

**GNSO Review Working Party  
TRANSCRIPT  
Thursday 21 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/gnsoreview20140821-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe  
David Maher  
Wolf Ullrich Knobon  
Chuck Gomes  
Rudi Vansnick

Guest speaker: Richard Westlake

Apologies:

Stephane Van Gelder  
Osvaldo Novoa  
Ron Andruff

ICANN Staff:

Larisa Gurnick  
Mary Wong  
Matt Ashtiani  
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: And good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party call on 21 August 2014. On the call today we have Jennifer Wolfe, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knobon, David Maher and Wolf-Ulrich Knobon. We have a guest speaker today. It's Richard Westlake. We have received apologies from Stephane Van Gelder, Osvaldo Novoa and Ron Andruff. And

from staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Mary Wong, Matt Ashtiani and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks and welcome to everybody. Thank you again for taking time out of your busy day to join this call and to be part of this working party. We really appreciate all of your commitment to the review process. I know we're towards the August so there's a lot of people on vacations and we have a small group today, but hopefully we can still tackle the issues at hand.

I know the first item on our agenda is an update from I don't know if it's from (Richard) or from staff or both, but I'll turn it over to you to give us an update on how the review assessment process is going.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you. This is (Richard) speaking. Shall I come in first? I'm happy to do that because I see that on the screen you've just put up the e-mail that we sent through yesterday. Just to give you the latest situation, as of earlier today there had been something like 66 total responses and our conclusion having worked through is of those 34 have been completed. So 66 have gone in. We've really had probably 40 out who have started to answer and 34 who have finished, so you could say probably there are about 14 people who have started but not gone much further.

But the 34 who have gone right through have been quite consistent pretty much from the point of the first of the stakeholder group questions, the qualifying questions for the commercial stakeholders group 34, and that number is consist right through. You'll see on the sheet in front of you on the screen the split between the affiliations, and I hope that's big enough for most of you to be able to read comfortably.

So we're really getting a bit of a spread. And not surprisingly of course of the 48 who have recorded their affiliation, nearly half are GNSO, about a third are GNSO, and the next highest component is those who say no affiliation with 10. Other than that there's a bit of a spread. And you'll see below that, the spread across as well on the chart. Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Do we know how many, you know, what our total marketplace is in terms of expected responses? I mean how many people are formally part of each one of these groups? Do we have that data? Anyone from staff know?

(Richard Westlake): Jen, it's (Richard) again. If could perhaps just come in.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure.

(Richard Westlake): I remember - I'm sorry was that someone else trying to speak?

Jennifer Wolfe: I don't think so. Go ahead.

(Richard Westlake): All right. I was going to say I remember a meeting or two ago I think it was Chuck saying that he was hoping we would have by the end of the survey something like well like several hundred responses in total. I would certainly say that to date we don't yet have an adequate sample to be able to say here is a general sense, a general set of responses.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. No I agree, and I think everyone was concerned about the August timeframe with regard to responses, so this would seem consistent with that. And I noted that we're looking at extending this until September 23. Larisa, I see your hand's up. Go ahead, please. Larisa, are you there? Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, Jen. This is Larisa. I'm sorry I was having trouble with my line. Can you hear me now?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes now we can.

Larisa Gurnick: Okay excellent. Yes (Richard) just touched on something that as you can see on the agenda on our previous call we had already discussed the possibility of extending the closing date of the survey to September 23, and we will in fact go ahead and do that.

And to help the responses and to ensure that we have a broad and diverse set of responses for the (Westlake) team to analyze, we will continue with the outreach efforts such as what we already did last week, a series of two webinars, and we have various other communications scheduled, including a blog and direct outreach to the various communities within the GNSO to the various groups to make sure that people remember to participate in the survey and also to encourage the ones that have already started the survey to complete their responses so that they can be counted fully.

Jennifer Wolfe: I see Chuck's hand is up. I just have one quick follow up. Are - if you've started the survey are you receiving e-mail reminders to complete the survey?

Larisa Gurnick: At this point not yet but there will be. That mechanism is being put in place.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen, and thanks, Larisa. Just a suggestion to think about. As you I'm sure know I'm definitely supportive of extending the period to 23 September, but I wonder if we'd be better off announcing that extension towards the end of the first week of September so that it has maximum effectiveness, because people will be hopefully back from vacations and so forth and I think we'd get more mileage about announcing the extension then than we would during anytime during August or even the first few days of September. Just throw that out as a thought.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa, is that - any thoughts there? Does that seem like a good way to proceed?

Larisa Gurnick: That certainly sounds very reasonable. Thank you so much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. No I think, you know, I mean it's unfortunate we don't have more responses but I think not surprisingly, you know, given that it is the month of August. So I think if we wait and make that announcement - but I do think reminding people who have started the survey that they need to complete it would be helpful. I know if I had started it -- I did take it and go completely through it -- but if I had not completed it, I would probably forget about it if I didn't get an e-mail reminder to go back and finish. So I think that would certainly be helpful.

Any other updates on the outreach plans or response or anything else that we should know thus far about the responses or any problems that you see occurring?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. No problems, Jen, but I just did want to remind and encourage this group as active and involved and helpful in the development of 360 as you have all been, we really hope that you can take the message to the people that you work with to remind them personally in whatever way you might find appropriate to participate in the 360 assessment while staff of course continues to do the formal outreach. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And then I see the next item - yes, Chuck, please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. Sorry to jump in again. It's Chuck. Just - I'm looking at that bar chart on the screen and there are lots of bars that don't have any labels. It seems like that particular data would be better presented in a table rather than a bar chart if there's not room to show all the labels of the bars. It's pretty hard to tell which of the labels go with which bars too. So just for future use if that could be put in tabular format with all of the labels for the bars, well

it wouldn't be bars anymore, just numbers, I think that would - it could be numbers and percentages both, I think that would be more useful.

Like I was trying to figure out okay how many registries have responded, and I can't tell which bar corresponds to the registries for sure. It looks like it's small but I can't tell for sure. And I don't need that right now, but it would be helpful if we could do that. And even if we're only going to have meetings every two weeks if we could provided an update of that data in particular and then the data up above too, that would help us in knowing how our groups are responding and give us some data that we can go back to them with. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. That's a great point if that could be done on the list as well because I know we do have a lot of people out and not very many on the call today. And I think for everyone to recognize from their groups, you know, what the response numbers look like and, you know, what the percentage of their specific group has responded, I think that would be very helpful and probably motivate, you know, the people involved in this working party to go back to their stakeholder group and...

(Richard Westlake): Jen, this is (Richard) again.

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead.

(Richard Westlake): I'm sorry I don't have a means of putting my hand up on the Adobe screen.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, go right ahead, please.

(Richard Westlake): Just to clarify for Chuck, that chart below is in fact the decay rate of people who worked through the survey. So on the left-hand side you will see started, which I think is the 64 or the 66, and then it is the number of responses to each set of the survey statements.

So you will see for example you get through to the various groups and user constituencies that 34 is the consistent number of people who have skipped that particular section, and the small bar is the number who had responded to the GNSO council, CSG, CBUC, IP constituency, ISPs and so on, question 92, simply because it is the start of the final question I think or the final set of questions page and so just showing the decay in the number at the very end but how the 34 is consistent right through up to that point. So that's actually a progress chart through the survey.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thanks, (Richard). That's very helpful. I had no idea that was what that was.

(Richard Westlake): You're welcome.

Chuck Gomes: That is very helpful information. In addition to that, it would be good if we could still see in tabular format that data so that it's a little easier for us to use. Thanks.

(Richard Westlake): Of course. No problem. I'm happy to do that. And you say you had no idea. Until I looked more closely neither had I, I'm sorry to admit.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Any other comments from anyone else on the responses to date? Okay. Moving on - or I see there's a comment on translations. Any update on translations or what's happening?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, Jen. This is Larisa. The announcement of the survey is now available in all languages, and within the next day or so the links off of those translated pages will provide people with a translated PDF of the entire survey.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. And then moving on, I see we have an update from the (Westlake) team on the working groups. Go ahead.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you, Jen. We were talking, then we had a briefing about two days ago on the PDP process for working groups, which was a very helpful session for us. I think we agreed that probably the most useful way of approaching this would be again starting probably in early September to launch a specific working group focused survey of no more than perhaps about three pages of statements and to send out that out. And for those who have completed the survey to say thank you for the work you've done to date, now we'd like you please if you would just to take a few more minutes to drill further into the workings of specific working groups.

And the way we would see that structured in conceptual terms it would be very much like the individual constituency or group pages, which is about two to three pages of statements relating to each specific one, where the front of the survey they simply provide a bit of identifying data and which specific group they are referring to - sorry, which specific working group they're referring to. And I think also we would include incorporating in that some statements around the process as described to us, the process getting through from - that we talked through a couple of days ago, right through to the point of getting the final decision, full consensus, consensus, strong support, et cetera, through to ICANN board approval.

And I think if we get a little bit of assessment on those as well that should add significant richness to the initial comments that we already have. But we felt rather than trying to add complexity to this survey which is already bulky enough to do a short targeted survey of a familiar format is probably going to be the most productive way of doing it. But to have it open for a relatively short period so it's not something that comes and stays there for a long time.

Jennifer Wolfe: (Richard), this is Jen. Just a quick follow up. So that would come in an e-mail, so if I've taken the survey I would get an e-mail asking me to take a short follow-up survey, is that correct?

(Richard Westlake): Correct. But we would also I think the intention is we haven't finalized this yet but it would also be announced publicly just again as a prompt for people.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. And, Larisa, is that - did you just put your hand up again?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. This is Larisa. Thanks, Jen. It would be really helpful to get some feedback from this group in terms of who would be the appropriate audience to target the working group survey to. The initial thought is that it would be targeted, at a minimum it would be targeted to those individuals that have participated in working groups. And of course those lists are available within the GNSO secretariat.

And the other question would be that we would like some feedback on is the timing of such a survey, some concern being about confusion possibly of having two different surveys available to participate in at the same time. So we really welcome some thoughts and ideas from this group on those two points. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: I'll jump in and share mine and then certainly open it up to everyone else. But I do like the idea of getting the e-mail after you've taken the survey, but I also agree it's a long survey and if there are people who just want to comment on working groups who have participated that that's a great way to get them to at least provide some feedback. So I think having some sort of an e-mail go out to the larger distribution list to let them know there is a special survey on working groups and also encourage them to take the broader survey. But other comments? I see Chuck you just put something in the chat. Do you want to jump in?

Chuck Gomes: Sure I can. I was just responding to Larisa. I think it's really good that we do get input from those who have participated in working groups, but I also think it's good to get the perspective of those who haven't, because there's a lot of perceptions about working groups on the outside and that might help us to see what educational efforts we need to do to change the perception of

working groups and also improve them. So I wouldn't restrict it to just those who participated.

And I agree with you, Jen, that it would be - we shouldn't restrict the participation to those who responded to the main survey because there probably will be some that may just want to participate in working groups. So I think it is good to follow up with those who did, but I don't think it should be restricted to that so that we get broader feedback. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Chuck. Any other comments or feedback on the follow-up assessment on working groups? Okay. The next item on our agenda is scheduling time in L.A. And I'm just looking at our calendar. I think we have - sorry, go ahead. Was that (Richard)? Did you want to jump in?

(Richard Westlake): No that wasn't me, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Was there anybody else? I didn't see anything else in Adobe, but please jump in. We have a small group today so please jump in if there was something else anyone wanted to comment on. Okay, so moving on. We do have a couple more meetings before the October ICANN meeting that we have on the phone. Larisa, did you want to provide an update on what was being planned for Los Angeles?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes thanks, Jen. This is Larisa. I wanted to get on the conversation about availability and calendar options early or as early as feasible to find out what would be a good date to target in person and of course virtual remote participation for the meeting of this group, and I was hoping to get some ideas based on your other responsibilities and commitments and meetings whether let's say Friday or Saturday or what date prior to the official start of the meeting would be good to target for a face-to-face session probably lasting at least an hour. And that would also give the opportunity for the (Westlake) team who will be present in L.A. in person to have a robust and substantive interaction based on the results of their work at that point in time.

Jennifer Wolfe: I see Chuck your hand is up, please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Sorry to talk so much, but the - I guess first a question. Is it fair to assume that that session would be open to anybody who wanted to attend? And I think that's a good idea like most sessions at these meetings so that it's not a closed meeting, and you can respond to that later after I finish. It's hard for us to predict timing acceptance in general since because we of course haven't seen the schedule.

Certainly we should assume that we don't want to conflict with key GNSO meetings like stakeholder day, constituency day, whatever we want to call it. We know that the GNSO has workshops all weekend the weekend before on Saturday and Sunday, but something like this could be integrated into that schedule as well of course working with Jonathan and the vice chair that is coordinating the meetings and staff and so forth. But it's really hard to say which days.

Now when you're saying Friday do you mean the Friday before or the Friday after? That's a critical issue because in both cases - I think there's a GNSO training session the Friday, I don't know if it's the Friday before or the Friday after, but the GNSO council has a session the Friday after so I'm pretty sure those are happening that way. So we need to be aware of that.

No I should - I'm not trying to restructure just GNSO; that just happens to be the area that I'm most familiar with. So avoiding conflicts with GNSO things on a schedule is a no brainer once we know what those are, but the whole week is pretty busy, so the sooner we get something put in the better.  
Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. And I'll just add my comments on that too. My concern about doing it the Friday before or after is that we will ultimately have limited participation because I know the GNSO is doing a working session the Friday

after, and the Friday before I think a lot of people haven't arrived yet. And I'd like to make sure we get as much participation as possible during this meeting.

I agree it should be an open meeting to anyone who would like to attend, and I also agree I think we should coordinate with Jonathan because probably finding some time on the weekend session would be most advantageous. I know usually by Sunday afternoon we stop and there's a GAC meeting and some other things, so maybe that's a timeframe to look at. But I see Mary put in the chat that she would talk to Jonathan, so maybe that's the best way to proceed and then otherwise to try to find a slot on the Monday or Wednesday or possibly Thursday timeframe. That would be my comment. Any other comments from anyone else?

Okay. Well so we'll look to hear from staff back on that point on our next call in two weeks. Any other comments or questions? I think we're moving along. It's not surprising where we are but hopefully within the next two weeks we'll see more participation, and then hopefully we'll see a big surge in September as people get back to work in the fall here. Any other comments? Questions?

(Richard Westlake): Jen, this is (Richard) again. We can be completely flexible around that week of ICANN 51 before or after, so please just let us know what works best for you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you. We appreciate that. Okay well thanks everybody. We'll look forward to talking again in two weeks. And to Larisa - oh I see Larisa's hand is up. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: No problem, Jen. This is Larisa. Just to wrap it up as action items, so staff will start circulating statistics to this whole list and make sure that people know exactly where the responses are falling, and we can certainly do that on a weekly basis and then we'll also get back to everybody quickly with some more specific information about the scheduling of this session in L.A. so.

And also in the meantime while the survey results and survey responses are being collected, (Westlake) is proceeding with other aspects of their review of reviewing the documents and they've had some good interactions with staff to understand the roadmaps of the available processes and documents. So that work continues to move forward.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. We'll look forward to that. And any other final comments from anyone else? Okay well thank you everybody. Have a great weekend and we'll look forward to talking in two weeks.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you all.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. You can now stop the recordings.

END