
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JEN WOLFE: Sure. We'll start and we'll go around the room. I'm Jen Wolfe and I'm the chair of the GNSO review working party. So welcome. Thank you for being here. I have a feeling we might have a small group, so thank you all very much for taking your time to be here with them today, and to provide feedback.

LARISA GURNICK: I'm Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff.

COLIN JACKSON: Colin Jackson from the West Lake Governance, the review team.

RUDI VANSNICK: Rudi Vansnick, chair of NPOC [inaudible] GNSO.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]... NPOC. And I apologize, I have to leave in about 20 minutes.

ROB HOGGARTH: Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MARIKA KONNINGS: Marika Konnings, ICANN staff.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Charla Shambley, ICANN staff.

STEVE CHEN: Steve Chen, ICANN staff.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

J. SCOTT EVANS: J. Scott Evans, Adobe Systems securities [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes, anything else? Okay.

JEN WOLFE: Welcome Richard. Welcome everyone. Let's go ahead and move forward. I think we've got a 90 minute session [inaudible]...

So our agenda for today, obviously we've just done welcome, but we'll review the review methodology and approach. Colin is going to give us an overview of how the review has been conducted, what sort of [inaudible], and then he's going to provide a briefing of the working text of the report that will ultimately be issued for the review.

Our goal today is really just to listen to the working text [inaudible]... and to provide initial feedback and discussion, and our timeframe will move forward to where we actually provide aggregated comments, [inaudible] on March 3, and then we have a deadline of March [inaudible]...

...take it from here.

One more, I'm sorry.

LARISA GURNICK:

Yeah. Let me just jump in real quickly [inaudible]...

This is just to remind everybody that the review has several different [inaudible] in it, the role of the structural improvements committee, it is to provide oversight over the review, and actually [inaudible] shortly. Staff will [inaudible]... as far as the independent examiner, and in the case of the Westlake team, their role is to collect the data, analyze the text, for observations finding and conclusions based on the actual information that they gather.

And the working text is a checking point. This isn't yet a draft report, this is certainly not final report, working text. It's just an opportunity to check in, and see the information that they've collected and have the opportunity to clarify and correct anything that [inaudible] corrected, in terms of factual observations.

The review working party, and that's all of you, your role is to be the liaison between [inaudible]... the Westlake team, and the rest of the GNSO community, and thanks to your hard work and efforts through all

of these months since May, you've provided input into the 360 assessment, focus the Westlake team on individuals that ought to be included in interviews and, at this point, [inaudible] providing clarification and correction to the factual information that has been collected. Next slide please.

Just as a quick overview, Jim... Do you want to [CROSSTALK] this one?

JEN WOLFE:

Sure. So I think most of you are aware of this as we've gone through the process, [inaudible] metrics on where we ended up in the process. Throughout the 360 assessment, we had 178 complete the online questionnaire, there were 300 that were started. So that was about a 60% completion rate. That wasn't completely [inaudible] where we talked about creating a survey that was short, long, people could start, stop, or at least they were able to gather data from all of the [inaudible].

But we were happy with that, particularly with the additional outreach we did during the Los Angeles meeting. There were 35 one on one interviews conducted. In terms of their review and observation, the Westlake team has reviewed documents, transcripts, proceedings from ICANN 50 to 52, the ICC report [inaudible] by the ATRT 2.

In terms of our meetings, we've had 13 work party meetings, there are officially 20 members. And again, I thank those of you who have been diligent in showing up and participating. And outreach, we had three webinars. We had 14 presentations, two blogs, two videos, 3,000

brochures and postcards. And we did have 1709 views of announcements about the review.

Close to 3,000 blog views, which is great, and [inaudible] to the community Wiki. Next slide. So just to review our timeframe, if you all have that up. Our next step as the working party will be on March 3rd, we have a call set. The purpose of that call will be to discuss the working text that will be provided. The plan is to distribute that later today via email.

It will go out to the working party list. They will also be placed on the Wiki. We will have, as the working party, between now and March 3rd to really read, digest, think about it, come to the call on March 3rd, have discussion. And then between March 3rd and March 20th, we will aggregate comments. And there is just one point I want to make, we don't need to come to some consensus on the comments [inaudible]...

...like that. We're looking to just aggregate everybody's comments, and provide that with Westlake in an organized fashion so that they can take that and use it. Westlake will then post the draft report, by April 23rd. Public comments will be gathered through the ICANN 53 meeting. And the final report will be issued on July 14th.

Any questions on the timeframe from anybody?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I don't have a question on the timeframe. I do have a question, just to make sure... When you take into the public comments, do you expect

that you will also reply to them and explain the ones you took onboard, the ones you didn't take onboard, the rationale?

JEN WOLFE: [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Whoever is doing the final, taking in the... Because I think that's where sometimes things fall off the rail just a little bit. When there is no explanation back about the public comments. And so I would just suggest you take public comment, you explanatory... We've got 30 comments that said this, we didn't do this, that [inaudible]...

Just people feel like they're not heard, and if you acknowledge, even if you don't take onboard, they're heard. And I think that makes it ultimate acceptance to [inaudible]... work product a lot easier.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...working groups and the PDP working groups, and the PDP working groups [inaudible]...

JEN WOLFE: I think that's something we can do too...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, absolutely. Yeah.

JEN WOLFE: ...and then we can see what ultimately comes out [inaudible]... that information and put it out there so I think that's a really good point.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just a confirmation. Is this the old plus 30 public comments, or the new whatever it is.

LARISA GURNICK: It's the new, which essentially is standard default of 42 days, and then there is... So the new process, the new public process [inaudible]... provide time for the community to review the staff prepared summary of the public comments [inaudible]... at that point. Right Rob? Public comments [inaudible].

JEN WOLFE: Any other questions about the timeframe, what's expected from us as a group between now and then?

Okay, next slide please.

Okay. So results, we're going to turn it over to Colin, to take us through. Colin, are you okay if people stop for questions, or would you rather wait until the end?

COLIN JACKSON:

I'm happy to take questions as we go. But before I start, what I'm going to do here, is present some of what is in the working text. I do want to make it clear that the working text is, it is not a draft report, it is an incomplete draft report, would be a much better way of looking at it. When you see it, you will see there were large areas marked, work to come here.

In many cases, that tends to apply more to the recommendations than to the findings. I think it would be fair to say we're pretty confident we have identified problems. We're not necessarily all the way there to the solution yet. So you will, and you will see that as I work this. These slides. In some cases, I'm just going to say well, we will have to get back to you on that one, and we will get back to you on it.

So, we have divided... First of all, I'm going to structure this around the five themes that came out of the Board working group recommendations. So this is a previous set of aggregated recommendations based out of our previous reviews of GNSO. And the extent to which those are being dealt with, and then we'll have a final section on moving on from there.

So, there is a lot of slides that are a bit like this. So what I'm pointing out on this one, is that there were three Board working group recommendations, which I have summarized savagely to get them into

four rows each. The first one is about working groups to do policy development. But all the ones on this page are about working groups in general.

So the Board working group made these three recommendations about working groups, and we have been asked, for job, have they been implemented and implemented effectively. And in all cases, all these ones have said yes. And our basis for that finding was that clearly, there are working groups, [inaudible]. So they're not, they exist. They do useful things.

They generate policy. And in the 360, [inaudible], wait, don't change it yet, I'll get to it. But there were some results from the 360 that justified this, and we'll show that up. They are some caveats which I'll also get to, but one of the major ones is that there is a handful of you to actually do the work in working groups.

This is the observation from everybody. We have had that comment repeatedly. It's a little worrying, given that the importance of the mission, our GNSO, and the fact that there are so few volunteers who are actually doing the hard work, I'm sure that lots of other people do lots of other hard work, but this particular aspect that's developing [inaudible]... Domain name system, or the generic names anyway, is in the hands of a few people.

Can we have the next slide please? This slide shows... This is again, these are results from the 360. [Inaudible] over to you what people said about the effectiveness of the working group. So there are two propositions here that people are invited to agree or disagree with.

What in the working group model is effective, and the other was that GNSO listens to community feedback.

As you see, both of those get more than 75% positive agreement, or strong agreement. That's a really positive thing, that says people think the GNSO is listening. People think that the working group model is doing what it's intended to do. Next slide please.

This is an interesting story when you look at it. Yeah. These we got from, actually I think this came from ICC and the ATRT 2 report, because we don't have an easy way of re-measuring that one. So we've used their work for this. Yes, I don't really need to say much about this, do I?

I mean NA and EU, really, [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But I see [inaudible] Africa is even bigger than Latin America. I'm a bit surprised by that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would suggest to you, the actual numbers are so low you probably can't even [inaudible]... I don't have an [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

COLIN JACKSON: Can we have the next slide please? This again, is from ATRT 2. This is about [agenda]. It is 80% [inaudible], pretty much the case. Now we don't collect statistics about that, and I'll talk about that a bit more.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] ...the other 20%...?

COLIN JACKSON: That's... So far as I'm aware, well ICANN doesn't actually tend to capture gender anyway, so there is not even any sense in having a conversation about whether you go to a binary or something more subtle. So I'll just leave that standing, and I have got some more comments on the recommendations on that as we go on.

Can we have the next slide please? These are initial recommendations for this area. Again, I'm referring back to the three recommendations that came out the Board working group about working groups, and so these are slides. Sorry, these are recommendations from Westside in that area. These are draft recommendations in the working text.

And I want to stress this, our recommendations are very much early draft, and I imagine we will be smartening and tightening them and making them rather more, aggressive will be a poor choice of words. More direct, perhaps and blunt in places. That's how I see the work on the report progressing from here.

So, there is an outreach program that ICANN runs, in fact, there is a couple. Our view is that that is not [inaudible] sufficiently, but it does need to [inaudible]... I think that that should be extended and more

focused through these outreach programs on bringing people into the GNSO as potential policy people for WGs and for the constituency.

We recommend a targeted recruitment program where you're actually trying to address the fact that we are 80% male and probably 80% North American/European.

We recommend reviewing the funding for the volunteers, perhaps travel funding. I'm not talking about paying volunteers, but they wouldn't be volunteers if we did that. Sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have a question.

COLIN JACKSON: Yeah, sure.

J. SCOTT EVANS: This is [inaudible] really struggling with the fact that we have this CROPP funds, but we can't use it, because we can't find anybody to go to other things. Because they're so taken up with all of the work that we have here. You know, three meetings a year, the work it takes to get somebody to go to yet another meeting, I mean, we have, ICANN has funds. They've offered us funds, but we can't even find anybody to use the funds.

And so we really are struggling, and I wonder if the community as a whole needs to have a discussion about this, because I think everybody

would like to have new voices [inaudible] more people in. ICANN is giving us money, we just can't find a way to use it.

COLIN JACKSON: Why is that?

J. SCOTT EVANS: People's time. It's just really tough to get their time to do things. One of the suggestions I made is, we have [inaudible] funds at the [inaudible] to build a booth, you would maybe take things like the INTA meeting and stuff like that, where we could reach out and maybe do some of these leadership conferences which they do for Americans ... And this is North American, only because that's my experience.

I go to leadership things where executives come and they do these leadership seminars for them and things like that. But we're really struggling. I'm wondering if anybody, [inaudible] struggle, [inaudible] brainstorm the community rather than segmented community groups, we might be able to come up with a game plan that [inaudible], rather than just [inaudible], groups things have false start.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: From the commercial body, we have some similar struggles. But also based on the fact the process, we have to do at least six weeks up front, and sometimes we discover that a meeting that is interesting for you, four weeks before the event takes place, and you cannot even go through the process because you need at least six weeks.

So it's in the process also, initial, CROPP is interesting. But the [inaudible] deployed is not helping us.

COLIN JACKSON:

May I add a comment to that? I know what you're saying about that, but one of the things about having the community brainstorm is that we all do this, we tend to send people who are like ourselves. And I'm saying we need more people who are not like ourselves. So we need to find a way to achieve that. We need more people from other regions.

Frankly, we need more women, you need to balance, in my view, we need to get a more diverse approach to policy making.

J. SCOTT EVANS:

And I think that's great, but ICANN as the staff likes to drive some of this, could do a targeted invitation to those groups, and bring them together to brainstorm. I am in no way suggesting that we have, you know, a bunch of men sitting around trying to figure out how to do this. I agree with you wholeheartedly that we need to get that... I think ICANN is control of the process, that's a role they can play and can play very effectively.

It's to do targeted invitations to bring people in to do a leadership discussion about this issue with representatives from those targeted communities we're trying to outreach to.

COLIN JACKSON:

And that was the second upon the list of recommendations, that I provided here in this draft, as you will see.

We also [inaudible] at trying to figure out how we construct a tailored incentive system, maybe some way of recognizing people for putting time into working groups. Maybe, it's not necessarily financial, or maybe through status or something else, to recognize the people that do the hard jobs, and celebrating that.

We would like to find a way to reduce barriers to newcomers. Now, we all know that it takes a lot of time. If I ask people how many ICANN meetings that they've been to, I think just about everybody is going to put their hand up and say more than 10. It takes that long to get into it. It's really hard. GNSO just as [suffering] complex as ICANN itself.

ICANN has a program, in which, what do you call it? Newcomer's day or something? To put people in, try to settle people into the community meetings, and we wonder whether the GNSO should do something similar. A way of trying to bring people in, and welcome them in, instead of some of the feedback we got, is that frankly, it can be quite the opposite, because there is, in some cases, an active possibility, with feedback we were given from existing members [inaudible] that has happened in some cases.

And obviously, we don't, that shouldn't happen, but a way to try to reduce that would be to try to put more emphasis on getting people into the organization, so that everybody there knows that that is part of the purpose of the organization is to bring new blood in.

CHUCK GOMES:

So one of the things that might [inaudible]... Okay. And there have been some talk about mentoring programs. And that's probably a good

idea, [inaudible]... a certain amount of education, but it's really the mentors, use of mentors within the GNSO, and it [inaudible] in particular, would probably be very valuable. Now again, [inaudible]... so busy, but mentoring, [inaudible] ...busy and it's part of your [inaudible].

So I think that would be one way, maybe one specific way...

J. SCOTT EVANS:

I've done it twice, one with Brian [inaudible], 2009. Now GNSO counselor. And I'm now working with Scott [inaudible] from Apple. And basically what I do is just say, "Follow me for a day. You know, just stick with me and follow me for a day. Ask every question that comes to your mind. Let's have coffee at the end of the day." And those are the kinds of things that I think...

I think the problems that we have, and I'm struggling in my own INTA, I'm president of my INTA, is that teaching people to lead, [inaudible] volunteer workers. So I think what ICANN staff should probably do to identify people you think are leaders, and maybe put them through a small leadership training so that they have the skillset to do some of this stuff.

I wanted to also point, that I agree with you about the possibility to add new voices that come into the GNSO system. I think that's been a failure upon ICANN not to shine a light on [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Somebody needs to mute their computers.

J. SCOTT THOMAS: So I think that we need to work together, but I agree. I've heard that from, I think, these non-profit group that came in. The Board identified to bring onboard has struggled with some of that hostility. And I think it's something that we as just citizens of the community, have [inaudible] work together to get rid of, because [inaudible] forces are going to bring us forward.

But I think that you're very right. That conclusion is very true.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]... so targeting one [inaudible], as a follow up. It's easier sometimes to bring people in the first time. Then the question is, how to keep them? So the question here is, I wonder something whether we, in different levels, different constituencies try to do the same thing afterwards. Everybody tries to keep contact, and to provide materials, and all of these things.

So the question here is, which part of that effort could be then combined. And the other thing is what should we [inaudible], and so people sometimes, [inaudible] that they [inaudible]... I do it by myself because it's mine, [inaudible]...

He or she could come to my community, between BC and [inaudible] might be sometimes that [inaudible]...

So the question is, [inaudible] combined and what we should do to support them?

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you. I need to keep moving, otherwise we won't get through this in time. So thank you for that, and I am taking notes, but also I must keep going. We believe that you should publishing participation figures, including diversity information. If you don't measure something, you can't track it.

We think that you should be actively seeking non-native English speakers. There are a couple of more points about working groups at the bottom here. Working groups should have a role in issues that arise from implementation. So there are cross complaints and comments that after a working group has created its policy, that somehow an implementation it doesn't get implemented like people thought it should.

That one came through several times. Sometimes people finger pointed about that, it's not my purpose to analyze the finger pointing, or to try to assign blame in any sense. But our view is that if a working group had a role in overseeing, or at least, commenting on issues associated with the implementation, that problem should go away.

CHUCK GOMES: Just a quick comment on that. This is the way that's worded implies that the working group just continue through implementation, and in some cases, that is quite a significant commitment. Now in the policy implementation working group recommendations [inaudible]...

The continuity between members of the working group and implementation [inaudible], but whether or not we want to imply working, say, functioning all the way through implementation, that can be quite intimidating.

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you for that comment. I'll address [inaudible]... I wouldn't [inaudible] would require anything like with as much effort or as many meetings, but that's fine. You've also... We've also noted that the policy implementation working group should have a role in ongoing implementation issues. That pretty much is, you already know that is pretty much what you are already doing.

CHUCK GOMES: And the recommendation [inaudible]...

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...standing group, the rest of time? Or is that going to...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Which group?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The implementation work.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The implementation review team?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHUCK GOMES: Well the recommendations [inaudible] right now are... One of our recommendations that implementation review team being the team mandatory for all policy recommendations, with some flexibility to make exceptions.

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you. I'm going to move on to the next slide now. The different area of recommendation. Again, we start with the Board working group recommendations. This is about the PDP. So, the Board working group had these three recommendations here, that new PDP rules are introduced. That PDPs contained an element in self-assessment, and that there should be in line with ICANN strategic plan. And we were asked for our judgment about how well these are being implemented.

And our view that the rules were implemented effectively. That the self-assessment is incomplete, for reasons that I'll go into, and that the reason our alignment with the ICANN strategic plan.

CHUCK GOMES: Does that mean that the PDPs are not aligned with this particular plan?

COLIN JACKSON: It means that there is no strategic plan in GNSO, so it's difficult for it align with anything.

CHUCK GOMES: You're talking about a GNSO strategic plan.

COLIN JACKSON: Yeah. So there is this... And as I say, I summarized these direct from the Board working group savagely to get them onto the slide. But...

CHUCK GOMES: Yeah, you say here, ICANN strategic plan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, that's different. GNSO strategic plan. Or is the ICANN plan...?

COLIN JACKSON: The Board working group recommended that the GNSO align itself with the ICANN strategic plan. That hasn't happened, because if it had done that, we would see a plan from the GNSO, a strategic plan, a business plan, or something with a sort of planning document, that aligned with the ICANN strategic plan. So that's pretty...

Because that's where it flowed in the Board working group.

MARIKA KONINGS: [Inaudible] I mean, that is as far as I know, not happening, but what has started happening is in the outcomes of the GNSO council development session that we're organizing, the group identifies some more strategic priorities, which areas do we want to focus on throughout the years. Those are not specifically aligned with policy development. Those are more, I think, address how to improve as an organization, which are the focus area, so that may be something to refer to, and I'm happy to share that information, but it's something that we recently started doing.

Although I don't know if that goes as far as a strategic plan, but some strategy that is...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]... in the presentation.

COLIN JACKSON: Well, that, as I said, that came with the Board...

CHUCK GOMES: I understand that. The community, when they look at it, are [inaudible]...

COLIN JACKSON:

Again, as I say, I'm briefly summarizing this to get into a slide. So it may be clearer when it's spelled out in text. The, people say, in the 360, roughly 50/50 that between the PDP takes too long, and the PDP is timely. And my, our view, really is that it does take a long time to reach consensus on things, when things are contentious, we can see that.

We do have some recommendations, hopefully to improve that. So just regarding the self-assessment, there is a data and metrics working group, and that's a good thing, which is endeavoring to come up with a way of measuring what PDPs do. But suppose we are aware, there is nothing about the successive policy post implementation.

We consider that [inaudible] by some form of self-assessment, or assessment run by GNSO. Can we have the next slide please? Now, this is the, these are our initial recommendations of the PDP area. So a leadership... And this actually goes back to something that I think stops at a few minutes ago about leadership. We're recommending a leadership assessment program.

So this is about leading working groups effectively. We are likely to recommend that there is some form of professional facilitation available for working groups, but not universally. We have been challenged to come up with a metric on how you would decide whether a working group required professional facilitation, and we'll take that away and think about it.

But we consider that there are some that would benefit from that, and it can take a lot of the, can I say, politics out of the situation. If you get

somebody who doesn't really have skin in the game, to use a metaphor, but is just there to get an outcome.

There is a face to face working group pilot meeting held here, and that is obviously going to be assessed. I mean, we're going to be recommending something that I'm sure you're going to do anyway.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

COLIN JACKSON: Was that indeed? Has that been assessed, do you know?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

COLIN JACKSON: Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I've heard positive comments about it, but that's not, I think you're asking for more than that.

COLIN JACKSON: I think I am asking more than that, yes. We're going to recommend that there is a fast track available for things that aren't continuous. So you can get a policy decision through quickly, if it's not going to be

something that is going to have too many implications that have sent too many people, then there should be a process to getting that through quickly.

That's common in other bodies that make rules and policies around the world, for instance, like standard [inaudible]. Chunking things up like the IRCP, of course, that had four goes. We recommend more than that. Try to break things into... Great problems into smaller problems, but I'm sure the process is on those.

Again, there needs to be an ongoing focus on the timeliness of WGs. They should have self-evaluation as part of their charter all of them. Again, which I used [inaudible] and improve the effects of any [inaudible]... So your feedback loop there, probably GNSO council, that needs to be monitored the self-assessment and using that to inform the chartering of new groups.

[Inaudible] to be evaluating the effectiveness of the policy, and post implementation policy, again, and using that to feed back into the chartering process. So we see quite a role for council here. Next slide please. So that brings me on the council.

Again, these recommendations in blue are from the Board working group. And these are ones that have been around for awhile. And we've been asked whether our judgment and whether they've been implemented. We've given a yes to quite a few of these things. Number eight, that's PBA, we have not reached a conclusion yet on that one.

The alignment with strategic plan, councils in line with strategic plan, we have said that there is a list of projects visible to us to somebody looking at the webpage, website. There is no evidence of actual project management such as resource planning, so that's why we take this on parcel. We do believe that the role of the council, thus the Board, needs to be defined here, because as we all know, sometimes it is not clear who is going to make the ultimate decision about policy.

Can we have the next slide please? Recommendations in this area, and again, I stress these are initial, and we will be doing some more here. No, can we get [inaudible], thank you.

We need to clarify that only working groups, and only PDP working groups make policy. The council's role is not making policy. The council's role is to ensure that the process to generate policy has been followed correctly, and to initiate and to measure things, and to initiate new ones, as, when it has resources for prioritization, we'll get to that.

And in fact, that's my next, the next recommendation here is that council should follow a simple and transparent prioritization process. So if you talk to some other bodies in the ICANN community, they will say things like, well, we have time to do six of these a year. So we do six a year. And we make a choice among all of the requests we've got about which six those are going to be.

And I don't know what that number would be, of course, because it depends on how many volunteers you have, but in my view, there should be a process for starting off a PDP that acknowledges both the priority of that policy that is required by the PDP, and the resource

available in terms of volunteer time to actually do the work to get to it. So you have to have both of those things.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Being and involved in the PDP at this point, that [inaudible]... capturing a lot of what is happening in other working groups, and where we see the follow up of what we're doing is probably going to create other, initiate other working groups again. I think it's very difficult to prioritize because we are subject to what's happening, and sometimes situations that we don't have under control, pushing us to working groups to be done.

Look like the IANA transition is something that's out of control. It just happens that you have to do something that it is impacting a lot of working groups that were already running. And sometimes, pushes you in a situation where you have to say, okay, we have to reinitiate the other one, in order to be able to capture what's coming up because we're close to [inaudible] before.

I think it's not so easy to prioritize. I feel maybe others have another impression.

COLIN JACKSON:

I'll move on, if I may. The third recommendation with all of the sub-bullets is about a training and development program, specifically for counselors of the central council. I won't read them all out for you. Can we have the next slide please?

Constituencies. Now, the Board working group recommended in its recommendation number 14 that it may be made much simpler to form constituencies and our judgment is that that was implemented, but not effectively. And we base that judgment on the fact that only one constituency has been added in the time since the whole model was setup, that a number have tried and failed.

And I'll just briefly visit that point, because that is extremely disheartening for people who would actually do quite a lot of work in this area, if they weren't so disheartened and generally spend so much time trying to work their way through the process, which hasn't worked for them.

So, constituency operating principles, we do not consider has been implemented because the Board working group recommendation was quite clear in some respects, which has not been followed. There is no central registry of constituency members, for instance. None that we're aware of.

There is no information to measure diversity. In fact, for a supposedly transparent multistakeholder organization, parts of the GNSO are extremely non transparent.

CHUCK GOMES: [Inaudible] constituency offer [inaudible]... And I know [inaudible]... Help me understand what that is really about.

COLIN JACKSON:

The Board recommended, and this is all spelled out in the report, the Board recommended a number of principles for operating constituencies which included transparency, which it spells out in some detail.

And I've also put in the caveats box at the bottom, that when I'm talking about constituencies, our same comments apply to the contracted house stakeholder groups, simply because of the structure we have here. Again, they are building blocks of the organization.

Next slide please. Thank you. Oh yes, thank you very much. I just, this is results out of the 360. It's quite a mess of numbers, so I don't expect you to abstract meaning from this straightaway. Again, I summarized it on the top, the propositions that people are invited to agree or disagree with, and this is the percentage who gave a positive reply, I agree or strongly agree.

What I do want to notice is the encourages new people column. When you look at that, the aggregate is less than half. Some of them are very low indeed. This is illustrative of, I think part of the problem that we don't have enough people to get the work done, because they, in many cases, feel discouraged and unwelcomed. You'll also note the geographic diversity is, people say about 60% say, when you look at the numbers, the actual geographic diversity is pretty local.

So there is a disconnect there between what people think they're getting and what they're actually getting.

J. SCOTT EVANS: Pardon me for being a little skeptical, but commercial stakeholder groups is at 35% and every member of the commercial stakeholder group is higher.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

J. SCOTT EVANS: So, I mean, it doesn't really translate. Do people not understand the question?

COLIN JACKSON: Perhaps, and commercial stakeholder group is a bit anonymous because there is not actually much to the CSG, and perhaps those questions shouldn't have been asked at the CSG level. The NCSG does exist in terms of the CSG kind of doesn't, if you see what I mean. More of a way of funneling votes.

Let's move on please, next slide. This is, we were about to measure council diversity because of course, the affiliations of council is a matter of record. So we simply analyzed where council has come from, and this is the list, which as you see, is dominated by North America, but North America is less than half of it.

Asia Pacific, interestingly, is more than Europe. But can we have the next slide again? And what we've done here, is separated out Australia and New Zealand. And I see [inaudible] a New Zealander. And said we are culturally, and depending on how you define cultural diversity,

which is something we'll get to, but culturally Australia and New Zealand have less in common, let's say, with Asian countries, than we have with North America or Europeans.

So if you lump us all together, there are really not many people left. And the, if we look at the center of gravity of the Internet these days, India and China both have very high numbers. We pulled those numbers out from the report. Very high numbers of users, the center of gravity to [inaudible], in terms of numbers of people using it, is shifting to those countries, and shifting to those cultures, and yet we are here operating, making policy in an environment which is culturally pretty homogenous and different from that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I have one question here. Have you used the nationality of the persons? Or where they live?

COLIN JACKSON:

On the web page of council, everyone is given a region, is assigned to a region. So it goes with the name of these pages, so we just use that. Next slide please.

Thank you. Now ICANN core value four refers to geographic, gender, and cultural diversity. We have not been able to find a definition of culturally diversity. We've asked for it, we can't find it ourselves on the website. We're not convinced that ICANN has ever defined what that means. We think it should define what it means, or you should take it out of the core value.

I could probably have a stab of it, but it would involve people who are not just from an essentially European and western culture.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Question. Is there some place that we can look to, another organization that defines it in some way [inaudible] start from scratch ... could make a recommendation of other organizations that have defined it that might help us?

COLIN JACKSON: So I can take that away, okay? You're right, and there is probably still primitive research on that. I can't answer off the top of my head.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, I was just curious.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Monitoring, you need to publish metrics on geographic, culture, gender, diversity, otherwise you can't, you can't measure it, you can't do it. We believe that both the GNSO and the NomCom, when it is in its role of appointing GNSO counselors, should take steps to increase the diversity.

We should be trying for, you should be trying to manage this diversity. There needs to be... In order to meet the requirements of the core value, and of the Board working group recommendation, there needs to be a public membership for each constituency, and for the two contracted house stakeholder groups, which should also include diversity data.

That membership list should include statements of interest. And it should also include where those members represent clients. It should include a statement of the client's interest. It seems to us, or, and that's the right way of putting it, that we have policy being made in a supposedly transparent multistakeholder organization by people whose identity we don't know, and who are not clear about who they are representing and making that policy.

CHUCK GOMES: So is that because [inaudible]... complete [inaudible]/

COLIN JACKSON: Sometimes we don't even know who people are. There are no... Some of the constituencies don't publish a list.

CHUCK GOMES: So you're talking about within the transition phase or... [inaudible]...

COLIN JACKSON: Yes, yes.

J. SCOTT EVANTS: Are we taking into account that some people have a sensitivity with regards to privacy? They do. I mean, the WHOIS debate that has been going on for 20 years in this organization, and there are the same people who have those interests of, I think there should be some footnote about privacy here, because it's a big deal.

Some people don't want you to know that they're involved. Certain governments might take actions against them.

I mean, I believe everyone should [inaudible]. I'm just saying there is a real sensitivity in certain areas of the world about Internet, dealings on the Internet and privacy. So I'm just putting that out.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Especially in Europe. And it goes for Europe and the west, and there is very strong feedback of sending data.

MARIKA KONINGS: And again, there is a difference in publishing people's email address, where they live, and name affiliation, and if they are participating and representing someone [inaudible]... No, no, no. I think we need to find a balance you described and make sure that people don't use that to hide [inaudible]....

CHUCK GOMES: So this is Chuck again. So this recommendation, essentially, suggesting the SOI [inaudible]...

COLIN JACKSON: Yes. I would say stronger than suggesting, it is recommending that, yes.

DENISE MICHEL: [Inaudible] the topic. I would like to get some further thoughts to the competition of the working [inaudible] and provide some data on [inaudible] cultural diversity as [inaudible] from the update on the foundation on policy development. I think that's an important [inaudible]... discussion about [inaudible].

COLIN JACKSON: I will talk to people about getting [inaudible] on that. Okay.

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck again. One more comment on the membership recommendation. You probably want to mention [inaudible] that different than just membership, for example, membership in the registry stakeholder group is an organization not a [inaudible].

COLIN JACKSON: Okay. So that's a valuable point, thank you Chuck. We're recommending that all constituencies and the registry and registrar stakeholder groups receive staff support. That they should not have to go out and organize secretarial or staff themselves. We believe that that should be provided by ICANN and we'll, [inaudible].

Next slide please. Improving coordination. There were two Board working group recommendations in this area. We don't have a complete assessment of this yet, but what we do have is the council communications one has been implemented. We have no complaints or comments about council's communication.

Talking about the other Board working group recommendation will be quite detailed but it's really about the chairs in GNSO meeting with SOs and ACs and trying to get more dialogue going between those. So we've unpacked that a little. The 360 gave us some communication. There are some figures on this. We had 57% positive on communications, which is not all that high.

There is, of course, a longstanding problem with the GAC, which is recognized and people are trying to solve this. We understand about the consulting group on early engagement with the GAC. We think that's the right thing to do. We also think, and I know you're looking at this, how the GAC could appoint a non-voting liaison to each PDP group, even if it's on a non-binding basis.

I mean, we understand that a GAC member cannot commit to anything, that's typically how the way governments work. They can't even commit their own government, never mind the whole GAC. But at least, if you can have them involved in an early stage, you stand some chance of one somebody who sat in on a GAC meeting, or two saying, well actually that might cause some ripples if you go this way.

Have you thought of this? And that will be good to get that flagged up early.

CHUCK GOMES:

It's Chuck. [Inaudible] of where the complication with that one within the GAC.

COLIN JACKSON: We're not here to review the GAC, but I do understand...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...community working groups, so there is experience that could be parallel.

DENISE MICHEL: Part of the original idea of working groups [CROSSTALK]...

J. SCOTT EVANS: I think you'll meet some resistance from some members, but I think if we capitalize it as a positive, where it has worked, and show those as representative examples [inaudible]... break down the resistance and the barriers.

RAY PLZAK: There is considerable experience in the regional [inaudible] ...about government participation, in its non-governmental way, in all five of the regions. [Inaudible]... examples that were...

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you Ray. Could we move on to the next slide please? Right. We're getting to... This is the last substantive page I have here, before we go off into Board administrative matters. But we need a... What we have done so far is looked at what has, how to suit the GNSO for the environment that's been there for the last few years. There are, of course, large changes coming up in the GNSO's environment.

For instance, the obvious one is the gTLD expansion, that is a happening thing. What impact should that have on how the GNSO goes about its business? IDN to its replacement, and as I've mentioned, the shift in the center of gravity of the Internet away from North America/Europe, culturally similar places like my home country.

We have more work to come in this space. And we need to write some more in this area, and to some extent, focus some of the material which is in the proceeding sections that I talked through onto this as well. But for now, we have very much focused on the Board working group recommendations that have gone, and we extent to which they have been achieved.

But we want to move on into the things that you're facing right now and how that is effecting the environment. And you can expect to see more of that in the draft that is received.

Have we got another slide? Yes. This is the material... You're not expected to be able to read this.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

COLIN JACKSON: That is an example. There are many pages of this material that you will be equipped with, and I'm sure you all know it by heart by now. Seriously, this is the qualitative material out of the 360. And we will be providing that for your delectation. Next slide please.

Right. So we have time, we have half an hour of the meeting left. I think, what would you like to do? Do you want to talk through this some more?

[CROSSTALK]

J. SCOTT EVANS: Can I just say thank you for the good work and the nice presentation?
[Inaudible] I appreciate it very much.

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you Scott. And I'm sure Richard Westlake is on the line and he'll hear that as well. So and I also would like to acknowledge that ICANN staff have provided a lot of help with this, so thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have an additional question to the research I've been doing on cultural representation, this is by geography. Could you also give us your view on the representation by the community? Because that is also important to see which voice is in the council present, and which voice is not present.

COLIN JACKSON: Yeah, that should be quite easy to do, I think. We can probably... If it's not obvious on the website, we can just ask.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think it's good to make that in the report visible, that there is a recognition of having a lack of representation of certain constituencies in the council.

COLIN JACKSON: Yes, that's fine. I'll set that right away.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, I appreciate what you've done so far, [inaudible] having the retrospective [inaudible] exactly right, and that was indeed what we were charged to do.

COLIN JACKSON: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] is of course [inaudible]...

COLIN JACKSON: I understand that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...new players on the block, along with everybody else. How substantial do you think is the work that you're going to be doing between now and the draft report on that? Integrating some of these ideas into what goes on? Because whether I'm talking on behalf of one group, I think to the future of ICANN, the structures stick to the future is actually

important to all of this, regardless of who is in those and how the players are.

And it is not... Your original remit was mostly retrospective. I think all of us are feeling, and indeed we know the Board is feeling, that we want structure for the future. So we are looking to do that.

COLIN JACKSON:

Yes, I hear that. We are looking at some areas... One of the things I do want to raise that we have already come to a conclusion on, is that if we need to find a way to make it much easier for constituencies to report, [inaudible], that's not actually going to be you, but we can provide some recommendations, but there need to be some changes to the rules that governs the construction and probably destruction, of constituencies, because we are living in an evolving environment.

I mean, this is the Internet, we have changes every week. So there needs to be a way of reviewing constituencies and an easy way of creating constituencies, and people [inaudible] sort of overlap here and there. We like its method. It's more important that we actually get all of the volunteers.

And this, I think, will go some ways to responding to the changing environment, the GNSO finds itself in. This by no means the only recommendation that I can come up with in this area.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

One approach of that [inaudible] scenario plan, perhaps in the new constituency section, you could give scenarios, if necessary, have a

recommendation. You can imagine that [inaudible] could be integrated in this way. We can imagine that constituencies in this way because of the overlapping and new relationships that exist.

Just for the people to see your sort of high level recommendations, and then some concrete recommendations would actually make the whole thing a little bit more real. I think, that would be [inaudible].

COLIN JACKSON: I'll think about that, thank you.

J. SCOTT EVANS: I think it's an uncharted territory for ICANN to take that [inaudible] being recorded. And I think what we need to do is we need to chart that territory for ICANN and for the community, so that you can't hide in cracks, and say, "Oh, we didn't know." So this group feels like they can't...

But we need to give them a clear roadmap for how to do it, and we need to support that roadmap.

COLIN JACKSON: I agree with you, but I'll also say that it would be a braver person than I to attempt to predict the future of the Internet over the next couple of years.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...current Internet.

COLIN JACKSON: That would help.

CHUCK GOMES: This is Chuck speaking again. I'm going to start off with a question because the question leads to probably another question, but the goal, I don't think, needs to be more constituencies. What is it we're trying to achieve by getting more constituents? And I'll stop there and then I'll go to my second part.

What is the goal we're trying to achieve when we say we want more constituents? [Inaudible]

COLIN JACKSON: We want to make it easier for people to be involved. We don't want people to get discouraged and tend to run away from the organization.

CHUCK GOMES: I get that, but the assumption then in that is that the best way to do that is through constituencies. I'm not sure that's always true.

COLIN JACKSON: I would comment that structural options are off the table for now. So we are working within the scope we have [inaudible]...

CHUCK GOMES: [Inaudible] structure, okay.

JEN WOLFE: Do you have another comment?

CHUCK GOMES: No, that I covered it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] registrar [inaudible]... Just one comment. You mentioned that the contracted parties do not publish their membership lists, actually the registrars do on their website, publish the list of members, and they want [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

COLIN JACKSON: I actually said that [inaudible], but they've asked [inaudible]... That is a fact. I don't propose by speaking to which ones they are.

ROB HOGGARTH: Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff. You did a really good job, I think, in terms of your research, going back and looking at the previous review period. Can you give us a sense in terms of relative scale and impact, as you begin to think about your recommendations, and you compare the amount of work that took place in the previous review implementing that?

What type of work is going to be generated by the recommendations that you are making?

COLIN JACKSON:

My initial feeling, I have to say this, it's very usual caveat obviously in drafting working [inaudible]... I don't see this as being such a big change, such a sweeping change the GNSO went through getting them to the structure it has now.

I don't see this as being so much, I see this as being almost administrative stuff, it's about tighter management, it's about prioritizing, it's about publishing information that is not being published. It's about freeing up some processes. It's not about a major, major sweeping changes the way things happen. It's about doing things you do do, but doing them better and faster.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

[Inaudible]... One question that I had was that, when you say the more constituencies should be easier to form, do you see any groups that [inaudible] in the current structure that do not have direct representation, or would not fit in any of the existing constituencies, and more or less on the topic, from what I see is that there is more and more overlap between the various constituencies as, for example, [inaudible] BC members become registry operators, and [inaudible], or registries become registrars as well.

So the [inaudible] with the groups are blending...

COLIN JACKSON: Yeah, life is messy [inaudible]... We're never going to solve the problems of the world for all time. [Inaudible]... that should exist? That is not for me to judge. But I do note that there are [inaudible] where people [inaudible] to have a constituency, they do eventually.

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck again. So, [inaudible], were you able to determine whether the people that wanted to form that, were prevented from participating in existing structures?

COLIN JACKSON: I didn't actually conduct the interviews with those two people personally, so I can't give you a direct answer, but what I can tell you is that they both went through what they regarded as a somewhat brutal process, and became quite discouraged through that. And this is not a good way to treat a potential volunteer who might get some really useful work done for you.

J. SCOTT EVANS: This is J. Scott for the record. I can say that I have people personally call me and describe what they've gone through, because I'm considered a veteran, and it aligns very closely to what they're telling me. So I'm not shocked, it's confirmed. I'm kind of glad to see that somebody now has sort of done a objective review and getting the same things that I was getting, from an subjective point of view.

And I validated and I think that needs to be acted upon.

COLIN JACKSON: Well, we would agree with that, yes.

JEN WOLFE: Richard has a comment. Richard?

RICHARD WESTLAKE: Hello Jen. Yes, thank you. Can you hear me?

COLIN JACKSON: Yes.

RICHARD WESTLAKE: Great. Look, if I could just respond to Chuck's comment there, I've been on the respected interviews we conducted about that. And really the essence of our conclusions, and we still need to test it with some more fact finding, is that the difficulties in creating a new constituency, were less with the formal process, which is will be clearly stated and set out, but more the opportunity that was either taken or allowed for some individuals either to bypass the process in order to delay, frustrate, or derail the process of application for a new constituency.

Now, I know those are fairly strong words, but they were, they came across very strongly in the people who spoke to us. And we did probe reasonably extensively and we've got quite a lot of, let me say, factual, well not factual, but certainly quite a lot of anecdotal data, and we do need to crosscheck some of it, which is why we haven't been detailed

about it in our report so far, but we are certainly proposing to work this one more significantly, and quite probably create a stronger set of recommendations than you see currently. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks Richard.

COLIN JACKSON: I have another comment that I would like to make that hasn't come out in the presentation, but I want to go back to the cultural diversity point that we made, that I made earlier, about the fact that essentially the North American/European are very similar culturally people, who are involved in this. In some Asian cultures, the kind of thing that we would regard as robust debate is simply unacceptable to not disagree with people in public like this, you actually do it in quite a different way.

This, my understanding is that people from those cultures would find this very difficult [inaudible] debate in the GNSO can be quite strong, and that's, you know, we're used to that. That's the kind of thing we do. I can see [inaudible]. But yes, this is, in my view, again, it's an issue that needs to be solved if we are to do something about the cultural diversity. I'll just leave that there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think we should leave it with Asia or something. I sometimes feel [inaudible] and I think we should not just say this is a [inaudible], even inside the robust cultures, I think [inaudible].

COLIN JACKSON: Do you use the word [bullied]? Thank you for that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: An observation actually. It's interesting looking at the group, of the brand registry group, where it started in [inaudible] where ICANN is, and we judge geographical area by head of this, and most of our members are multinational, so they are and we say we are a diverse organization, just based on the head office and where the [inaudible] really came from. We started off, we're much more North American/European.

Today, we're about a third including a specific. [Inaudible] has often been facilitated by agents, not directly with the members. So their agents have encouraged, [inaudible] to go into the process in the first place [inaudible]... have been middle men, it's a bit of a persuasion, is a good idea to join. And indeed, they continue to represent them within an organization, so allow that.

And that has been very helpful because these agents then have the understanding, and can handle, if you like, the discussions based in these sort of forum. And solve that cultural issue there. I think it has happened that we would see, continue certain within our organization. But it does address the issue that you were saying, in terms of expectations of certain cultures in debate and other things like that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, thank you for that.

J. SCOTT EVANS:

This is J. Scott again. I'm pretty vocal, I'm pretty confident, that I've been treated certain ways [inaudible], what I'm most concerned of is people who are sitting in the audience to see that behavior. And culturally, they would... I mean, I had been treated so poorly one time, that a man from Sweden said, culturally it was so offensive to him, the way I was treated, culturally, they just don't treat other human beings like that.

And I was just not really conscious of it, I guess, because [I'm] American, that it has that kind of an effect on people. So I think, yeah, it's a disincentive to stand up in front of a microphone and be treated that way. [Inaudible] Rhonda [Seal], came to the 2009 meeting in Sydney and was going to stand up, and the room was so hostile, she was afraid she would lose her job at Mars, which is a very private company, if she stood up and said anything in such a hostile environment with the press that was there.

I think it's not just that. I think the rules of engagement on how we treat each other, because that effects people are watching, and they don't want to participate. They're discouraged from joining by that, and I think that point needs to be brought out, because that's really important. Because newcomers are going to come in and they're going to watch for a while, and they're not going to participate if it's culturally insensitive to them, even if it's not directed at them.

COLIN JACKSON: Yes, I think that's a really good point. Thank you Scott. I think earlier, from personal observations, it's a bit of a race to the bottom going on, and if you can achieve your objective by being, frankly, pretty nasty to people, then that's what happens in some cases. And that does appear to be a particular issue in some parts of the organization.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Actually ICANN does have a certain standard of behavior that is... Stated as something that we have to follow, however, it is not enforced that's the issue there. [Inaudible].

J. SCOTT EVANS: And as stakeholders, it's our job to enforce, it's not ICANN's job, it's our job to self-police. And it's ICANN's job then to back us up [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] no sanctions [inaudible] as well.

RAY PLZAK: Ray Plzak. You are hitting the nail on the head, which is the leadership has got to exert leadership. Whoever is chairing the meeting has got to control the meeting from that perspective.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Absolutely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

RAY PLZAK: And whoever is chairing the meeting has also got to make sure you stay on track, and stay on agenda, and won't allow these side diversions to occur. So I'll say this again, it's not just the chairs, there are leaders every place. Those people that go to the microphones all of the time are actually leaders. And so, there is where the discipline needs to be, and so you know, if you're developing consensus, you also have to go through a process of self-correction.

And so, those are kinds of things that have to be... And you do have a set of rules, sometimes it can be very well worthwhile to have those things put into a smaller bullet-type [inaudible] list, or maybe [inaudible] or something like that. And before a major meeting starts or something, just go over them real quickly.

Just a gentle, friendly reminders. And work it through that way. So if you instill the discipline from the start from, it's easier to make the course corrections as the meeting progresses.

COLIN JACKSON: I can say, just as an anecdote, outside of ICANN, I was at [inaudible] kind of equivalent of black hat running down in the southern hemisphere, and one of the speakers, to illustrate a point, made a remark which was very offensive to a minority, and they were rejected from the conference for that. That was quite fair of the organizers [inaudible].

JEN WOLFE: We have about 10 minutes left. So I don't want to stop conversation if we need provide any other feedback, so I want to make sure we discuss our next steps. Ray, did you want to say anything on behalf of the SIC?

RAY PLZAK: Actually, there were a number of comments that I could have made along the way, but [inaudible] as has been my intent to this whole thing was for the Board to step back and let the community do it, because it's your review. It's not the Board's review. I mean, the bylaws mandate it occur, and mandates that the Board [inaudible] in motion... but what we've attempted to do this time is to get the Board out of it and get us into an oversight role, let you do all of the work, let you divide all of the recommendations, let's you figure out where you want to go.

And then work out an implementation plan, work out resources, we get it budgeted properly, and so forth. And we get it done in an organized fashion. So, from the perspective of what's occurred so far, you can say that we are quite pleased with the effort that has gone through. And that will make the role of independent examiner, more so the role of this group right here.

We are what is making this review work.

JEN WOLFE: So in terms of our next steps, just to confirm, an email will be distributed, probably later today, maybe tomorrow, depending on when you finish your working text, to this group, and will also be posted on

the wiki. So we will all have the opportunity to go in-depth in the information [inaudible].

We will have all of the data points attached to that, is that correct?

COLIN JACKSON: You will have the, I put a slide up with showing you...

JEN WOLFE: That was just the survey. We will also have interviews? What additional [inaudible] we have? [CROSSTALK]

COLIN JACKSON: We will not publish the interviews because they are confidential.

JEN WOLFE: Okay. But the qualitative comments that people made, particularly on that sort of ending question of [inaudible]...

COLIN JACKSON: We will not show you all of those. We had taken some of those out and put them into the text, and [inaudible] them. In many cases, the relevancy is who made them, and we don't wish to make them clear who made them because that would be violating their [CROSSTALK]...

JEN WOLFE: That's absolutely fair. If we do have questions about data sets, or some other quantitative information, I think we can follow up...

COLIN JACKSON: You can follow up.

JEN WOLFE: ...question? We're also going to be positing on the Wiki a space for comment. So between now and our March 3rd meeting, we can certainly email... My concern is if we start getting crazy threads [inaudible]... manage and to keep track of it. So I would encourage you to use the Wiki, go post on it and [inaudible]... convenience and comment, and at our meeting on March 3rd, the goal will be for us to really continue this and to have a more robust conversation, really looking at what we would like to see, and look like going forward, and being able to aggregate our comments to give to Colin before this becomes the actual draft report.

COLIN JACKSON: Yes.

JEN WOLFE: So I would ask you all... I mean, we'll certainly put out a note on an email, and I know you're really tired after this meeting, but following up next week and actually come back, take a look at this, spend some time so that our call on the 3rd is, we're all prepared, we've heard it all, we have done our homework and we're ready to go. Comments or

questions about our schedule? Thank you Colin, I think that was really helpful to get this type of a briefing before [inaudible] context for us so thank you very much.

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you very much.

JEN WOLFE: Okay. Avri?

AVRI DROIA: I just wanted to apologize for coming late because I was in the accountability, and there were conflicting obligations [inaudible]... so I may ask you questions about things I didn't hear after...

COLIN JACKSON: Feel free. Drop me some email or grab me in the hallway.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm also happy to be in a meeting and not to hear accountability.
[LAUGHTER]

AVRI DORIA: I ruined it for you. I'm so sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I did say multistakeholder a couple of times.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]