them but will allow you to skip the second one. Of course if you only wish to comment in relation to one just as it will allow you to skip over the detail comments in the original logic which is if you only have a shallow knowledge or you don't wish to comment in any depth on any particular constituency or group within the GNSO.

So what we tried to do is to gather some initial information which is essentially demographic information to get a sense of how valid or how informed the responses are going to be. That's those first five or six questions. Then we move into a set of questions and we tried to make it as voluntary as possible in terms of what questions you have to complete but we do think it is quite important at least that people try to address a number of them such as those for example, the questions setting out or the statements setting out in the bylaw. There should be a body policy known as the GNSO which they're responsible for developing and recommending substantive policies and so on. One of the questions that is asked in the reference has it been effective in achieving its purpose as defined in the article. We think it's important that people actually look at it even if they then wish to click the I have no opinion box.

So once we've got past that first set of questions then we have gone as far as possibly - as far as possible into putting in voluntary questions that people don't have to complete. But again there are somewhere at least there is the requirement to fill in a quantitative assessment even if that assessment turns out to be I have no opinion on one or more of those. So I think so far I'm hoping that people have followed what I'm saying. The - as I say the addition that I just sent through a minute or two ago to (Larisa) is the one that allows responses in relation to two groups and we're just working through the logic

of whether to include more than two or whether to include a note and then allow people to come round and do the survey again rather than making lists of it inordinately. Thank you (Larisa).

(Larisa Groenig): Thank you Richard. I know that Richard is not in the Adobe room so Richard you may not be able to see the fact that we're - the screen, the latest version, the PDF of the latest version that you sent to me in the room. So I don't know if it would be helpful for us to scroll to certain sections to illustrate the items that you're referring or if at this point we just want to continue to take comments from people that would like an opportunity to make a comment even if it's on the older version of the survey. And of course after the changes have been incorporated we'll circulate an updated version for everybody to see. Jen I'll let you...

Jennifer Wolfe: (Larisa) this is Jen. I - yes I was just noticing that there's a - Chuck has a question in the comment in the chat and I understand Richard can't see that. So I'll just read it out and then perhaps he can respond to that and then we'll take further comments and questions. Chuck was asking in the chat will there be a limit of only responding to two groups? So I'll ask for a response on that question first.

Richard Westlake: Thank you Jen. Richard Westlake here again. That's what we have built in just right now into the latest version of the survey which you have there. But what we are proposing is to put in some ticks to the effect that if you wish to respond in relation to more you can reenter the survey or redo the survey but we want to build some logic at the beginning of the survey if you do come in a second time so that you don't have to give us all the original information again. So you go straight to the group information.

To be honest Jen we haven't yet had a chance to discuss the best way of doing that. This is obviously moving very rapidly and we're meeting again this morning New Zealand time, which is Friday morning New Zealand time. We're meeting again to talk through what is actually the best way of doing

this. But we accept that some people will want to comment or may want to comment on more than one or more than two groups. Do we find a unique type of way of building the logic into a single survey or do we allow people to come back in again to come back and do yet another one?

Jennifer Wolfe: Chuck does that answer your question? I just want to give you an opportunity to jump in.

Chuck Gomes: Yes Jen. I think it does. I - what I was thinking and it - this won't apply to a lot of people but certainly in my case I was thinking I certainly would be appropriate to respond with the registry stakeholder group. Probably the GNSO council but also if working groups are an option that would be another perspective. So that's why I asked the question. But the work around they're considering probably would be okay. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. And I know we just received this yesterday and now an update is coming out. For those of you who have had a chance to review do you have other questions or comments for Westlake? Philip.

Philip Sheppard: Yes thanks. I think just the latest version I think I made a comment in my email. I'm not sure Westlake was able to see that. It was only awhile ago. But I was saying the - to my mind there still seems a bit of a confusion between the various hierarchies and council that we're trying to responses about. And I think question eight is quite a good example of that. Question eight is asking about how certain communities are represented and involved. And there we see the list of the stakeholder groups, you know, the bottom two, our constituencies and houses.

And it just seems a bit strange in terms of representation for houses and houses was a construct for voting convenience essentially and the constituencies are for the most part parts of the stakeholder group. So it's a bit of a strange question to be hocking and that sort of flows for some of the other points and I hear the responses in Westlake in terms of how that might

be addressed and I think support those but just wanted to highlight eight as being an example of the issue I had raised.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Philip. (Larisa) your hand is up. Did you want to respond to that point?

(Larisa Groenig): Yes thanks Jen. This is (Larisa). I typed that into the chat as well. Question eight has already been flagged and sent to Westlake for correction to make sure that all the stakeholder groups are appropriately represented. So we'll definitely get that one fixed. And Philip I've certainly noted all your comments and for everybody and for Philip Westlake is getting these comments in real time. So you can be assured that we're capturing all the feedback and considering the best way to integrate it. Thank you.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks (Larisa). Thanks Philip. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks again Jen and (Larisa) as well as the Westlake team. The - one of the things I found when I went through the survey yesterday is that in quite a few cases I - the only - the best option I could pick was no opinion except that really wasn't the case. It wasn't that I didn't have an opinion. It was that it was not applicable or something like that. So that then forced me to put in a comment to explain my response which obviously takes more time and so forth. So as I said in the chat a no opinion choice is very different than something like a not applicable response. It gives us very different information. So that's more of a comment than it is a question.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay thanks. That seems very reasonable to look at adding a no opinion and perhaps a non applicable. Is - any comment from Westlake or (Larisa) from staff at that point?

Richard Westlake: Yes it's Richard here if I could perhaps. We have received that comment yesterday thank you. We just haven't had time to incorporate it yet. Perhaps I could say we put that if you'd like as a sort of a shorthand catchall but look I do understand it's set the message you're sending by having no opinion is a different message from saying it is no applicable. So we will incorporate that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you. Ron?

Ron Andruff: Thanks Jen and thanks to everyone for the great work that's been done on this survey. I've just - as we now - I heard earlier that we're dealing with Richard in New Zealand and us here and now we've got one version that we're supposed to test but yet there's a lot of iterations going on. So I just wanted to get some clarification does it make sense for us right now to go in and start for the rest of us in the committee who have not yet gone through and reviewed the survey. Should we review the one that was sent around yesterday or do we want to hold off on that because it sounded to me like (Richard's) making quite a few modifications. So I just want some clarification on that. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Richard can you respond that question?

Richard Westlake: Yes thank you Jen. My sense would be that we have now had some quite significant amount of feedback to the first version. We have had some feedback to the second version and we're still in the process if you like of building the next version. I would say it is probably of limited benefit. So may I suggest that people hold off. We will aim to have the latest test version which I hope will be a very late draft if not the final to launch by the end of your weekend. Would that fit the timing (Larisa)? As far as I can see that should be reasonably acceptable.

(Larisa Groenig): This is (Larisa). Thank you Richard. Yes I think that that would be ideal as to not to confuse people and I did want to clarify that as Richard is referencing two versions but it's the second version that has been circulated to the GNSO

review working party. The first version went to staff and we had immediately provided much of the same comments and several others that you already articulated. So to (Richard's) point we have a call with the Westlake team in several hours to discuss all the feedback received. And I feel very confident that by end of the weekend we will be able to produce virtually the, you know, latest version and hopefully near final version for people to interact with. So unless people that have already had a chance to look at the survey have, you know, other structural or, you know, large type feedback that would be useful to discuss right now I feel very confident that the next version will address all the comments that we've received so far. Thank you.

Richard Westlake: (Larisa) may I add one comment?

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure please.

Richard Westlake: Thank you Jen. Sorry for interrupting but may I just say that yes we will be addressing all the comments. There are one or two where in fact we have in our response to (Larisa) yesterday we have made a case why we've done what we've done regardless of somebody saying either they don't like it or they've asked for a change. But I think those are all the points that we can address during the call later on today (Larisa).

(Larisa Groenig):   Very good and once again Richard is referencing some observations, some comments that were raised by staff and that just to highlight the process on our end. Every comment is cataloged if you will and as we go through this process of the nitty gritty changes that the Westlake team is proposing we're noting how each comment will be addressed. So it will either be noted and done or if it's not feasible or if Westlake has a different point of view. That will also be captured. And I will be happy to provide that inventory if you will back to this team along with the next version so that everybody can see how the comments were considered and the rationale we're - we weren't able to incorporate the comment fully. Would that be acceptable?

Jennifer Wolfe: (Larisa) I think that was a - I see Ron your hand has been up. Do you want to address that issue or is this a new issue that you wanted to address.

Ron Andruff: No I wanted to follow on on some of the comments that (Larisa) has made and also Richard has made but whenever you're ready Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh okay. Anyone have a specific response to (Larisa)? I know we need to talk about the timeframe to be able to review the survey and provide our feedback. So maybe we can hold that and let me let you jump in Ron, or does anyone else have a specific response to (Larisa) first?

Okay seeing none Ron, why don't you go ahead and then we can jump into the timeframe.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Jen. Two points that came to my mind as I've just been scrolling through this Richard.

One is - and they actually are kind of tied together. Number 3 asks how many ICANN meetings you've attended and it finishes at 10 plus. There's a big difference between someone who's gone to 10 meetings which effectively would met for three years so they've been active, and someone who's got 20 or 30 meetings.

So if you then look to question Number 22 for example, and the question says, "GNSO Council communicates in plain language." Well my response would be, having gone to 40 plus meetings, yes it would be the same. But someone who's been to ten meetings, they may not understand them at all.

So I'm wondering about maybe we should be adding to the Number 3, maybe 10 to 20 meetings and then 20 plus meetings. If someone has gone to 20 plus meetings, that means they've been around for a good five or six years, maybe seven years, and that's a big difference.

And I think the kind of responses we get will be gauged based on that number of meetings someone has attended because they'll be more aware of the ICANN processes, language and so forth.

So that was one point I wanted to just bring out and hope that you might consider.

The second one has to do with these boxes where we say, "Please expand if you wish." And I wondered if (Wes Lake) has considered limiting the amount of characters that one can write in that box.

And the reason I'm suggesting that is because if I'm forced to put something in 500 characters or less, I know I have to make that a very concise statement as opposed to rambling on and on about how I feel about this particularly element or that particularly element. And I believe like Chuck that as the more of the pretext boxes we have the less responses we'll get only because people are, in general, kind of lazy to the kind of activities.

But I'm wondering if we were to limit the number of characters, would we get more concise answers? And I'm wondering that and I'm actually asking you that as a professional. Thank you.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. Shall I respond to both of those?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, please go ahead.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. On Question 3, yes we are certainly happy to put in a number of categories, and I do take the point about somebody who has been to 25 ICANN mtgs. It is significantly more than 10.

I think what we might see is compress the groupings, collect the groupings, so that we would have 2 to 10, 11 to 20 and then 20 plus, just so that we don't have - you know, we don't want to have an unreasonable number where somebody can't remember that they go to, sort of 5 or a 7 or whatever it was.

So I think we will collect a bit but certainly we will allow more people to demonstrate significantly greater ICANN experience.

On the textbox, I think that's a very good point that people understand they do have to be compressed. In fact, most of the ones we have are limited to 800 characters which is quite a short comment.

I take your point completely. We will be specific and let people know that they are limited which will force (unintelligible) comments.

Thank you for that Ron, I think that's really a valuable addition there. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Chuck, your hand is up please.

Chuck, did you have another point or question?

Chuck Gomes: Sorry, I was on mute and talking to myself.

I want to respond to Ron's comment, and let me say first of all that I generally support it. But I also found in the survey that there were some questions where there were 5/6/7 parts and only one textbox. So if you limit it too much and you need a comment on several of those, that could be a problem.

I know in one case, because of that I entered several different statements that related to different subparts of the question. So we just need to keep that in mind.

Again, I'm not encouraging a lot more pretext boxes, but at the same time, when we're putting a limit we need to keep that in mine for text boxes that relate to a group of sub-items and only one textbox.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. Richard, did you want to respond to that at all or are we?

Richard Westlake: No, I think that makes very good sense and we will certainly go back through and check that we're not asking people to be too compressed. Because what I think you said earlier Chuck although this won't apply to many people, there will be a number of people who have very valuable comments and we don't want to constrain it unnecessarily but, you know, we need to get a balance between keeping people succinct and forcing them to be or not allowing them to say what they need to say.

So we'll go back and check that because there are one or two I'm aware where we've got six or seven and I think questions/statements (unintelligible) is a classic one. If you do have comments which might be different between several of the bullet point responses, we want to allow people to respond adequately.

So thank you for that one Chuck.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And I'll just have one last call out there if there are any comments for those of you who have reviewed the survey. Any other comments to provide at this time?

Okay, seeing none, I'd like to move on and discuss the timeframe. It sounds like essentially by Monday of our next workweek, we should have a revised survey that we can review and provide comments on.

What is the opinion of the group in terms of a reasonable timeframe to review that and provide final feedback to (Wes Lake) before it is launched to the public? Any comments from the group?

Seven days Ron says in the Chat so a full week so that everyone has the opportunity to review and respond. Chuck agrees.

Any other comments or suggestions?

To Richard and (Larisa), is that reasonable if we give everyone a full seven days from the time it's rereleased? So that means we would push back the public launch date by just a few days.

Richard Westlake: Jen, could I perhaps come back without sort of having discussed it with (Larisa) but we can do later today.

Could ask if people would be willing to complete it by the end of that working week, in other words, by the end of Friday the 1st, that would mean if there were any final (pivots) we would have the weekend to do it and it could be launched at the beginning of the week beginning Monday the 4th if that's going to be acceptable to (Larisa) or you Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: I see Ron's hand is up and Chuck has a checkmark. Can I ask Ron for your comment?

Ron Andruff: Thanks very much Jen.

Richard, I think that's reasonable, the five day workweek makes a lot of sense to me, and that's really what I was kind of referring to when I suggested seven days.

I also wanted to ask a question of the Chair and the group. Do we see that there's something that just we are going to go through and test or are we considering reaching out to let's say three or four or five members of our constituency to come in and test and get their feedback as well. Because fresh eyes always catch the little itchy things that we don't see because we've been looking at it for so long.

So it's really a question to the group and I wondered how the rest of the work party members feel about that. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: So Ron, I'll provide my comments. Obviously, and we just had our Council meeting this morning and I let the Council know that we would be circulating the survey, and certainly the more feedback we get the better.

So I certainly think that if you can send it out to some members of your stakeholder groups and get feedback that would be most welcome.

But any other comments or suggestions on that point?

Richard Westlake: Thanks Jen, I think that's a good lead; appreciate it. This is Ron; thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you.

And just confirming, is everyone comfortable that if essentially by Monday business, we receive the updated survey by the end of the day on Friday, we can provide our feedback. Is that reasonable to everyone, including as we just discussed, reaching out to others in your stakeholder groups and constituencies for feedback?

Okay, seeing no comments, I think that's how we should proceed. So Richard and (Larisa), anything else you want to comment on? It sounds like that's our plan of action to move forward.

(Larisa Groenig): Jen, this is (Larisa). Apologies; I've been kicked out of the Adobe Room so I can't raise my hand, and I don't see the queue so my apologies for that.

But I also wanted to - so that timeline works fine. Obviously we are making - we want to make sure that the survey is the best that it can possibly be and it's clear as possible. I think the extra time is well worth it to make sure that the responses are really solid and what we want them to be.

At the same time, we're also managing the translation component of this. So we will most likely move forward with an earlier version, at least just to get it into translations.

And our plan is to take the questions but essentially to take the PDF of the survey and have that translated so that people that would like to see the questions and the answer options in their various languages will have the option to do that.

And then for those that will want to respond in their native languages, that will have to be done outside of the interactive format through some sort of a Word document mechanism and then those responses will have to be translated. So just wanted to (unintelligible) for the group that we are managing for that to make sure that people have options to respond truly in whatever way is most suitable to them.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you (Larisa). Richard, did you have another comment as well?

Richard Westlake: Thank you Jen. Yes, if I could.

Just two points in relation to the (team) survey and (unintelligible). Please remember the best (unintelligible) is a test version. We are not collecting the substance of comments. Obviously when we read through some of them it is giving us some sense that what we're trying to do is we are simply tasting the logic and the appropriateness of the survey, so this is a set of building blocks rather than - please don't spend too much time putting your comments into this version and (select) probably not.

And secondly, I recognize that the community we're talking to on this call will tend to be people who will do the version of the survey. Could I ask that a few of you please take the time to try to skip logic for those who don't know the GNSO very well and may well wish to answer an (unlimited) number of questions, and give me feedback on that as well please.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you for that clarification. That is a great point as I'm sure it would be easy for any one of us to go off completely in the survey as though it was the full survey so that's a great point. And then also we will certainly review the shorter version and provide feedback on that as well. So thank you for raising those two clarification points.

Richard Westlake: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Michele, I see you have a couple of comments. Did you want to add anything from the Chat?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele. Just very briefly.

I mean I just - now these are the dangerous assumption to assume that just because people like me might engage in one of these working groups that I'm actually going to fill out a long survey. I get sent surveys all the time; I don't complete all of them. If there's a short survey version that I can do, I'll usually opt for that one.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great, thank you. Thank you for the comment. And certainly your feedback on the short version would be most helpful if that's the one you would be more inclined to complete.

And hopefully we're providing something for everyone because I know we've had different comments on this point that some want a shorter, some want a longer, so hopefully we're finding some middle ground that meets everybody's needs.

Okay, if there are no other comments at this point, I think we have our timeframe that we should be receiving over the weekend or certainly by Monday an updated survey. We will forward that out to our groups and provide feedback on the list so that that can be incorporated. And then be

looking at Jeff and (Wes Lake) launching this publicly by a week from Monday.

Our next Monday is two weeks from today which is August 7th, so hopefully by then we will have sort of an update as to how many surveys have been completed, how it's going, and we can then follow-up on what we need to do to boost any implementation in terms of getting the survey out there.

(Larisa), anything else from Staff that you see on our agenda?

(Larisa Groenig): Not at the moment Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay thanks (Larisa). Chuck, did you have another comment?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, one of the concerns that I had is that the primary response for it was August. August is probably the least active month in our community of any month of the year. And if the primary response for it is August, I think we're going to essentially limit a lot of responses and probably especially for those who are less active in the community and we want their feedback.

So if the primary period is August, I definitely think we're going to need to extend it well into September if we want regional responses. At the same time, I don't think it's wise to have too long a response period because people just put it off and then maybe never do it.

So I think we need to keep that in mind. Historically, August is always a slow month for the ICANN community.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck, that's a great point. And I know we had talked about that in one of our other meetings.

(Larisa), I think that the time period was extended through September. Was it not or could you provide an update? And then I see Michele has his hand up as well.

(Larisa Groenig): Jen, this is (Larisa). Yes, I just typed into the Chat. While we want to get as many responses as quickly as possible for obviously reasons, we've already considered the fact that the survey would need to stay open through September, and of course we'll continue to monitor the status of responses and bring those updates to this group for a couple of reasons.

One is to continue the outreach effort and encourage communities to respond, and obviously we'll continue to do that too.

But the other reason too is because if we see any kind of concerns or unexpected outcomes of either responses or non-responses, then we would certainly want to consider what impact that's having and come up with another game plan. So we will continue to monitor that very closely.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks (Larisa). Michele.

Michele Neylon: Michele speaking.

Just following on from what Chuck was saying. Mid-July and August are traditionally times of the year when a lot of people take holidays, or even if they're not on holiday, they're in a kind of different working mode as it were.

I think it's very dangerous to open up any survey that anybody wants to have taken seriously during July or August. And I would be much happier if this was put off until the first week of September. The rationale behind that being that a lot of notifications about things happening during the months of July and August will just get lost; people won't see them.

Some people I know, they'll just delete all email over a certain period of time. I mean if I was away for two or three weeks, I would probably dump a lot of the email that I get from certain groups because it will be irrelevant by the time I actually get around to looking at it. So I would be very, very wary of opening this up.

But I - you know, it's a question of either doing something properly or doing something quickly. And I personally prefer doing things properly. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: (Larisa) or Richard, did you want to respond to that point?

(Larisa Groenig):   Jen, this is (Larisa). Yes, I certainly appreciate Michele's point and we identified this as a timing consideration from the beginning when the GNSO review process was launched.

At the same time, I would not recommend delaying for the full month because I think that we have good plans in place to ensure that if some people do in time delete their emails, we will be sending reminders, we will be using multiple means and multiple channels to reach out to people to let them know that this is happening.

And most importantly, we will continue to monitor the responses to see what kind of coverage we're getting so that we can still continue to reinforce the importance of responding to the survey in early September. But at least this way, we'll start the process of collecting feedback in August. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you (Larisa) and it does sound like we'll have the opportunity to continue it well into September. So I guess we'll see where we are in a couple of weeks and just continue to provide feedback.

Any other final questions or comments? Okay, seeing none, I thank everyone again for your time, for all of your feedback. I think we've made tremendous

progress again in adding to this, the survey, expanding the scope of it including all of the comments and the feedback.

We really appreciate everything (Larisa) that you're doing and (Wes Lake) that you're doing. And we'll look forward to talking again in two weeks and to activity on list to respond to the survey next week.

So thank you again to everyone. That brings our meeting to a close.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Richard Westlake: Thank you.

Man: Thanks everyone.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

END