GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday, 03 March 2015 at 2000 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-review-03mar15-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
Ron Andruff
David Maher
Edward Morris
Jennifer Standiford
Klaus Stoll
Amr Elsadr
Robin Gross
Rafik Dammak
James Gannon
Philip Sheppard
Bill Drake
Stephanie Perrin
Mike Rodenbaugh
Rudi Vansnick
Tapani Tarvainen
Sam Lanfranco
Matthieu Camus
Walid Al-Saqaf
Ken Stubbs
Laura Covington

Guest speaker: Richard Westlake

Apologies:
Chuck Gomes
Osvaldo Novoa

ICANN Staff:
Mary Wong

Marika Konings
Larisa Gurnick
Charla Shambley
Lars Hoffman
Glen de St Gery
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO Review Working Party Call on the 3rd of March, 2015.

On the call today we have Edward Morris, Jennifer Standiford, Klaus Stoll, Jennifer Wolfe, David Maher, Amr Elsadr, Robin Gross, Rafik Dammak, James Gannon, Philip Sheppard, Bill Drake, Stephanie Perrin, Mike Rodenbaugh, and Richard Westlake.

I show apologies from Chuck Gomes.

From staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Charla Shambley, Mary Wong, and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and back over to you Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks very much. Thanks to everybody for taking time today to join the call to provide feedback to the Westlake team on the working text of the report that will ultimately be issued on the review of the GNSO.

I just wanted to note that I think on the record, and I wanted to make sure I have this correct, we've received four written comments, one from Bill Drake, one from Stephanie Perrin, one from Philip Sheppard, and Chuck has sent

around a partial document with comments. Did anybody send anything that we might have missed? I just want to make sure we've provided everything to Westlake and that we've captured everything that's been circulated.

And just so everyone knows, following the call, if you'd like to provide your written comments or redline, of course we welcome that and it will be aggregated and provided to Westlake.

As you can see with what's on screen, before we get started, this is of course our meeting on March 3. Our next step will be to deliver all of the consolidated comments that arise out of this group to Westlake by March 20, so we still have a couple of weeks to incorporate any other comments if, after the call today, you find that you'd like to make more comments. So that's what our timeframe looks like right now.

What I'd like to try to do is to maximize the use of our 90-minute time today. We do have Richard Westlake on the phone, so he can answer questions, you know, initially respond to any concerns. We have mapped this out to essentially go through section by section of the document today.

I had circulated in an email I think our comments probably fall into, you know, three, maybe four big buckets. One is if you think there are things that are factually inaccurate, that of course is very important to provide to the Westlake team. I know there have been some concerns about quotes or things that may be taken out of context, so we want to make sure they have that information.

There have been some concerns about the conclusions, which we can make sure they're aware. And then I've noted there's also been some questions about the methodology. So those can also be raised today.

So unless anybody has an opposition, we could essentially just start working through the sections. Does anybody have any opening comments they would

like to make or questions they would like to raise to Westlake before we start down that path?

And I see Mary has a question. Mary, do you want to speak to that before we move on?

Mary Wong: Hi, Jen. Hi, everybody. This is Mary Wong. Just to note that because we do have several participants on the call who are not working party members and some have indicated their affiliations, I was wondering if it would be appropriate for those who have not done so to indicate as such.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Is there any concern or objection to that? Okay. Okay great. Then if I don't see any other comments, why don't we go ahead and move on. Richard, I'll just open it up to you. Did you have anything you'd like to state before we move on?

Richard Westlake: No, Jen, thank you very much indeed. I'm looking forward to it. I'm here for the full meeting, so I'm clear to half past the next hour.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great. Thank you. Why don't we go ahead and move right on into Section 5? Hopefully everyone has the working text in front of them. If you don't, please let us know and we'll make sure that gets circulated.

We'll go ahead and move onto Section 5. Are there comments about factual inaccuracies that you would like to raise with regard to Section 5? Okay I'm not seeing anything. How about anything about quotes that were used or conclusions that had been reached in Section 5?

Bill, please go ahead. Are you there? Can you hear?

Bill Drake: Yes, I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes we can hear you now.

Bill Drake: Okay. I'm sorry. We are having a little bit of last minute chaos because there was a NCUC response that I sent you several hours ago and I thought that I sent to the list, but it turned out that the e-mail address that I sent it from is not the one that ICANN subscribed me to, which I didn't know. So it didn't go through to the list.

I don't know if NCUC's comments have now been sent and received. I think Glen just sent them to the list. Does anybody see those?

Jennifer Wolfe: I know I have the complete document that you sent.

Bill Drake: Right, because I sent it to you and copied the list three hours ago.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. So I did receive that. It did not go to the list is the issue.

Bill Drake: Apparently not.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, okay.

Bill Drake: Okay, Mary's saying they have been sent to the list but I doubt that anybody has read them yet.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well if you want to chime in those comments, you're certainly - if you want to as...

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Bill Drake: I hear somebody talking in the background. I don't know who was speaking or what that was.

NCUC sent an extended reply that required a number of people coordinating, so unfortunately it couldn't get done earlier. So I apologize to the other

members of the working group for sending a reply right before the meeting. At the same time, the document that we received Wednesday afternoon in Singapore we hadn't had a chance to see either, so it's sort of I guess in the same general category.

I think we raised a number of concerns about the use of quotations, the methodology and a number of other issues. And I could talk through all of those if people want me to do that, but it's a ten-page letter. So I'm not quite sure how to proceed.

Jennifer Wolfe: I saw that, Bill. And I think what we want to try to do so that we can keep all of the comments organized is to actually go through the working text section by section. If you want to provide maybe some - an overarching statement about the methodology, because I noted that was a big part of it, and then as we go through the sections, if you wanted to come in at that point and raise them as we go through each section, would that work for you?

Bill Drake: Yes I suppose so.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Did you want to raise some questions about the methodology at the outset before we get into each section?

Bill Drake: Well, you know, there were, again, I didn't write the parts - I didn't draft this letter, so - but concerns were raised about a range of issues concerning the use of the statistical approach and so on, which I guess I really think people need to read that in order to get their heads around it. But people were concerned about the size of the sampling and how reflective it is of population sampled and so on. So there's a whole - there's a set of issues around that, which I think would require a little bit more digging into.

Then you'd asked about the questions of accuracy, and yes there was an extended set of replies to the use of various quotes that were put into the draft report, which we were rather surprised by in their selective character

and very negative tone about one part of the GNSO community, which struck us as rather astonishing because they, generally speaking, were completely false comments and provably false if one were to actually look on the Internet and get information.

So that raised some concerns in our view, and we outlined those at length. Now again, I don't want to deter the whole discussion with a discussion of NCUC's concerns about the report that are not generalizable to the larger contours of the report necessarily. We intend to write more substantive detailed comments later on about other aspects of the report, but we did want to respond to the characterization of NCUC now, and so that's what that set of comments do.

So again, it's up to you, Jen, how you want to proceed. I don't want to totally distract the broader conversation with this one issue, but I would like people to take a look at that. And again, I am sorry that the comments did not get through, but they didn't bounce back undeliverable from the address I sent them from, which is I've been told is I subscribed by but apparently I was no, so.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well, no, first of all thank you. Thank you for the comments and thank you for the detailed response. I know maybe everyone hasn't had a chance to read through all of the comments completely, but that's okay for this purpose. I mean these will obviously all be included in the aggregate comments that we as a collective group provide to Westlake, so.

And again, I encourage any of you if you want to provide supplemental written comments, everything that we have as a group will be delivered to Westlake. I think today what we want to try is to go through, like I said, to try to get through the different sections and add any additional comments and ensure everyone's voice is heard. If you haven't had a chance to provide something in writing or won't have time to that we make sure we capture that in the call today.

But certainly if you want to enhance anything that you've provided in writing, Bill, throughout the call today, please do so. I see Philip's hand is up and then I do want to just make sure that if there's anything else on the methodology that we get that in and then move into the section. So, Philip, please go ahead.

Philip, are you there? I see your hand is up. Okay we're not hearing you, Philip, if you're speaking. So I'm not sure if he's having a problem.

Bill, was there anything else that you wanted to finish up on...

Philip Sheppard: Can you hear me now?

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh now we can, yes Philip. Thanks. Please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Okay sorry. I usually leave on my microphone and apologies for not doing that earlier. Thank you Jen for that.

I thought Section 5 was quite interesting in the results they gave in which there was quite a strong support in terms of the effectiveness of the working group model. And I just wondered if Westlake had some comment as to what they meant about effectiveness?

Because what I read in Section 5 was that the working group model had been successful in its attempt to be universal in outreach. It was successful in being a good methodology related to a multi-stakeholder model. But what I didn't see analyzed as to effectiveness was any comment on the ability to deliver policy results in a timely fashion, and I wondered if Westlake had received comments on that or if we'll see those things at a later stage.

Jennifer Wolfe: Richard, can you respond to that?

Richard Westlake: Thank you, Jen. Yes I'm happy to do that. Thank you, Philip. Look, we did make some comments about that and we received quite a lot of input on the timeliness. And there was quite a range between those who felt that policy development through the working groups was unduly drawn out and lengthy and those - some people, probably a similar number I would say overall, who felt that that was part of the nature firstly of the consultative iterative process that ICANN adopts and, secondly, of necessity through the use of volunteers that if one tried to accelerate the process too much further, you would start to limit the number of people who could participate simply because of the availability of their time.

And as you'll see under our comments on the working group model, there is one of the key caveats about the effectiveness of it was that there are still only relatively few volunteers who do most of the work. And I think we have a table in there, in the draft, the working - sorry, the working text that you have the moment, showing the number of people who drop off after doing only - sitting on only one working group.

So there's a huge attrition rate, and I think one of them comments we've had that people found that the burden of it was actually quite intensive. And so to try and accelerate as well would only limit that further. And we've already commented on some of the demographic aspects of participation as well.

We certainly have commented on it. I'm sorry if it's not clear enough at the moment, Philip. Thank you.

Philip Sheppard: That's okay. Maybe my recollection of reading it all is not as good as it should be.

Did you feel that there's any correlation between attrition and achievability of a group?

Richard Westlake: Very good question, Philip. To be quite honest, no we didn't, because it's very difficult I think sitting where we were to assess the effectiveness of each individual working group, which is why did rely, to quite a degree, both on the 360 responses and on the results of our interviews. And that led to a lot of our conclusions.

Going back to the question about the methodology that we had earlier on, could I say if people have concerns about statistical size, I'd suggest a lot of them take a look at a mirror, because we sought input as often as we possibly could. We tried to get participation, and there were some people, even some people sitting on this call, who simply did not complete either of the two 360s, and to now complain that there aren't sufficient responses I think is marginally defensive.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you, Richard.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Richard. Stephanie, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes and in my defense to the last remark, I certainly would have filled out the second one had I known. Somehow I missed it. I think you have to understand that we're very busy and there's a lot going on.

And that leads to the remark that I was going to make. I made a number of comments about this problem of stakeholder burnout and participation in the PDPs. And I think certainly as far as Section 5, yes the PDPs are...

Jennifer Wolfe: Stephanie, I'm having a hard time hearing you. I don't know if anybody else is. Can you get closer to the phone maybe?

Stephanie Perrin: Can you hear me now?

Jennifer Wolfe: It's a little bit better. It sounds a little echo-y. It's just hard to hear you.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay well I will...

Jennifer Wolfe: That's better. That's better.

Stephanie Perrin: Is that better?

Jennifer Wolfe: That's better, yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay.

Jennifer Wolfe: Please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: What I was going to say in terms of burnout is this seems to me where most
                    of the work that's done at ICANN and it's a major problem that the same
                    people are signing up for working groups. I recall Mikey O'Connor reading the
                    stats out that came in the ATRT and then of course promptly leaving,
                    somewhat burned out, about two meetings later.

                    If some of the key players were to leave, our working groups would be
                    decimated. And so I would think that we need a lot more work on how to
                    resolve this problem. That's basically all I wanted to say. I think that we can
                    talk about recruiting new people, but the knowledge threshold that they need
                    to feel that they are making a useful contribution on working groups is too
                    high. It is putting off some of our new recruits. I think that's an issue. Thank
                    you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Stephanie. Bill, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Bill Drake: Yes I just wanted to quickly reply to Richard's point about some people
                    complaining about sample size if they didn't do the 360. I think that at the
                    time that the 360 was sent around, a lot of people were very busy with other
                    things. And the expectation that a lot of people had, certainly people I knew,
                    was that what the report was going to be doing was going to be focusing on

the GNSO PDP process, the working groups, things like that, not necessarily getting into having commentaries about individual constituencies or stakeholder groups, et cetera.

So I think people didn't necessarily feel that it was terribly pressing that they do that. Now I recognize that that's unfortunate and that I wish more people had responded to it. But at the same time, I don't think it's sort of hypocritical to raise questions about the larger implications of generalizing from the sample sizes and yet at the same time not to have mobilized all your members that participated.

I think, you know, I think there were a lot of reasons why people didn't - they didn't understand really, particularly the ones who are like not active in working groups and things like that or have not been on the GNSO council, I think a lot of people just didn't feel that motivated. We sent around a notice about it to let people know that it was happening and that they should do it, but you can't compel members to do it, so. But that doesn't necessarily invalidate the concerns, in my view. So anyway, that's that. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Bill. I appreciate that. I know we struggled and worked hard as the working party to try to make it accessible as possible to create various versions that were shorter versus longer, and it's always a struggle I think. And any time we're trying to generate support and for people to spend time doing things, but hopefully we've at least gotten a - I think we've gotten a strong number of responses based upon the effort that was put into this, and clearly sufficient to base their methodology on those responses. And certainly, Richard, if you want to respond any further on that point.

Richard Westlake:Jen, thank you for that. Look, I don't think there's a lot of point in pursuing it. It is what it is. We have the results we have. We the interview results we have. And in fact as far as the original terms of reference went, we have stuck not just - we've gone - we've been working to the terms of reference for anybody who cared to read what the purpose of the review was and the methodology,

but we've gone extensively further because the terms of reference referred to limited interviews if necessary.

We certainly thought some were, and we've now completed -- if I remember rightly -- somewhere around 40 interviews. So we have certainly gone and I think we've taken a huge effort to make huge efforts, put in huge resource to try and get as broad and as I would say as broad and generally representative set of comments and input as we could.

Now some of those comments perhaps are not to everybody's taste, but they are the comments we have received. And where we've included them, we thought we included them because we felt, A, they were relevant, and, B, they weren't exceptional in the ones that were made to us. Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And just to that point on the comments. This is certainly for anybody, you know, on the working party. If you think that there are comments that are inaccurate or you have concerns, please do, you know, put them on the list so that we can make sure Westlake has a record of those concerns. We want to make sure that certainly all of the voices are heard on that issue.

I want to try to keep us moving forward. I've got us at almost 25 past the hour, and we have a lot to get through. So on Section 5, which is the adopt a working group model, and I see Stephanie, I think that's old hand. Is that a new hand that you have up? No? Okay thank you.

Any other comments on the Section 5, which is adopt a working group model? Anything you want to raise in terms of factual inaccuracies, concerns about quotes, anything related to conclusions or recommendations that are provided, or just a question that you want to raise to Richard while we have him on the phone? Anything on else on Section 5?

Okay I'm not seeing anything, so we'll go ahead and move onto Section 6, which is revise the policy development process. Any comments or questions? Again, we're generally looking at factual inaccuracies that you want to bring to Westlake's attention, comments that you think may be out of context or might not be appropriate, or anything about conclusions reached in Section 6.

No hands. I'm trying to make sure nobody's putting anything in the chat. If there is anything, please raise your hand. Even if you're an observer, if you'd like to say something, please don't hesitate. I want to make sure we get everything heard.

Mike, please, go ahead.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Hey, Jen. Yes, I did - we had a question come up from one of our members asking what is the interplay between this review and what the SCI, the Standing Committee on Improvements, is doing?

Jennifer Wolfe: What is the interplay? I'm not sure I totally understand that question.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well apparently there's this SCI group, and maybe this is a better question for staff to answer and obviously it doesn't have to be answered on this call, but I do want to get an answer back. Because she is our IPC rep on this SCI group, which is basically tasked, as I understand it, with suggesting changes to the PDP, suggesting (unintelligible)

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh so with regard to this section? Okay. I understand. If I can frame it correctly, you're saying on this Section 6 to revise the PDP process, how does that work with the work that the SCI is doing? Is that your question? Is that correct?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. And I see (Ron)'s hand is up, and I know he has been the chair of the SCI. So, (Ron), I'm going to let you jump in if you'd like to address that.

(Ron):   Yes thank you. Exactly, Jen, I wanted to respond to Mike. The Standing Committee on Implementation Improvements basically takes up issues that are referred to predominantly by the GNSO Council and effectively where policy has been developed and it's a bit of a square peg trying to fit into a round hole. At that point, the SCI would take it up and try to give it some deep consideration as to how we might resolve that issue and get it back to council to then put into implementation.

So in this particular case, this study does not have any impact on SCI activities at all at this stage of the game. I hope that answers your question, Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks, (Ron).

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And does anybody else have another comment or question on that point? Thank you for raising that.

Any other comments about Section 6 of the working text? And Mike and (Ron) I think your hands are down now, but they're still up. Richard, do you want to add something?

Richard Westlake:Jen, yes thank you. I'm just watching the chat coming through, and there's one comment, "Where to begin with all the inaccuracies." We would be very keen to have the written comment on what all the inaccuracies are or are perceived to be because then we can address it. But a comment like that is very hard to know what the concerns are. So thank you. We look forward to receiving the input.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Richard. And yes, absolutely. For anyone on the call, if there are inaccuracies that you see, we definitely want to have those documented so

we can provide that to Westlake and try to avoid inaccuracies coming out in the report, so absolutely.

For now, any other comments on Section 6?

Man: One other...

Jennifer Wolfe: Is that Richard? Let me try to go in order with who's got their hand up. (Ron), you still have your hand up. (Ron)? No. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes thank you. I just wanted to raise an issue that I think might help here. I certainly understand Westlake's concern that some of us haven't read the terms of reference. I have read the terms of reference. I believe we actually had a discussion in London about the limitations of the terms of reference given the scope of the review that it required.

And I think some of my concerns are not just about the original 360 assessment, which I did take, but about the kinds of comments that were elicited in the interviews, which lead us outside the terms of reference. I mean, I understand Westlake's position that they've bitten off a lot here and done a lot of extra work, but perhaps the terms of reference need to be enlarged and we need to go back and do this -- I hate to use the word properly -- but if you're going to raise issues that are outside the term of reference, then you have to address them in a statistically reliable way.

So I think we're going to be stuck with the kind of feedback that you're hearing and reacting to if we don't either scope a whole lot of things outside the terms of reference (unintelligible) or broaden them and deal with them in a more methodological way. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Stephanie, could you just - when you're saying terms of reference, could you just clarify what you mean by that, please?

Stephanie Perrin: I mean the terms of the contract. I believe Richard said a minute ago that...

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, okay. All right, that's what you're - okay I'm sorry. I just wanted to make sure we understood.

Stephanie Perrin: If you're going to do a few interviews and you're going to quote extensively from those so that they make up basically what appears to be, and we won't know until we see the next draft, the gist of the report. And that interview sample tends to be more rigorous (unintelligible). And I'm afraid (unintelligible). Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Stephanie. Mike, is that a new hand up I see?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, Jen. Just following up on the earlier question about the SCI, we had a similar question about the PDP that's ongoing, the Policy and Implementation PDP, and feel like there should be some mention in this section as to the interrelationship between this review and that PDP, if any.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay that's great. Thank you. So you're suggesting that Westlake consider cross-referencing that PDP that's ongoing that could overlap some of the recommendations here? Is that correct?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great. Thank you for that comment. Very helpful. Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa Gurnick. Thank you, Jen. I just wanted to provide a clarification to one of the comments in the chat regarding interviews that staff - that there were comments that staff discouraged interviews. So I just wanted to correct that.

It is not accurate. Staff did not discourage interviews. Just the opposite. Staff worked with Westlake and the members of the GNSO Review Party to make

sure that people would respond to interview requests. The original methodology that was presented by the Structural Improvements Committee of the board, who oversee this entire review process, called for limited interviews and a much more heavy reliance on the quantitative methods of collecting information, which would be through the 360 survey and desk review of documents.

So we had a limit from the get go based on the methodology that the Westlake team agreed to. That had a constraint on the number of interviews. And when Richard talked about the fact that interviews extended to 40, that was a considerable increase from the original number that was contemplated, once again based on the guidance from the Structural Improvements Committee. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. So in the interest of trying to keep us on time, I'm going to go ahead and move onto Section 7 of the report, the restructure of the GNSO council. Any comments to provide on factual inaccuracies, again, quotes that you have concerns about or conclusions reached? Yes, Philip, please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you very much. Just a couple of comments here. One, Richard, you might have noticed in the comments I submitted in writing a couple of days ago in terms of scope, which relates very much to structure and the subject of this section, I have suggested inclusion of that original September 2013 board resolution. I wanted to know that you were happy about so including, because I think gives a very helpful overview as to what is generally expected here.

And the second question here is I note that in your conclusions you're saying you're still thinking about this, and I just wanted to know what your timing was in terms of being able to complete this section.

Jennifer Wolfe: Richard, would you like to respond to that? Yes, please. Thank you.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. Two things. Firstly, Philip, thank you. We have received your pretty comprehensive set of comments, thank you. I have to say we have not had a chance to review them in any depth at this stage, so I can't say either way whether it will actually appear in the report, in our final report or our draft report.

As far as timing goes, we're scheduled to deliver a complete working text by it's about Tuesday of next week, as far as I recall. So we will have the next working text then where we will have drawn some conclusions, and we will have made those comments. And as you know, about a month later, we're scheduled to produce the full draft report to go to public comment. Thank you, Jen.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you very much, Richard. My earlier comment was merely asking you to include ICANN board statements verbatim. So I hope that's not going to be a problem.

Richard Westlake: Thanks, Philip. Let me go to it and we will certainly take that on notice. And I'd probably have no problem with it, but of course one's editing the whole time. Thank you.

Philip Sheppard: Of course. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Richard. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you. There was a comment that I didn't make in my comments with respect to the absence of a strategic plan for the GNSO. And excuse me a question, I am new. I am wondering if the strategic plan for the GNSO, if one exists, I think it's a good idea, rather simply reacting to what is going on. But it needs to be somewhat separate, given its policy and more or less oversight function. It needs to be separate from the ICANN strategic plan, in my view. And I didn't make that point in my comment, so I'd like to make it now.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Stephanie. Do we have other comments? Larisa, did I see your hand was up? Did you need to speak?

Larisa Gurnick: No, I lowered my hand. Thank you so much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, just wanted to make sure I didn't miss it. Okay. Any other comments on Section 7, the GNSO Council portion of the working text? Any factual inaccuracies, quotes, comments of concern that you want to raise or questions you want to raise to the Westlake team?

And I note the question going on in the chat -- and I'm sorry, I'm trying to keep track as well about how the interviews were determined -- Richard, is that something you want to address, or Larisa, would you like to address that question? Because that seems to be an ongoing question here.

Richard Westlake: Jen, we certainly went through the - first of all what we tried to do was to get greater depth of understanding around some of the results of the quantitative 360 and the qualitative remarks that came with that. We also then made some fairly extensive efforts early on in the piece before the Los Angeles ICANN meeting to get as broad a range of interviews arranged as possible.

And despite what I would have to say were some fairly extensive efforts, which I think a number of people are aware of, we were simply unable to get responses from some people, and from some people it was very difficult indeed to arrange a time. We had a very intensive period of about 20-something interviews during about four days at Los Angeles in addition to observing several constituency stakeholder groups and other meetings.

And then what we also did was then reach out after Singapore -- sorry, after Los Angeles -- for further interviews for people we'd been trying unsuccessfully to reach. And then when we thought we had a reasonably good range, we then had a final round of people who either decided three

months later to respond to our request for an interview or found that they hadn't been interviewed and felt they should be, some of whom we had in fact attempted to contact earlier on.

So we in fact ended up doing - we have been completing interviews right into this year, to the point that it has grown 40. At this stage, I can't say the breadth and representative nature overall in a quantitative sense, but I can say that we worked very hard to try and make it representative from the start. And there were several areas where we would have liked to try and get more input from particular groups or constituencies but simply received no responses, or one way or an interview became impossible.

And so we have qualified any recommendations. We haven't drawn conclusions based on what we believe is maybe one or two comments or one or two pieces of evidence, we have only been firm where we have been - well let me say, the strength of our recommendations has been proportional to the depth, quality and, in our professional judgment, the reliability of the information and evidence we have been able to receive through the range of research, which has been, as I say, the interviews, the 360, the working group 360, and also extensive review of documentation and observation of some meetings.

And the purpose of this feedback round at the moment for the next few weeks is in fact to highlight any specific factual inaccuracies or for people to feedback to us where they do believe we have been wrong, and we would very much appreciate the comments on what they believe is wrong, why they believe it's wrong and what they believe we should or rather the correct evidence is so that we can cross-check and that we can then correct any inaccuracies. Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Richard. Larisa, I see your hand has been up.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks, Jen. Richard actually just made the statement that I was hoping to make as well, so I will just use my one minute here to reiterate how important it is to please provide your feedback, clarification of factual inaccuracies to Westlake through the list and through all the different means that have to do that, so.

The purpose of this time, reading through the working text and providing that feedback, is so that concerns and clarifications would be considered by Westlake prior to the creation of the draft report. So that is precisely the purpose of this effort that we're undergoing right now. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. And yes, absolutely. Again, and if it doesn't get in during the call today, please don't hesitate. We have until the 20th of March to provide our feedback, and all comments are welcome and will be aggregated and delivered to the Westlake team.

You know, I see in the chat -- and the chat's moving rather quickly with all the comments -- that if you do have inaccuracies that you see, please do let us know. Chime in during the call today or send them around on list and we'll make sure that those are included.

So I think - Stephanie, I see your hand is up. I'm not sure if that's an old hand. Is that a new hand?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes I took it down and put it back up again to reiterate.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay perfect. Go right ahead. Thank you, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: I can see that the methodology of the interview selection is going to remain an issue, and I would suggest that if you're not willing to drop it because of its methodological problems, then at least do an analysis of who you interviewed, which stakeholder groups. And a pie graph would be good to see. I did an off-the-cuff estimate of how many staff you interviewed and I

think it's out of whack, not that staff opinion isn't great but it's hardly what we'd rely on in a GNSO stakeholder review, I would think.

So we need to know which constituencies were interviewed, and I think it would be very interesting to interview some new people. I mean, I'm not just being egotistical here. I don't know what the methodology was for selecting people, and we need to see that explained, particularly in such a small sample.

So I don't want to beat a dead horse on that, but if you're not going to downplay the use of the interviews to get a fact and opinion, then you have to position it and acknowledge the weakness in my view. I understand that you were up against it, getting the samples, but that still doesn't compensate for a methodology that's flawed, in my view. And I don't mean this as a criticism of Westlake. It's a criticism of all of us that somehow this didn't happen correctly. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Stephanie. Bill, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Bill Drake: Yes hi. Sorry. This is just because the conversation is a little bit moving across different spaces and I, you know, that's inevitable in this situation. I think that, you know, given that we are dealing with some serious concerns about one particular part of the report that's obviously going to shape the way people are perceiving the larger set of issues, and obviously we're going to have to come back later on and respond in more detail on the suggestions with regard to the other sections of the report.

On just this Section 8 we haven't come to yet, since we are raising questions of interview, I was just wondering the quotes that are selectively put there in, the two pages of negative quotes about NCUC for example, are those -- I just wanted to know as a point of information -- are those quotes from text comments submitted or were those quotes from interviews? Richard, are those interview quotes?

Richard Westlake: The quotes that we've raised are both. They're a selection from both the written quotes within the 360s and also in some cases the interview notes. So it is a selection of the two.

Bill Drake: A selection of the two. And when you use a quote, just so I understand, since - if a quote is a specific wording, presumably that's one person's quote, correct?

Richard Westlake: Where we have used each specific separate quote in there is a specific quote, yes.

Bill Drake: Okay. So these are comments from one individual that you decided should go into the report. Thank you. That's all I wanted to know.

Richard Westlake: If I could perhaps just comment on that. What we have done is tried to choose a selection, a representative selection, of the comments that we have received. We have just taken them verbatim. One or two times we have, let me say, edited simply to get spelling correct, because people have been obviously in a rush on the 360.

And I think what we have already seen in some of the feedback is that where some people believe they know exactly who said something, it actually turned out that that wasn't the case, not that we have told them but we had one person in particular come back to us later and said, "Look I got that one wrong."

Bill Drake: Yes I remember Avri doing that.

Richard Westlake: (Unintelligible)

Bill Drake: Can I just say though, just so I understand, it appears that the only quotes that are used are about civil society. And I'm just wondering is there a particular research design rationale for that?

Richard Westlake: I'm sorry, I don't follow the question, Bill.

Bill Drake: Well as I looked at your report, there's a - one paragraph about the registries, one paragraph about the registrars, and then an extended set of negative comments about NCSG and NCUC. So from that should I conclude that in all of your discussions, nobody had anything critical to say about any other part of the GNSO and only the NCUC and NCSG were criticized or were criticized in ways that seemed ripe enough to be - fun to include?

Richard Westlake: Bill, without going into sort of too much detail and depth here, what we have included, as I said before, is a representative sample of the interview comments we received. If we could have the feedback, the written feedback from people who have concerns about this, we are most willing to go back right through our report, which we will be doing after we receive the feedback, and rather than making changes on the hoof now, we look forward to the feedback so that we go through again and confirm the representativeness of what we have, and not just the representativeness, also the relevance of what we have.

                   And if there is something where we see that either a quotation we have made is either misleading or unhelpful to the report, then we would be perfectly willing to change that. So we do look forward to...

Bill Drake: Fabulous. And we very much looking forward to engaging with you more on both the issues of representativeness and relevance, and I think the letter we sent you is a starting point for that. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Bill. And thank you, Richard, for restating that again. If you see things that you think are inaccurate or have concerns, this is definitely the

time to raise them. And, Bill, if there are supplemental comments that you want to submit, you know, please do make sure we get those by the 20th.

I also just on the note of the interviews, I'm not sure, Richard, I don't recall off the top of my head in the report if there was a place where the methodology of how those who were interviewed was selected. I know it looks like that you're planning to add, you know, what their role is or what their affiliation is. Is that something that you will be updating, Richard, where we can have that information included in the report since this seems to be an important issue to a lot of people?

Richard Westlake: Hello, Jen. Yes, thank you for the question. Look, clearly it is an issue for people. We will certainly strengthen our comments there on the methodology of how we selected the interviewees. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: And is it - I assume that we can list their role within ICANN since that's - to try to have some sort of it - was it representative. Was that possible or were there promises made to not include that information?

Richard Westlake: No, where we've listed names, we will be including the roles. For the purposes of getting the original working text to you, we thought at the very least the names and, in most cases, people would know which groups they did represent, and in many cases as you look through the list, you'll see they have multiple hats within the ICANN community. But we will certainly be listing their principal role or roles.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great. Thank you. So I'm going to try to keep us moving. I think we were moving up to Section 8 of the report, which is enhance the constituencies. And I know we've been crossing over some of these broader issues on methodology and who was interviewed, and I think that's very productive, so I appreciate everybody being patient as we work our way through the report.

As we move onto Section 8, enhance constituencies, and I know I think this is probably where, Bill, a lot of your comments came from was in this section, but above and beyond the comments that have already been made, are there factual inaccuracies, are there concerns about conclusions and so on that we should raise for Richard. Bill, I see your hand is up. Is that a new hand for this section?

Bill Drake: No it is not. I'm sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay no problem. Philip, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you very much, Jen. I think there's a significant slightly misleading statement on Page 91, which I had mentioned in my written submission a couple of days ago. In the second paragraph on Page 91 which currently reads, "In theory, the current GNSO structure provides for the creation of new constituencies, so a wider range of views can be represented."

And I think it's very telling that that's in the draft report that we see before us, because I think that presumption is something that I have seen amongst members of the GNSO, longstanding and new. It's a presumption that I've seen among members of the board governance committee, and alas, it is a presumption that is inaccurate.

Because the truth is today, that although the generality of new constituencies exists, the ability to create new constituencies is a function of those charters of the stakeholder groups.

And hence the suggested clarification that I had suggested in my notes was the following, which is the current GNSO structure, which predates new types of TLDs and the underlying charter of the stakeholder groups, provides the creation of new constituencies only in two of the four stakeholder groups, namely the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Non-Commercial

Stakeholder Group. The charters of the Registry Stakeholder Group and the Staff Stakeholder Group do not allow for new constituencies.

And I think that point is very important and should be clarified in the report. And, Richard, I hope you are happy to make that clarification.

Richard Westlake: Philip, again, look, thank you for the comment. We will certainly be going back through some of those charters based on the feedback you have sent, Philip. And if that's correct, we will certainly amend what we've said in our working text.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Philip, and thank you, Richard. Bill, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Bill Drake: Yes thank you. I wanted to raise a different question, because as long as we're on this section -- and it's not about NCUC, you'll be pleased to know. It's about the larger design of the study, I guess. The concern - it concerns the table on Page 78 where the views of various subgroups about a respondent, about the different stakeholder groups and constituencies are reported.

And I think rather misleadingly, it starts off by saying, "This table shows the extent to which," and it doesn't. What the table shows is not facts, but rather perceptions. So I think the table should be labeled appropriately.

But leaving that aside, what I'm not understanding is what is the value of asking other people about whether a particular group manages its workload effectively. If they are not part of that group or applies metrics, they're not going to really know that. Whether the Executive Committee is balanced, they're not really necessarily going to know that, unless they chose to do something like look at a web page.

So I guess what I'm wondering is this is a snapshot of some perceptions of some people in the GNSO about other parts of the GNSO, maybe their parts as well, but it just perceptions. And would it have been useful to perhaps compare those perceptions to actual numbers? Some of these can be found, like whether an executive committee is balanced by geography, race, gender, whatever, and then like take note of the difference between the two.

I think one of the interesting questions is are the perceptions that people have of their community accurate and do they comport with the facts? And if not, that's, Richard, I would think that's an interesting thing to talk about. I mean if we do have a situation where all the people who are part of this community sort of have feelings or views about each other, each other's groups, that shape the way they would represent them, without having consulted real information before making assumptions, that's an interesting thing to take note of and to talk about why, I think.

And I'm just wondering, why not do that? I mean, why not compare these numbers about perceptions to some real numbers about reality? Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Bill. And I think -- and I'm going to ask Richard to clarify this -- but I'm looking at the table on Page 78, I think that is taken from those who self-selected themselves in the 360 as one of these groups, and that's how those numbers were tabulated. But, Richard, could you possibly explain that a little more, how that table was calculated?

Bill Drake: They are members of those groups?

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that's correct. Richard...

Bill Drake: Okay because the previous table says, "And represents a total number of respondents regardless of affiliation." So I assumed that that was...

Jennifer Wolfe: Richard, maybe you can provide some clarification. I thought that's where this came from, but maybe that's not. Could you clarify that, please? Richard, are you still on?

Richard Westlake: Yes I am indeed. Sorry, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Go right ahead, please.

Richard Westlake: Now are we talking about the table where we go through the stakeholder groups and constituencies where we're getting positive responses, the percentage giving positive responses?

Jennifer Wolfe: He was referencing Page 78 of the working text. There's a table there that shows - it shows each of the groups and then the Executive Committee balance, encourages new people. There's a number of columns across here. So I think we're just trying to get clarification on how those calculations were made and on what basis.

Bill Drake: And...

Richard Westlake: That is quantitative from the 360. We have in the right-hand column showing the total number of people who commented on this particular aspect, and these are the percentage of total respondents who either responded strongly in favor or in favor.

Bill Drake: Okay we understand that part, Richard. What Jen was asking you was the end there, these are subgroups, right? Those are not necessarily - so the 23 responding that the Registry Stakeholder Group are not necessarily members of the Registry Stakeholder Group, correct?

Richard Westlake: No not all necessarily.

Bill Drake: Okay so they could be from anywhere.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, okay.

Bill Drake: Okay so they're selected - that's how I read it. So 27 people from the 152 had comments about whether or not NCUC's Executive Committee is balanced, just to use that as an example. And they obviously did not consult a website or know anything about us before deciding 48% said no. So my question is, why wouldn't you compare these numbers to actual numbers and take note of the difference? That would be interesting.

Richard Westlake: What do you mean by actual numbers, Bill?

Bill Drake: Well I mean, you can verify. Or you could look - you could get the information about the composition of executive committees of each of the groups, right?

Richard Westlake: We could. Whether we could get an objective view of whether it is also appropriately representative is not actually a totally objective decision. So we rely on the people who choose to comment.

In most cases, the people who commented on particular stakeholder groups or constituencies have or had an involvement in that stakeholder group or constituency. Very few people commented on either constituencies or stakeholder groups through the later parts of the 360 who had not themselves been involved with it. It was one of the qualifying questions at the start.

Have you -- I can't remember the exact wording -- but it was along the line of are you or have you been involved with this particular constituency or stakeholder group, and every single section of the 360 asked that question at the front. And I can't remember a single person -- Larisa maybe would correct me -- but going through the responses, I can't remember a single person who had not been involved with that group or was not currently involved with that group who commented on either a stakeholder group or a constituency.

Bill Drake: Okay. Now you're saying what Jen was saying...

Richard Westlake: There are people, although they are self-selected, they are people who have self-selected based on their previous experience, certainly the majority of, if not in total. And when you get the full draft, you will see the full wording of the 360, and for those who chose to complete it, there was generic questions at the start, I think about 11 questions to start with or statements to start with, and only after that did the 360 break into the specific sections of stakeholder groups and constituencies, which is where the filter, the self-filtering took place.

So although it was voluntary, anybody could have gone in there, in practice, I think it was actually pretty much self-limited to people who had in fact had firsthand view, so it wasn't just broad overall comments.

Bill Drake: Okay. It would be really helpful to know that for sure, because that changes - that affects it a lot here. But my question here - I'll stop, Jen. I know I'm going over. Because I just...

Richard Westlake: Jen, if I could just quickly just clarify that. I think the question - the statements, the survey statements, when you see the survey statements from the 360, it'll be quite clear how the 360 progressed through it. The first 11 sections and then the subsequent ones, which as I say, were for people who had had an involvement.

Bill Drake: Totally missed it. Thank you, Richard. Again the point, my question was might it not be useful or interesting to you to compare these subjective numbers to real numbers? You can get numbers on the geographic diversity of a group. You can get numbers on whether there's geographic gender balance in a group. I mean, there are - some of these things - manages workload, okay that's hard. But some of them, you know, there is an actual number that's available, right?

Jennifer Wolfe: No, Bill, I think that's a great point. And, Richard, I don't know if you can respond to that right now or if that is going to be somewhere in here. But maybe there is a way where you're talking about, you know, the Executive Committee or something that can actually be benchmarked against what's actually on, you know, their website or some sort of fact that supports that. That might be helpful just to know did what people think match up with what's actual. I don't know if it would be possible to include that.

Richard Westlake: Jen, if we could actually have the particular issue just - I've got it I think what the question is or the concern is, but if we could have that in the feedback that comes to us, we will certainly take a look at it and, again, if it appears that it will either affect or strengthen our recommendations or our conclusions, we will certainly consider including it.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you. So I see I think, Stephanie, that is a new hand from you. Is that right?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes it is. Thank you very much. And I realize I'm monopolizing the microphone here. But I wanted to emphasize a point I made in my comments in a one-liner. I really would like to know where the recommendation that travel support should be prioritized to individuals who satisfy ICANN that they're participation would be valuable but that they would not otherwise be able to attend.

I think this is quite a dangerous route to go, not that we all don't know people who come to meetings and frankly aren't there when the heavy lifting is going on, but I think that there's something to the point of nature of ICANN as an organization, as institution. There is ICANN corporate, including staff and the board and the CEO, and there are the stakeholders.

And if ICANN is truly a multi-stakeholder organization, then there has to be considerable weight placed on the authority of the stakeholder groups to make decisions about who's doing the work and whether they're useful. And it

may not be working perfectly, but I would worry a great deal because staff incentives are notoriously different than the incentives of the stakeholder. And I speak to the former governance person who would have loved to have a few stakeholders dropping (unintelligible) on certain occasions.

But - so I don't mean this in a malicious way, but we just have to recognize if they're doing an institutional (unintelligible) on this, that's how you have to tease it out. Their goals are different. And so I'd like to know where this observation came from, this recommendation, and whether you have any intention of changing it just because I am (unintelligible). Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Richard, is that something that you want to respond to right now or to take into consideration?

Richard Westlake: Jen, look, I think I would much rather that we can consider the comments that are coming when they come through.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes certainly.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. Rather than going into detail now.

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely, absolutely. That's what I thought. I know that was a big question. So I think that's important and one for you to take under consideration. Thank you, Stephanie.

Let's - is there anything else under Section 8? Bill, I think - is that a new hand from you, Bill, or is that from before?

Bill Drake: I'm sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that was before. Okay. Anything else closing out on Section 8? Or I want to make sure we get through each section before we get to the end of the time period here.

I'll go ahead and move onto Section 9 then, which is improving communication and coordination within ICANN structures. Are there any comments on factual inaccuracies, concerns about conclusions reached? Okay I'm not seeing anything.

The final section other than the appendix is the GNSO structure, which was Section 10. Any comments here on factual inaccuracies, concerns about what was in here that you want to bring to the attention of the Westlake team?

Philip, please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks. This an area also I know that we've yet to see Westlake's final conclusions, but I would just like emphasize that, again referring back to that original ICANN board resolution of September of the year, and indeed a recognition of the fact that ICANN's stakeholders have rapidly changed over the last year or so.

It means that I would hope we're going to see some substantial innovative and interesting and future-looking conclusions in Section 10. Because without that, I fear this report will be largely irrelevant to the future of ICANN and the future of the GNSO, and this will be a huge opportunity missed. So my emotional and rational appeal to Westlake is please to think about this perhaps harder than they thought about any other section of the report so far.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Philip. Richard, is that a new hand for you?

Richard Westlake: Yes it is. Thank you, Jen. Just responding to Philip. Yes we will have a section which has - is really very much in the formative stage or was at a formative stage when the working text is put together, Philip, focusing particularly obviously the gTLD expansion IDNs, the Whois replacement, and

what I think we would refer to as the shift in the center of gravity of the Internet as a whole.

And so we will be having a fairly significant section referring particularly to those four key topics and the impacts. Because as - we completely agree with you. The aim of the report is to be useful as a forward-looking review, not just simply a revision mirror snapshot of where it is and where it's come from. Thank you, Philip.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Are there other comments or suggestions you'd like to make to Westlake on Section 10? Yes, Rafik? Are you there?

Rafik Dammak: Hi. Can you hear me?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: So you can hear me?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes we can hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. So regarding the - yes, so regarding the Section 10, so it's about the structure of several comments connected there, but just I want to understand. I don't see any numbers or stats there to look at. I mean, just to understand how they get some comment and suggest regarding the structure, because I see some that they are kind of concerning.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think your phone is...

Rafik Dammak: But looking to know how they get that recommendation up and that, kind of - sorry?

Jennifer Wolfe: No you dropped out for a second, but I think - is your question to Richard how did you arrive at these conclusions? Is that right?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, first. I'm trying to understand, because reading that section, I mean yes it looks just kind of took some suggestions but we don't know the weight. I mean if someone is suggesting like remove the whole group, I would like to know how much weight this suggestion has. I mean it's - you cannot just collect comments without giving them some weight I mean to understand how many people supported or not that and how they reached such conclusions.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you. That is a great comment. And, Richard, I assume you can take that into consideration as you look at it.

Richard Westlake:Almost certainly we will. As you see, we're on - we haven't yet completed it or haven't yet submitted our recommendations in this area. The reality though is that some recommendations do relay on a subjective professional assessment rather than you can't always have hard evidence on everything, particularly views relating to the future.

So there will be a professional opinion. And where that is the case, we're certainly making that point in the report. So those who read the report will know what conclusions and recommendations are based on (unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Richard. Are there further comments on Section 10?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Richard, but saying yes, sorry? Jen, I was trying to comment again.

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead, please.

Rafik Dammak: So saying professional, I mean subjective professional recommendation, it looks like kind of (unintelligible) for me. I think we need to be careful here in how we are reaching conclusions. I think we need much more to understand

what kind of process or flow that led to such logical result. I mean that way we can comfortable how we can just do some observation. We don't know how they were selected, and then we can make some - I mean we create - I mean we set some recommendation. I mean that needs to be reworked more. I will be happy to provide more comments later, but I think that part will need to be reworked, and yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, thank you for comment. And yes, certainly if you want to expand upon that in writing, we'll make sure that that gets included. Absolutely. Thank you very much.

Are there any other comments? We've got about 15 minutes remaining in our call, and I want to give Westlake an opportunity just to give us an update on what they'll be providing next and what our timeline is before we close out. But are there any other comments on Section 10 or any other closing comments on the working text as it is right now?

Any new comments? Okay. So obviously we've had a lot of discussion and important feedback for Westlake about concerns about, you know, certain statements that have been made and the interviews, and I know they'll take that all into consideration and provide, you know, responses to that where they think that's appropriate.

I want to give Richard an opportunity to just give us an update on the work that's still in progress and what we'll expect as we move forward and our timeline. And then we'll close out with just looking at our timeline again and determine if we need another phone call before we move this forward. So Richard, I'll turn it over to you.

Richard Westlake: Thank you very much, Jen. Now our process is that next week we are providing an update of the working text, which will include the areas we have said further comments are due. Now those won't incorporate feedback in

relation to the comments we have received either previously to this or in today's call.

As you know, you are scheduled to provide us with comments by the 20th of March. We then shall consider all of those and incorporate all of those where it's appropriate or where we consider it appropriate into what will become the draft report in April. And that's when you could expect to see responses consideration of and, in many cases, inclusion of the comments, the feedback, the concerns and responses to some of the concerns in the draft report that will come out in April.

So don't expect the responses to today's comments please next week with the new working text. They will come in the draft when we consider the full set of responses that we have asked for. And we do look forward to some constructive feedback, constructive input and objective pointing demonstration of where we have been error.

And I'm perfectly happy to accept that we may well have been in factual error in some cases and we may have drawn conclusions based on false assumptions. And we would be very happy to have any counters to those pointed out to so that we can make sure that our report is balanced when it gets to the draft. Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And I see there's a couple hands up. If I could ask staff to put up the timeframe for us on screen because I just want to make sure that we're clear with everyone on what our timeframe is to continue to provide feedback and how this will move forward.

So while they put that up, I'll go ahead and go to the hands. I see Mike, your hand is up.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, this timing is way too fast. You're giving us a report on the 10th, which is going to have a whole bunch of new conclusions that nobody's seen

yet except you guys, and you're going to ask us to have substantive comments back to you in ten days. It's not nearly enough. I would need 30 days for that, I think.

Jennifer Wolfe: Now that they have the report up, let's just talk through that again for a moment. So obviously today's the day that we're providing our initial feedback, and we will continue to collect from everyone in writing up until March 20. And then the draft report will be provided on April 21. There is still this public comment period.

So I guess that would be my only response to that, Mike. And I definitely understand. I know this is a lot of information to digest and turnaround, but we will have time for public comments from the community so every group can go and provide their comments.

So do you feel like with the public comment period that's going to give sufficient time to really further digest? Because we'll have - that's going to be between June 12 and July 7.

Mike Rodenbaugh: You're completely undercutting the input from this group, which is the only group that's really paid attention to this 138-page report since it was published a month ago. It's incomplete -- significantly incomplete. Lots of conclusions missing, but now you're going to dump on us with ten day before you make the report public. It's not acceptable.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa, do we have any flexibility on the timing on this issue?

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, Jen. This is Larisa. So I just wanted - before I answer your question, I just wanted to clarify because it may be a little confusing on the chart that appears on the screen right now. That draft report would be posted for public comment on April 23 and would stay open for public comment for the full period of April 23 through June 4.

Then based on the new public comment process requirements, the community has between the 12th of June and the 7th of July to provide any clarification on comments that were summarized by staff didn't truly reflect the nature of what the community expected. So the full public comment period is April 23 through June 4, and then actually on through later in June.

As far as flexibility on the timeline, I guess I'd like to find out what this group would find acceptable, and it sounded like there was a request for 30 days to review the additional information that was submitted by Westlake. That's something that we will have take a look at the schedule due to extensive changes and extensions on this project. So certainly quality trumps timeline, but there are contractual and other considerations that staff will need to take up before I can give you a conclusive answer.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Fair enough. But whatever you agreed in your contract with Westlake, I mean we don't have a complete report as we sit here today and we're not going to have one for at least a week. And then you want us to turn around, you know, inform thoughts about it in ten days. It's not nearly enough.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Mike. I see Stephanie has her hand up as well. Let me have Stephanie jump in.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes I was certainly asking to slow down the train on this. I think it is a bit much to ask Westlake to take this kind of feedback onboard in any substantive way. And I would like to say that we are trying to improve this document in a positive way. I'm not volunteering my time on this just to be obstructive. I'm trying to help come up with something that's actually guide the GNSO over the next few years.

I agree with the statement much earlier that if this doesn't - if this isn't future oriented -- and that's the stuff we haven't seen -- it's just going to sit on the shelf. And I think that this whole discussion about the timeline underscores the point that I made a few minutes ago. This may be on somebody's

management contract at ICANN to get it out and done and ticked and responded to a report-- and I mean that in the nicest way. I had management contracts too before I retired.

But from the point of view of the volunteers, we wanted to help solve problems, solve turmoil, clarify the rules, get new recruits, stop burnout. There's a whole lot of really important goals here that this report will help serve. And if it goes out too soon and isn't adequate, we won't get comments. And I gave you a whole pile of data on why I think the comment period is important. But rushing reports out the door is one of those reasons.

So please slow down. Have another look. Give us a chance, and give Westlake a chance to put a better document. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Stephanie. And just to let the group know, because I know there are a lot of people on this call that might not have been participating all along, but in the early phases we have been able to secure extensions of time when we wanted to ensure that we had more results to expand the scope of the survey.

So we have been expanding beyond what was originally agreed to numerous times. And I think we just need to make sure that that can work. I think everyone agrees we want to put out the best quality report and that we can provide our feedback to Westlake and that they have time to consider all of that feedback.

Bill, I see - I think your hand is up new and then I see Larisa. And I think we've got about five more minutes before the close of the meeting. So, Bill, you're okay? All right, Larisa, please?

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, Jen. This is Larisa. Thank you very much. Stephanie, very much appreciate your comments and actually very much appreciate everybody that's on the call taking the time to provide feedback. Very constructive and

definitely I will respond on behalf of staff that it's in everybody's interest to make sure that the outcome of this process is productive and useful and we get improvements.

So please know staff will come up with a timeline and respond to you that makes sense. And we'll be flexible and do our best to accommodate your request. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you. Did I see any other comments as we close out? So anything else? Any other remaining comments?

There was a question of a do we want to schedule in another phone call like this before, I suppose it would be before the March 20 deadline. Do we feel we need another call or do you think that you can provide in writing to the Westlake team? Is there a sense? I'll try to watch chat or... Stephanie, is that a new hand I see?

Stephanie Perrin: I might as well seeing as how it's up. I do think we need another meeting. I really do think we need to go over the next draft. There's too many that's missing.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So would it be fair to say we don't have another meeting until we get a second draft? Is that correct? Once we have another draft, we should another phone call? Yes.

(Ron): Yes, Jen. This is (Ron). I was actually going to exactly that question. I'm a little confused now as we're going back and forth. I think most of us agree that with the recommendation that we can't keep the window too tight because we need to go back to our constituencies and our stakeholder groups and so forth and share with them this information and gather it back.

The question I have is when will we see what I'll call the version 2.0 of this coming out of Westlake? And then that will then help inform whether or not

we can deliver comments by the 20th and whether we need a call. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay thank you. Klaus, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead. Are you there, Klaus? Klaus, are you there? Okay we're not hearing you or your mic is muted. Are you there? Okay for some reason we're not hearing you.

Okay so I think we have some consensus that a phone call would make sense after we see the next draft, and we will work to find out what we need to do to extend the timeframe on this in order to extend comments.

Klaus, are you there now? Sorry, we're not hearing you.

Okay are there any other comments? We're right at the time to close out the meeting. Are there any further comments anyone would like to make?

Okay thank you then. I think that'll bring the meeting to a close. I appreciate everyone's time. I know there's a lot involved in reviewing the reports, and we appreciate your feedback and comments. Our goal of course remains to make this a very valid, strong report that can help us all make the changes that we want. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END