

TRANSCRIPT

GNSO Review Working Party

Wednesday 30 September 2015 at 1800 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.

Attendance:

Avri Doria
Chuck Gomes
David Maher
Jeff Neuman
Jen Wolfe
Klaus Stoll
Stephanie Perrin
Rudi Vansnick

Apologies:

Amr Elsadr
Bill Drake

Staff:

Larisa Gurnick,
Charla Shambley
Terri Agnew
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party Call on the 30 of September, 2015. On the call today we have Jeff Neuman, Klaus Stoll, Avri Doria, David Maher, Chuck Gomes, and Jennifer Wolfe.

We received apologies from Bill Drake and (unintelligible). From staff, we have Marika Konings, Larisa Gurnick, Charla Shambley, Terri Agnew, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And I'd like to remind you all too please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you ever so much and over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks so much and thanks, everybody, again, for making time on such short notice to continue our calls. The purpose of today's call is to focus on the other 35 recommendations that were made by West Lake throughout the GNSO review process, specifically looking at the final reports. As you all recall, there were significant concerns about revised Recommendation 23 which was the purpose of our last call.

Since that call, that issue has been presented to the GNSO council and it was also presented to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee this past Monday during their meeting. And just to provide a brief update on what happened during that call, staff did apprise the OEC of the concerns that we had. West Lake did present their final reports and then their discussion continued amongst the OEC.

There was widespread understanding that more time would be needed from the community, so that has been granted to us so we are not under any time constraints to move forward with a formal response regarding Recommendation 23. Also - and of course you can go and read the transcript - but there was discussion by OEC Committee members that essentially came to conclusions that that revised Recommendation 23 should be rejected.

So I anticipate that will be the likely outcome, but, of course, I think it's important that we respond as the working party. So what I'd like to ask for today, unless anyone has a big objection, is that we not continue to spend time talking about revised Recommendation 23 since we have been given more time.

The council - GNSO council had asked that each of the groups have time to go back and weigh in on that issue and that we wait until we get more information back from everyone and then work towards a final recommendation - or, excuse me, a final response on revised

Recommendation 23 and that we use the time today to go through the other 35 recommendations to look at which ones that we think, based upon public comments, based upon information you have from your respective groups, which ones we think, you know, have widespread support are generally good ideas are things that could be implemented, and that we would recommend moving forward into an implementation and then segmenting out those ones that we think there may not be widespread support for or maybe they need more discussion.

Maybe they would require, you know, more work or more resources so that we can essentially take those 35 recommendations and bucket them into what we think is workable and are good recommendations to move forward and which ones we think either need more time or should just not be considered. I think that would be an effective use of the 90 minutes we have scheduled today. I note, too, that (Rudy) just had circulated something from the (EMPOC) questioning the methodology.

You know, again, I think that's a big discussion topic. And if we could use our time today to do something, you know, very meaningful by looking through these recommendations and considering that we had, you know, substantial response from the community in terms of, I think we had 78 surveys and we had over 40 interviews.

So let's use the time to look through that and use our resources to make some recommendations. Chuck, did you have something? Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and it's with regard to the (EMPOC) statement. And I put a little bit of this in an e-mail response to (Rudy) and on our list. It seems to me they're - making some points that are - that affect what we're planning to do today, depending on what they mean by them.

So, in other words, if we were to take - one interpretation of what they're saying is is that, I mean, do they consider what we're planning to do today a

part of the bottom-up process that they say should happen? If so, then what we're doing consistent, I think, with what they're suggesting. If not, then they could be opposed to what we're doing and going through the other 35 recommendations until we consider the broader implications of the methodology and so forth.

So my own inclination is is that we go ahead and do what we were planning and that that, in itself, can be part of the bottom-up process, understanding that we're not making any final decisions. We're just making suggestions as to how the recommendations could be implemented or whether they should or not. So I raise that now because as long as we're all okay with that and think it's consistent with what (EMPOC) has said, then, there's probably no problem with us proceeding as planned. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. And I know, I had just sent out an - as well to (Rudy) and to the list and I know, (Claus) - thank you for letting us know - he's joining the call shortly. I mean, I guess my read on this would be that he even suggests that, you know, maybe this be viewed as a green paper.

So even if that is how it is later characterized, I think it's still worthwhile for us to go through the exercise of looking at the recommendations and determining, you know, as a working party, you know, what do we think, which ones do we think could be implementable, you know, particularly if there's recommendations that everybody agrees with and that we think could actually provide improvement and improve effectiveness of our organization.

It seems like it would be an awful waste of all of our time and everything that's gone not this if we don't at least follow through at this stage. And I see Chuck, is that a check mark? Does anybody object?

I mean, we've got this time scheduled to go through them. You know, many of them, you know, I think if there's any controversy, we just move it over into that bucket of okay, that needs more consideration, but at least to go through

the ones where we feel like there's widespread support, we can use that time and then at least have a refined list where we could come back to, you know, the GNSO council to the community At-Large and to the OEC and say, we, as a working party, have looked at these recommendations and here's a list of them that we think are, you know, workable good ideas that everybody supports.

Let's go and improve the organization with those. And for all of those others that can fall into that bucket of, you know, raising the concerns of the EMPOC and the methodology and so on. Does that make sense to everybody?

I'm seeing agreement in the chat. Anybody opposed? Okay, so with that, why don't we go ahead and move forward. And if you can put up an Adobe Connect, we were going to pull up the - I think, staff, do you have a - something to put up at this point in time to help guide us through this process?

We were - think we were going to go through each recommendation and just bucket it into one of these two categories.

(Larisa Gurnick): Jen, this is (Larisa Gurnick).

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, please go ahead.

(Larisa Gurnick): (Charlotte's) putting up, on the screen, a template that staff has prepared as a potential suggested way to sort the recommendations as you are discussing them. So just bear with us for a moment and it'll come up on the screen momentarily.

Woman: Okay, that's it.

(Larisa Gurnick): Here it is.

Woman: Great.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Can we make that just a little bit bigger in the screen or is that as big as it gets? Or is there a way - is there a link or something you could send out to us so we could pull it up on our screen to see larger?

(Larisa Gurnick): Sure, absolutely. We'll send the link right now.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. That would be helpful and then at least we can follow along both in Adobe Connect and perhaps on our own screens. So as you can see, what we have here - I'm going to try to read through it. On - so we have Recommendation 1.

We can read the language here and then determine, you know, what do we think it takes from a cost-benefit standpoint? Is it easy, medium, or hard? You know, does the GNSO capacity - does the GNSO have the capacity to do it?

Is it aligned with strategic direction? Is there a dependence or impact on other groups? Do we need more information or just any additional notes? Does this seem like a workable structure to talk through the other recommendations for everybody?

Seeing no objections, so why don't we go ahead and work through that. And (Sharla), are you going to be able to just, real-time, make the notations?

(Sharla Shambley): Yes, that's the plan.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. Well then why don't we go ahead and go through these one by one. And I'm still looking for the link, but if the link comes out, hopefully that will help everybody.

So our first recommendation is that the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot

programs with regard to GNSO working groups as noted in the WG participation recommendations under Section 545, I think that says. So on this one, general thoughts with regard to, you know, cost-benefits, you know, the ease of implementation capacity, you know, looking at this framework of issues. Do we have comments on this point? Yes, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and my comment isn't so much on the recommendation itself; it's that first column. Cost-benefit and ease of implementation impact seem to be two separate things in my mind. Is that just me or - that seems like two different questions.

Something could have a good cost-benefit, but still be hard to implement. So I don't know how to answer that - both - and in - you can have different answers, in other words, for a cost-benefit analysis. And I think it still could be hard, for example, to - you know, in fact, saying cost-benefit is easy, medium, or hard doesn't even make sense.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, so it looks like (Sharla) is, real-time, making the change for us so we can have ease of implementation to be an easy, medium, hard and then, you know, a cost-benefit - maybe we can just fill in if - what we think the cost benefit is for this one. And I think, too, to the extent that we think, you know, maybe some of these recommendations are too broad or they're not definitive enough, we can just make that notation, you know, as we go along.

So if we think we're not sure what it means, then we can just make a note we're not sure what this means, as opposed to its going in that bucket of something we think should move forward. So, Chuck, do you have comments on the recommendation itself?

Chuck Gomes: I can, if you want me to just start in, I...

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, you can go right ahead.

Chuck Gomes: ...as far as ease of implementation, I guess my real quick gut feeling is that it would probably be about a medium-level. I don't think it's necessarily an easy task, but I would like to think it wouldn't be too hard.

So I'll throw that out and I'm open to other people's opinions on that because that's just a first gut reaction on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Other comments on this recommendation for the GNSO to develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of our outreach strategies.

Chuck Gomes: And then I just - this is Chuck again - just to go to the column that was just added. I think it's going to be hard for us to do cost-benefit analysis until we have more detail in terms of what it would involve to do it. So I'm not sure it's very easy for us to do cost-benefit analysis unless we just want a guess.

So I'm not sure how to answer the second column on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, so I suppose it would be a matter of, you know, what sort of metrics would be put in place and what would that cost and then what's the benefit of that? So maybe to some extent, we just sort of guess if - what we think it could be or if we're not sure, we would just leave that open for now.

Chuck Gomes: It does sound easier...

Jennifer Wolfe: So I...

Chuck Gomes: ...now that they said cost instead of cost-benefit.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So that's easier to answer, probably. And I still don't know that I have a good answer...

Jennifer Wolfe: For this one?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, but it might be medium, I guess, would be my guess, but I don't know. I'm - I'd really like to hear from other people and I see (Stephanie's) got her hand up.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right, right. (Stephanie), please go ahead.

(Stephanie Perim): Thanks so much. (Stephanie Perim) for the record. I actually commented on this one because I'm all in favor of metrics, but on these ones, are we that subjective? You know, how are we going to measure the effectiveness of outreach?

Are we going to count countries or groups of is this a - quite a risk is spending a whole pile of money and not really getting anything that means anything. So I think it could be a little bit of a black hole. That's my comment.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, thank you. Do you think this is something that is - is this a recommendation that we say in principle, it's a good recommendation, but more work would be needed to determine is this another working group? And I think my question too is does this overlap - and maybe staff can help us with this - does this overlap some working groups that are already underway with regard to metrics?

Does anyone know?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. You know, there's lots of work going on with metrics, but I'm not sure - and I - we'd have to go back and look specifically - I'm not sure these kind of metrics are - I don't think these kind of metrics are a part of that, but that's just, you know, from looking at it from a distance.

Jennifer Wolfe: But, I see now there is some more (unintelligible) going on in other constituencies, so maybe we note this one as - you know, unless somebody has an objection just in principle to the overall concept that it needs some more development and to determine if it's in process in other places. Is this work already being done?

(Rudy) checked yes. Any other - Chuck - anyone opposed.

Jeff Neuman: Guys, this is Jeff Neuman.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, hi, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I'm trying to flip back and forth to the final report and I can't find Section 5.4.5. Am I just missing it?

Jennifer Wolfe: (Larisa), can you help with that? I don't the report. I need to open it (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: I was trying to go back...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: And, (Rudy), I'm sorry. I was looking at another document. Go ahead, please.

(Rudy): Thank you, Jen. (Rudy) for the transcript. Well I think that if we really want to have clear figures on results of outreach that, indeed, it's something that we should work on. But I would consider that being a task of (unintelligible) constituencies to what are the results of outreach efforts they are doing?

I think that that's the closest way of getting real results instead of having (unintelligible) and metrics coming out of calculations. So I would say yes for this recommendation, but give it to the constituencies themselves as a task to execute and have a clear view on what the outreach results are.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. And I see (Stephanie) making a similar remark in the chat. So maybe, (Sharla), if we can add into the notes that this is something that could be done at the constituency or stakeholder group level.

(Claus), I see you're asking are we talking about corporate ICANN or community-centered outreach. I think this would be community-centered outreach. At least that's how I would interpret this, but please chime in if you think it's to be interpreted different.

Chuck Gomes: (Claus), this is Chuck. It's GNSO outreach, right.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right.

Chuck Gomes: The whole idea is...

Jennifer Wolfe: That's what I'm thinking.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, exactly. Its GNSO outreach to get new participants. So...

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible) about what - I still can't find the 5.4.5 so I don't understand this recommendation. With regard to GNSO working groups as noted in Working Group Participation Recommendations under Section 5.4.5, and I don't see a 5.4.5.

Jennifer Wolfe: (Larisa), are you still looking that up? Is that maybe a - is that a misstatement on the section?

(Larisa): Yes, Jen. I just posted in the chat. It...

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, I'm sorry.

(Larisa): You're absolutely correct; 5.4.5 does not appear in the final report, so let me reference the draft report and see if I can come up with...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

(Larisa): ...what was intended. But yes, this is an erroneous link, it seems to be.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, thank you for that. And I know we all reviewed the draft report and then there were changes in the final report. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. This is Avri speaking. Yes, I think that this outreach was further than membership drives, as I remember when I was reading it, but had much more to do about having more participation in the policy-making processes and so on. So while membership outreach is certainly related to that, it isn't the only part of that.

It goes beyond just getting our members involved or those that have an affinity for our membership categories, but goes to those that have something to contribute to the process and various methods for doing that. So I think, you know - I just think we're narrowing what they were talking about a little too much, you know.

I actually think it's not that easy to implement, but in terms of looking at this, it certainly has an impact on everything else. I'm not sure how much it would - and I'm not sure what column GNSO capacity means. Does this increase the GNSO capacity? Probably.

Does GNSO have the current capacity to absorb both (unintelligible) working groups, especially those that already haven't adjusted to its behavior patterns and such? That I'm not sure of, so it probably would require an increase in GNSO capacity and would certainly promote greater GNSO capacity.

Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Avri. And (Rudy), is that a new hand for you?

(Rudy): Yes, Jen. It's a new hand. (Rudy) for the transcript.

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead.

(Rudy): But I agree with Avri. I think that, in essence, the recommendation is coming from the fact that we have - and we have a huge number of working group that was in strong (unintelligible) of working groups in a couple of years. And by that fact, we didn't have enough people to put into working groups, and that's where the question is coming from and I think the basic question is getting more participants in the working groups and with the same rate as the number of working groups that we are getting today.

So I - it's related to the number of working groups that have been created in the last couple of years.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, thank you. So to try to close out on this so we can keep moving in the interest of time, I think - some additional information and more discussion. But I think we've captured the notes that have been (unintelligible). So, Chuck, did you have something else on this point?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, sorry to prolong it, but I don't think the comment in the additional notes works and it isn't - it's not consistent now with what Avri said, which I think she was right. It couldn't - you know, I mean, there's parts of it that could be done at the constituency level, but when you're talking about working groups and so forth, that doesn't work there.

So I don't think that last part of the note really works because that goes against what Avri just said. And then, real quickly, yes, I think it's going to be hard for us to talk about GNSO capacity. But as far as alignment with strategic objectives, or directions, I think that's an easy yes because of the -

you know, when you consider the strategic objectives, they really are to get more involvement.

And then, I think, also, we can answer a yes to dependence and impact on other groups because it'll be dependent on certainly constituency stakeholder groups, working groups, etcetera. So those two, I think, may be easy answers. And I'll stop there.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, great, thanks. Excellent input. Thank you, Chuck. Okay, let's move on to Recommendation Number 2, which reads that the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP working groups, given the vital role volunteers play in working groups and policy development.

So I'm going to take some of this recommendation -- so just saying the GNSO that they do mean the GNSO as a whole to develop and fund more targeted programs. As we start to look at this, what are initial thoughts with regard to how easy this is to implement, the cost, the impact on, and any other work that's being done in the GNSO?

No comments. So, obviously, I think from a funding standpoint, there's obviously going to be some cost. So maybe, is that a medium cost? There's some cost involved in outreach?

Is this easy to implement, medium, hard, comments? I guess we could check medium.

Chuck Gomes: I don't - this is Chuck - I don't think it's easy.

Jennifer Wolfe: I don't think it's easy either. I don't think it's hard but maybe medium's the right - I mean, outreach - I mean, we're talking about outreach -- so funding it, putting some money into it to some sort of outreach program.

Chuck Gomes: Did that document ever get sent around?

Jennifer Wolfe: I think they put it up in the chat.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, it's just in the chat.

Jennifer Wolfe: It was in the chat, if you scroll back up in there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: So as we're looking at, then, so we've got - it's medium work to do so -- medium in terms of cost. Is it in alignment with the strategic direction? I mean, certainly outreach seems like that would be in alignment with the strategic direction, unless anybody thinks otherwise.

Does anybody feel like this work is being done somewhere else within the GNSO right now?

Chuck Gomes: Well, you've got your - what is it - training that goes on. I forget what it's called. The - (Avri's) involved in that too that they're - the...

Man: The leadership.

Chuck Gomes: ALAC kind of started. I don't know if that really relates to this or not.

Man: Yes, you are talking about the Leadership Training Program.

Jennifer Wolfe: So does this have an impact on other work that's being done? No.

Man: I think - if there's a limited budget for the GNSO, I think it will.

Jennifer Wolfe: So in terms of this recommendation, do you feel like we need more information? Do you feel like it's, in principle, it's a good idea but it depends

on what the - how the cost is going to be allocated in comparison to other needs? It seems like that might be the issue.

If there's budget needed, how does that compare? (Rudy) is saying yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: So maybe in the additional notes, list that depending upon how this impacts other funding.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. I'm just trying to think of the practicality of this. Like, I'm trying to think of going through the process and forming a - or starting a PDP on a particular topic. Let's say it's, I don't know, revising the UDRP or something like that.

A targeted funded program to get additional volunteers.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well, I don't think it's for a specific PD - maybe I'm reading this wrong but my take on this is that it's just a general outreach to try to get people to volunteer for working groups in general. So it would be an outreach program whether it's webinars or otherwise to - and I'm sorry, (Rudy), I just saw your hand go up.

So I think it's more of a general outreach. If there was some sort of a program that was maybe trying to market or communicate with more people to participate, generally, versus to a - something specific. But maybe I'm misinterpreting that. (Rudy), please go ahead.

(Rudy): Thank you, Jen. (Rudy) for the transcript. Well, I think that more and more, what we see is that in - we need more and more expertise in the working groups as the PDPs are really complex materials. And it is always good to have new blood in the PDP working groups.

I participated in a few recently and it is really specific. You need expertise and it's - so just four or five people in the working group, I think that is not representative for the whole (unintelligible). And I think this is quite an important issue if ICANN is not willing to put the appropriate budget to allow such programs to be successful.

If it's used in a way of using the same budget that we always use, I think it will not have any affect. I'm afraid that we will not have that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, (Rudy). (Stephanie), please go ahead.

(Stephanie Perim):All right, (Stephanie Perim) for the record. I don't want to sound like I have no trust in the system. I'll put that caveat out there. But I think it's a bit delicate doing recruitment programs for specific exercises.

Would be open to criticism from different groups. So we know we have a massive PDP coming up on three years -- also in three years (unintelligible). I agree that it would - we absolutely need lots of people to work on that PDP, but if the communications is not extremely neutral, then there is going to - it's going to be looking like we're stacking the deck if all of a sudden we get - I hate to pick on them - but, say, 50 IPCs lawyers there on the working group.

There'd be an allegation that ICANN is not doing a good job on this outreach thing. So I wonder if it might be more useful to talk about broad-based communications rather than recruitment. Does that make any sense or do I just sound paranoid?

Jennifer Wolfe: No, I think you're right to say that maybe to refine this, that as opposed to calling it recruitment, per say, that it's outreach for participation. I think that's a good clarification. (Stephanie), did you still have your hand up to speak?

Okay, so it seems like there's general support of the idea of outreach to get more people involved in the GNSO, but the funding piece of it would depend

upon how it impacts other budgets and a prioritization of that. Is that a fair characterization of the thoughts on this recommendation? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: My comment's going to be more general that with regard to Number 2. First of all - and I think if we just add another column, we're going to get too busy here - but one of the things we don't have on here is priority, which I thought - you know, which ones of these things would - do we think are the most urgent to get done?

And I think that's a really good question for us to consider on these. Now, on my more general comment, it's about our methodology in terms of going through this. We haven't made it through 2 and we're already a third way through the call and that's not surprising.

And there are only nine of us on the call. There are lots of people that aren't on the call. So, I mean, is it feasible to put some of these items - I don't know if all of them fit into a survey-type approach -- a quick, easy survey that all of us in the working party could complete within a limited amount of time.

And then, assuming that that - the tool would allow for easy compilation, that would give us a broader perspective of what people think when we go through these rather than depending on each person to speak up and then, of course, a few of us monopolizing. I'm guilty there myself so I'm talking about myself.

So I don't know. And (Larisa) has her hand up. Maybe she wants to respond to that.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, I see that. And I agree; I was thinking the same thing. I was just looking at my clock and thinking we're only on Number 3; there's no possible way we're going to get through 35 in the next hour. And the likelihood of us getting another call before Dublin is pretty remote.

So, (Larisa), I'll defer to you if you wanted to comment on that point and then we can come back to that because I think it's an excellent point.

(Larisa): This is (Larisa). Thank you, Jen and Chuck. We would - staff would certainly be able to turn this into a simple survey that could be tabulated. And originally, the idea of proposing a format of this nature was just to inspire some views as to how to go through this process so that the outcome of this could be a prioritization.

So, Chuck, to your point, absolutely would be useful to have that as an outcome of this exercise. And we would be happy to add a prioritization column. But certainly, as we formulated this and thought through this, it was not clear what basis one would use to prioritize unless you went through some means of classifying each recommendation.

But, bottom line, happy to work with Chuck and Jen and anybody else that would be interested to formulate a survey to send out to the group. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, (Larisa). And on that note, I note that, you know, we don't exactly have representation on this call, you know, which is always a concern if we go through this and then later we come back and have, you know, people who don't feel like they were represented or participated in the call. So that's certainly something we could look at as potentially translating this into a survey that goes out to the working party, give everyone an opportunity to respond to it, and then, hopefully, come to the Dublin meeting with that feedback.

And we could go in and then prioritize these into which ones we think there's the most consensus for. Chuck, did you need to add something to that please? Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, two things in response to (Larisa). First of all, any survey we do - especially considering our criticism of West Lake and the methodology and so forth, this is just a brainstorming exercise so that we have a point of discussion for the group. It's - this is not a scientific study and people need to understand that.

But, secondly, with regard to priority, (Larisa), I agree with you. We need a basis for establishing priority. And so I think the priority - prioritization is two-fold.

Number 1, there's just a first gut feeling of, you know, I think this is really important for us to prioritize. But once we compile more of the data, we'll be able to refine priorities. But I think it is helpful.

If we can, in the next couple weeks, identify some of the recommendations that are - that we can agree on are especially important to put at the top of the list. And we could start there. We can always change those but I - so I do like the idea of adding a first-reaction priority feeling on there. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. (Larisa), did you want to respond to that?

(Larisa): Yes, thanks, Jen. So, Chuck, as a follow-up question, do you think it would be useful to have a priority question that asks people to rank this recommendation, you know in terms of low priority, high priority or low, medium, and high? What do you think would be (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: I think a low, medium, high would be fine. You don't want - again, we've got to keep it fairly simple. But for example, if we identified six recommendations out of all of these that most of us thought was a high priority, that's a good clue to us, you know.

And if there are mixed feelings in terms of priority that will be our point of discussion as we move forward. But yes, I think low, medium, high is good enough for me.

(Larisa): Thank you for that feedback.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. And I think that makes sense. I mean, I think that's really what our goal here, as the working party, and agree to your point, Chuck. This is not intended to be scientific, what we're doing here.

This is intended to be we're trying to look at the information that we have in the recommendations and decide if we, as a community, think, you know, these can be implemented and that - if they're good or bad recommendations. Is there a consensus for those on the call? Would you prefer to defer to a survey to go through this?

Do you think it's worthwhile to talk through the recommendations? You know, I want to be respectful of everyone's time. I know you've made time for a number of calls here in the last couple of weeks and you all have a lot going on.

If we think that's a better approach now that we've gone through a couple of these and we see what's involved, we could certainly defer to a survey and then come together in Dublin and get the results of those surveys and talk them through. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, just to follow up what you just said - and I think that's what you meant in your last statement there - and that is is that this doesn't mean we won't talk about them. But this would give us - I think we could talk about them more readily and more quickly if we had the compilation of the results from the survey. I think we still need to talk about them one by one like we're doing, but I think it'll be easier and more efficient if we have some survey results first.

Jennifer Wolfe: So I agree and I - you know, I'm also, again, mindful, as I said, that then we could hopefully have participation from the full GNSO community, which is not necessarily on this call. And I want to make sure that if we come back to the OEC as the working party and say here are the top 10 recommendations, or whatever it might be, that we think are, you know, recommendations, there's full support for them, we think they could be implemented, that that's really coming from the community and not just those of us who could make this call today.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: So I want to question something you just said, Jen. Are you suggesting that we do the survey for the whole community? I hope not because I think...

Jennifer Wolfe: No, I mean to the working party.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jennifer Wolfe: But the working party is supposed to be representative. There were people assigned from each group in the - each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay, that's fine.

Jennifer Wolfe: ...had, you know, a number of people.

Chuck Gomes: I just wanted to clarify that. I think...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, no, absolutely. That's exactly right. I didn't mean to send it out to the entire community. We certainly have the public comments to each of the recommendations so - and certainly we can look at those public comments to

know what did people say and how did they respond to the recommendations.

But no, I - to clarify - I did mean out to the working party, which is representative of the community. So is that...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Jennifer Wolfe: ...is that the consensus, because if that's the case, we don't need to, you know, continue on right now. We can get that survey out and we can plan to then do exactly this -- go through one by one but with some data points of which ones were deemed to be more priority than others.

Chuck Gomes: Jen, this is...

Jennifer Wolfe: (Maurice) is asking - yes, go ahead, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: ...Chuck. So considering we have the time and people committed it - and I'm not saying we have to use it all - but also recognizing that we probably are going to have to work on a segment for Recommendation 23, should we take 10 or 15 minutes and just talk about some principles of that statement that we think maybe the broader group might consider or do we just defer that?

Jennifer Wolfe: So I'm open to seeing how you all respond. I mean, I think where we left off, I had presented that issue to the GNSO council. There were responses that everyone - or I shouldn't say everyone - there were some who said they would like to have more time to go back to their respective groups. So I don't know if there's a lot more that we can do until we get that feedback.

And I'm noting that the groups who were asking for more time are not on this call right now. So, you know, I - I don't know, does anyone else want to spend more time talking about the response or is it premature until we get that additional information? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: So let me - it - just throw something out and get a reaction from those that are on the call. In looking at the on-list discussion, obviously, we didn't agree on everything. There were some that thought the recommendation was okay; there were some that didn't think it was okay at all.

I think we all probably agree that, you know, it needs to be looked at in light of the GNSO structure and everything, regardless of what your feeling is. So what I want to throw out to people - my thought is that it doesn't matter whether you like the recommendation or not. I think we can make a statement that - and I think much of the statements that's out there right now can be characterized in this way - I think we can make a statement that isn't depending on whether you think the recommendation's right or wrong.

And if we approach it that way, I think we have greater chances of getting a consensus from the working party on a statement. And so I throw that out. Am I off-base, am I on-base? I'm just curious what people think.

Jennifer Wolfe: Chuck, do you mean because it was thrown at us without feedback from the working part that - on that basis or do you mean - are you going beyond that point?

Chuck Gomes: No, no. Let me try and explain it better. We had the draft statement out there and there were a couple constituencies who kind of didn't seem like they wanted to support it because they like the recommendation. And what I'm saying is I think the statement can be drafted so it doesn't matter whether you support the recommendation or not.

There are things that we can say from a GNSO perspective that are problematic about the recommendation. So I'm - I think we can put our differences aside in terms of whether we like the recommendation or not and still come up with a statement that, hopefully, all of us can support. And I

don't know if I'm naïve on that or not, but that's what I'm throwing out just for reaction.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, thanks, Chuck. Any reaction from those on the call? Seeing none, I think - I mean, and Chuck, I feel like this is a little bit of our problem is we, you know, we have nine people on the call and there's a lot more represented. So maybe it's better to take this up on list...

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Jennifer Wolfe: ...where we can elicit a response and, hopefully, everyone is coming back to us on that. And I'll just note as well that, as I mentioned at the (unintelligible) - the OEC is deferring on this, so I don't feel like we're under some sort of time pressure as though we have to get something out at a certain point in time.

They're deferring on it and their general discussion was to reject it. But certainly for those who think that it should not be rejected, you know, we want to hear from them so we can get that input. So just looking at our agenda since we've determined we're going to defer our discussion of each of the recommendations until after this survey is out - and I know (Larisa) had a couple questions in the chat, so I want to come back to that.

But I want to point out too - (Ray) pointed out to us in the OEC call that we do have the opportunity to evaluate West Lake. And I know there are a lot of concerns about methodology. I know I have concerns that they - that some of these changes were made without going through the working party, you know, somewhat at the last minute.

I'm sure a lot of you have some issues -- positive, negative -- that you want to raise with regard to West Lake. So (Larisa), can you just clarify what the process will be for us to provide that evaluation?

(Larisa): Sure. This is (Larisa). Thanks, Jen. The process was - and by the way, the - this is a new step in the process and I think a very good one - we talked about it quite a long time ago. My thought would be that there were certain criteria that were used in the selection process of the independent examiner.

And it might be useful to revisit those criteria and evaluate West Lake based on those criteria, and perhaps, provide some additional commentary on your assessment. That also could be done as a survey or, you know, some tool of that nature to help people provide their views and then compile it. So those would be my initial thoughts on how to do it and it - this certainly could be worked on and put together and circulated anytime and give people some time to think through.

Jennifer Wolfe: Is there any time frame in which we're supposed to complete that? Is there a deadline that we have?

(Larisa): No, Jen, no deadline. This is just one of those process improvements and lessons learned to close the loop and have the opportunity of having this information on record and on file as other reviews are conducted and other selection processes are launched. So it's really future and forward-thinking and looking.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, thank you. That's helpful. So it seems like to do some sort of an evaluation like that - some kind of a survey that people could complete on their own - would make the most sense. Does anybody else have comments on how we would go about completing that evaluation?

All right, seeing no other comments or objections to that approach, I think, (Larisa), we could go forward with putting together some type of survey, as you have suggested, and you can let us know what is a reasonable time to try to get that out since we don't have a time constraint. So the last point - and I know, (Larisa) - and actually, why don't we go ahead and address - did you have some other questions on how we put out the recommendations survey?

(Larisa): My question was to the group to get some sense of how much time we should provide for people to respond to the survey...

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, you mean like...

(Larisa): ...for the recommendation?

Jennifer Wolfe: ...should it be open for two or three - you know, my opinion would be that even though it is a relatively short period of time that we put it out quickly and ask for it to be completed before we get to our Dublin meeting so that we can use our time particularly while we're - you know, most of us are in person to this sort of heavy lifting work.

So that would be - I think we're at almost two weeks. Any objections to trying to get it done before we meet in person? Not seeing any objections, Chuck says yes, that's okay, no objections.

Okay, (Larisa), so why don't we plan on getting that work completed before we all meet in person in Dublin?

(Larisa): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck again.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Let's - again, the survey needs to be really quick answers so people don't have to spend hours to complete it (unintelligible).

Jennifer Wolfe: No I think it would be what they put up, I mean, right. I mean, isn't that what we're thinking? Is - it would be what we were just looking at -- that framework...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, just checkboxes.

Jennifer Wolfe: ...of checking the boxes, right, and then making notes if they don't have those.

Chuck Gomes: And if they don't have - and they should be allowed not to check a box if they don't have a response.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. So maybe we have an N/A column on each one of these. And then if you want to make additional notes, you can make additional notes. But I think that will make it much easier...

Chuck Gomes: Don't put - don't make it N/A because that wouldn't necessarily be the case. It's just maybe, hey, I don't have an opinion.

Jennifer Wolfe: Maybe no opinion? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: So maybe a no opinion box on each of them. And it may also be helpful when we circulate this to also recirculate the public comments that were very nicely organized by recommendation so that if you are not sure, you could look at the public comments that were made on each recommendation as additional background.

(Larisa), did you want to comment again?

(Larisa): Yes, I also was going to suggest that it might be useful to circulate information that was assembled by staff and several of you -- certainly Chuck, for sure -- on the first - on the draft set of recommendations. We actually created Wiki pages to capture work underway, Jen, as something that you had required.

So there's some - what might be useful information contained in a different place. So if you're not opposed to this, we could certainly come up with a way to provide some additional useful links and information for those that would like to take the time to look at both public comments as well as initial reactions from several people to the draft recommendations.

Jennifer Wolfe: That, of course, would be extremely helpful. And I think what's been good is being organized by recommendation, then you could go through and see other comments, the public comments, and then come up with your own opinion and go through this exercise of checking the boxes and making any notes.

And that should be good to allow us to see, you know, where do we, as the working party, come out with these recommendations, and then, again, go through them one by one when we meet in Dublin. And on the note of meeting in Dublin, in the chat, (Sharla) circulated the Doodle Poll. We are trying to get a sense of everybody's schedule.

You know, I noted a few people saying their schedules are still not solid. I completely understand. I think we're trying to get in an early morning meeting that may, hopefully, work for the most number of people. So, certainly, if you can respond to that Doodle Poll and help us look at that, we want to try to get as much participation as we can while we can come together face to face.

(Larisa), I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

(Larisa): Oh, that was an old hand. But since I have the floor for a moment, I just wanted to remind everybody in terms of a timeline, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee will not be considering feasibility of these recommendations in Dublin to allow more time for all these processes. Just keep that in mind that we want to make sure that there's sufficient time to go

through this work thoughtfully and recognizing how many other priorities are in front of you all.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And, yes, that's a great point -- just to reinforce that I think we felt under some time pressures that they were going to be making decisions and we needed to get this out as fast as possible. And they very clearly - you know, to (Rudy's) point about this being a, you know, bottom-up process - very clearly, the OEC is looking for, you know, response from the working party and their - I think they're going to give us time to be able to provide those meaningful responses.

So, you know, I think we're going to shoot - you know, shoot high in terms of what we're able to accomplish in person in Dublin. But if we need additional time, I think we can certainly plan on scheduling follow-up calls to take our time and go through these and do meaningful work. So I think, (Larisa), I don't think that's a new hand.

I - unless - is that correct? Okay, perfect. So I think that gets us through our agenda. We're coming up to the top of the hour so I think this was actually a really good use of our time today to update everyone on where we are.

And I appreciate your patience and diligence as we started through this process. And I think we all quickly realized we weren't going to get through all 35 of these, but at least we were able to talk through how this chart will work and, hopefully, be prepared to go in and answer those questions on our own. When it comes out, I will certainly encourage those parties - particularly those who have not been very active - to ensure that we get participation from their constituencies or that we have good and valuable inputs as we move into Dublin.

So any other comments, questions at this point in time? Okay, seeing none, I see (Stephanie's) typing, but, hopefully, there's no - do you have something new, (Stephanie)? No, just a thank you.

Okay, well thanks to everybody for your time and continued commitment to this process. I - it's very important and I certainly appreciate your time. So we will look forward to seeing you all in Dublin. Thanks, everyone.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Jennifer Wolfe: We can end the call now. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Bye, safe travels everybody.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Jewel). You may now stop the recording. This call's adjourned. Thank you for your support today.

END