GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 04 September 2014 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnsoreview20140904-en.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
Wolf Ullrich Knoben
Osvaldo Novoa
Ron Andruff
Philip Sheppard

Guest speaker: Richard Westlake

Apologies:
Chuck Gomes
Avri Doria
Michele Neylon
David Maher

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Larisa Gurnick
Mary Wong
Lars Hoffman
Matt Ashtiani
Brenda Brewer
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have now started. You may proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Damon). Good morning, good afternoon and good

                evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party call on

                the 4th of September, 2014.

On the call today we have Philip Sheppard, Jennifer Wolfe, Wolfe-Knoben and Ron Andruff. Our guest speaker is Richard Westlake. We have received apologies from Avri Doria, Chuck Gomes, David Maher and Michele Neylon.

From staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Matt Ashtiani, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. Mary Wong from staff has just joined the call.

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

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks. And thanks to those of you on the phone. I know there's some competing events going on today and a number of people were not able to attend but I appreciate all of you being on the line to participate in our continued discussions on the review.

We do want to get an update on where things stand with regard to the 360 assessment responses and move forward with the agenda as outlined. I did just want to bring up one point, which may or may not be an issue for those of you on the phone but there are 20 members of this working party and so far we've only had four complete the 360 assessment.

And I know I was one of those so for the other three thank you very much for completing it but for any of you who are on the phone who have not completed the assessment please do. Certainly as part of the working party it's very helpful if at least we complete it and then certainly encouraging, you know, our respective constituency stakeholder groups to participate as well is very important.

I'll send out a quick note on the list as well reminding everybody but certainly anything you can do to help encourage others to participate would be greatly appreciated.

So with that I think I will turn it over to Richard to give us an update on what our responses have been and the current status of the assessment.

Richard Westlake: Hi, Jen. Thank you, this is Richard Westlake speaking. Looking through the survey I can advise that in fact we have now had three more responses. I have not yet had a chance to check whether those are - whether we have any more members of the review working party who have completed it but Jen, thank you very much indeed for your encouragement to the review working party team members.

You'll see on the screen is the update that I sent through about 48 hours ago showing the spread of the people who have completed it. We have about - just under 40% of the people who have done so and we are now looking at a total of 84 people who have entered. But of those probably only - still only about 40-45 have actually completed the survey.

So as of next Monday we will be proposing now to send a brief reminder - sorry, next Monday your time, Tuesday our time, we will be sending a reminder email to everybody who has started the survey but not completed it unless there are people who have simply gone in and not even entered their own email address, if they're people who've just obviously been taking a look from outside.

And the intention is to send a first reminder next - beginning of next week which will be about the 8th or 9th of September and then one week later on the 16th to send the final reminder because that is going to be approximately one week before the survey closes off.

And I think what we'll see from the diagram that's showing in the Adobe room there are some further pages we sent through which gained a greater analysis. And one of the helpful points is that of the people who have been completing the survey more recently they do tend to be people who have

indicated that they have attended rather more ICANN meetings so they tend to be I think people who probably have more experience with ICANN and therefore one hopes a greater understanding of what is going on.

Jen, I think in the summary that's my update for you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. And, Ron, I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Jen. This is Ron Andruff from the BC. Thank you very much for the report which one question that's coming to my mind as I'm kind of reflecting on this is there a bailout point where people hit on a couple of questions and they say that's it, I'm out? Or are people abandoning at different stages along the way? And do you have any input on that you could share with us? Thank you.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. If I could reply directly to that, Ron. What we're seeing is that there is a - there's a very high dropout rate within about the first four or five - first half dozen or so questions. But once somebody hits the first of the questions where you can say you're involved or you're not involved and you then start skipping, once people get to that first stage with only very few exceptions they have been carried right on through towards the end.

So I don't - we're not seeing people dropping out once they get into the substance of the review so I think that's quite encouraging. So those who have taken the trouble to do it have at least done it properly.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: I had just one follow-up question, too, Richard. Are people actually filling out the text boxes where they have the opportunity to be, you know, more ad hoc and write whatever they want? Are people actually doing that because I know that was a big issue was would we be able to say what we want to say or if

there was a question that wasn't addressed? Are we seeing a lot of feedback coming in from a qualitative standpoint?

Richard Westlake: Jen, look, I can't give you a general answer because we haven't been through the 84. As typically happens there's quite a variety. There are a few people who are putting comments in. What I would expect and what I've certainly seen in the past is that the quantity of comments drops off through the course of the review. As you proceed you really just want to get to the end I expect - if my psychology of completing a survey is anything to go by.

So that wouldn't surprise me but I do think the number of good solid comments is going to be probably significantly lower than just the numbers who have completed the quantitative analysis.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Are any other comments or questions from the working party to Richard on just the current update on where we stand? Yes, Philip, please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks. Philip here. Just a couple of comments really, I thought it was quite interesting that we had probably something like four or five responses from the GAC. I thought that was potentially good news in terms of that level of interest.

And I notice one issue just as I was going through it and doing some of the text responses that sometimes I just wanted to say something perhaps a little broader than the direction the question was taking me in which I did so.

And then I came to the next text box and in fact I was wanting to say roughly the same thing and in this case I simply repeated that. But in my experience many other people don't do that, they sometimes say "same as above." So I just hope that when they do that you'll be able to sort of look back and see (unintelligible).

I know it's slightly more tedious to do that in terms of compiling answers, but sometimes it - when you get into the detail or substance then you're actually thinking about, you know, free text answers it becomes a little more - I think then you start to realize I think, you know, the difference between the simplicity of the questions and sometimes the complexity of the answers but is something to look out for.

Richard Westlake: Yes, Philip. I think that's exactly right. There are certainly quite a few of those, you know, see above, as above, those types of responses. And that really - what that does essentially is it just makes the task of collating and analyzing a little bit more tedious. But I think we've got enough there to be able to do that. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Any other comments or questions on the current status? So it sounds like we've got a reminder email going out next week and in the coming weeks. Are we still - what is - what have we extended the deadline to at this point?

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, this is Larisa. I posted in the comments box that the notification just went out yesterday and there's a link to the updated announcement. The assessment has been extended until the 23rd of September.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great. So we can check back in on our next call and we'll still - our next call is on the 18th so if for some reason we think we need a further extension is that possible or are we reaching the end of our time period on this?

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, this is Larisa. Maybe we can discuss this later down in the agenda when we talk about the updates to the timeline. But at this point of course quality is a most importance and staff is doing quite a bit and thanks to you, by the way, Jen, for agreeing to do a blog and various other means of reminding people that the survey is available for response and, you know, we'll see quite a bit of communication, support happening this week and next to make

a real heavy push in the next several weeks. So we anticipate that we'll have good responses with everyone's help. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. Okay. Well if there are no further comments or questions on the updates, let's move on to the second item which was to discus the supplementary assessment with regard to working groups. I know Chuck's not on the call and just wanted to recap he had made a comment on list that he was concerned about it competing with or overlapping with the current review and that perhaps we should wait to launch that.

Any comments or discussion on that suggestion? And, Larisa, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead and then I see Philip too.

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, thank you Jen. Certainly from the staff perspective and Westlake perspective we would really appreciate some thoughts and ideas and comments on the timing of the supplementary survey. Many of us share the same concern as Chuck and want to make sure that this is done in the most clear way for the folks that are interested in responding.

And of course the other aspect that we would very much appreciate feedback on is the construct of the survey and the main focus is on does it make sense to generalize the survey for any working group based on the way working groups are constructed? Or would it be more valuable and productive to ask questions relative to a specific working group based on the responder's experience?

So I just wanted to frame those topics as ones that we would very much appreciate feedback on. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Larisa. Philip, please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks. Philip Sheppard here. Yes, in general I think I support the comments that Chuck had made and in particular on the timing. I think you'll have both

sort of issues to deal with interest level if we had the two running simultaneously but also issues to do with confusion and that people may complete the second survey and think that's the whole thing.

So I either thought it would be better to indeed do that directly after the closure of the first which will also give the advantage that certainly as we're collecting email addresses from the first, you'll also be able to target all those who are happy to be identified directly with an invitation to complete the supplementary survey which I think would be helpful.

On that last question just raised in terms of generalizing or not, it's a very good question and I'm uncertain as to the answer. But my suspicion is that my own experience of working groups have been that they were often very different in character depending on the subject matter, the chairman who was participating, the date, you know, was it one of the earlier working groups or ones that happen later.

So I would have thought it would be quite challenging to generalize feedback. And I think probably getting more specific feedback would allow you to have more concrete information and then would have to leave it to Westlake to pick out from that the more general points.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Philip. Ron, I see you're next. Please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jennifer. I support what Philip is saying and Chuck is saying. I think it's a little bit confusing for the community in many ways if we're - we've created a survey, we put the survey out. We've extended the dates on the survey. We're now promoting the survey - and I'm speaking of this current one - quite extensively.

I think if were now to launch a second survey or an addendum to this survey, if you will, it's going to cause a lot of confusion amongst the community as, you know, which survey are we talking about? I think I did that one already.

So for that reason we may want to hold this one in abeyance until we've got the first one completed and then make an announcement that we're going now in a deeper dive into the working group elements. So that's my knee jerk reaction to that.

But as I was reflecting on the fact - I scanned the survey just the other day. Of course we had a long holiday weekend, I apologize I haven't had a chance to look at all of the documentation in more detail.

But as I scanned it, it occurred to me that as the chair of the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation we had worked on developing a survey that would be sent to working groups with an outside contractor after the working group had completed its work to get a sense of was that an effective working group or not and why.

And so I'm going to go back and in fact I think Marika is on this - is on the call now. Marika may be help me or she's dropped off now I see. But Marika was working with us on development of that survey within the SCI and certainly we have other staff support there.

So I can go back and ask them and what I'll ask, Jen, is if they could forward me a copy or a link to where that survey resides and perhaps there's some value in looking at the questions that were presented in there to see if we can enhance the draft that Westlake has put forward.

Because I think one of the problems I have with the Westlake draft is that I'm not sure am I responding to a specific working group? In fact when I read it I was wondering if I was responding to this working group and answer questions in regard to the work that we're doing here in this working party or working group.

So it's a little bit confusing to me where we stand with the Westlake survey right now. And I know we had that other survey so I think it would be - benefit us.

Marika, I see you've responded in the chat. Perhaps, could you speak to the survey that we developed a little bit and perhaps point us in the right direction? Thank you.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And I'm actually trying to find the link because indeed we developed the survey and it's one of the requirements that working groups indeed finish their work.

And specifically targeted at PDP working groups that they complete that survey so there's some feedback, you know, for staff and as well as the Council on, you know, what their experiences were, you know, were the requirements that, you know, are applicable to PDP working groups under the PDP manual as well as the Working Group Guidelines; were they respected?

Did they, you know, receive the information they needed? You know, was the support level as they expected? So those are some of the questions that are in there. But I'll dig out that link and send it to you, Ron. And happy as well to share with the broader working party as well as Westlake if that is helpful.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Marika. I think that would be helpful. So I think there's definitely consensus that we don't want to create confusion and overlap and there may be some more clarification on the working group party. Any other comments - or the working group survey, excuse me. Any other comments from anyone?

Okay. So I think - so, Larisa and Richard, I think there's some consensus that we shouldn't just release it yet and we can continue discussion on list and in our next call to ensure that we make it very clear what is expected and certainly leverage the list of people that we have who have participated on working groups.

Okay. Any other comments on that point?

Richard Westlake: Jen, could I just make a comment? It's Richard again here. Could I comment? One surprise I had when I think Ron was speaking just a moment ago saying that when he went through the draft of the supplementary one he wasn't sure whether it was a generic or a specific working group that he was responding in relation to.

I'm happy to strengthen the wording but we were quite specific that right at the beginning we say which GNSO working group are you commenting on in this survey? So I was hoping that that would be sufficient to focus people that it is one specific one and to say if you wish to provide feedback on more than one please complete this survey once for each working group you're providing feedback on.

So I'm sorry if that wasn't clear when you looked through the draft. I hope it would be when you come in and do it as a survey. But certainly I'm happy to have another look at that.

Ron Andruff: Richard, this is Ron. I just wanted to comment that I really did a quick scan of the whole thing and so I read that at the beginning that the introductory comments. But as I was going through it my brain was seeing it in a different light. And again, it was a quick scan so it probably wasn't your error as much as it was mine.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Move too quickly and...

((Crosstalk))

Richard Westlake: Very kind of you but, you know, if you, you know, we have to assume that other people may so where we do - what we might do is have to change the headings to something like participation in relation to this working group or something like that.

Ron Andruff: Indeed that would be helpful. Thank you very much.

Richard Westlake: Thank you, Ron.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. Moving on, on our agenda then Item 3 is the interviews to supplement data gathering. Richard, would you like to provide an update on that?

Richard Westlake: Yes, thank you very much Jen. Well we've been speaking briefly about the range of interviews that we wish to complete. And I think we are - we haven't yet got the point of assembling a full list in conjunction with Larisa and Matt as to whom we should be interviewing.

What we would be targeting is a number of in face - in person interviews during ICANN in Los Angeles and balance, I would suspect, possibly the same number again, remotely by phone or Skype.

We're thinking of no more than probably 20 in each so a total of somewhere between 30 and 40 interviews. So we want to get an adequate spread to the representative to make sure that we are speaking to people who have clearly got something worthwhile to say.

Now we have actually been approached directly by a small number of people to date saying I'm really keen to have a chat to you. And we want to reach out within the next week I would suggest but we're very keen also to take suggestions as to people that we should approach.

Jennifer Wolfe: Richard, just one quick question and then I certainly want to open it up to
                  everyone else. Is there any criteria that you're using to determine who is
                  interviewed and who is not? Because I am quite certain that when this is all
                  said and done and people see who was interviewed there will inevitably be
                  some criticism. So I think it would be helpful to know if there is some objective
                  criteria as to whom is interviewed and who is not?

Richard Westlake: And this stage, Jennifer, we haven't formalized those, but you're exactly right.
                  And I'm afraid that part of the real life aspect of this is one or two - a few of
                  the people that we will aim to go to will be less because we think they're likely
                  to have valuable input but more that they're likely to be noisy if we don't.

Jennifer Wolfe: Of course, absolutely. But any comments from the group? I mean, I think
                  certainly looking at, you know, representation among the various, you know,
                  SOs and ACs, would be helpful to ensure that we're trying to have something
                  there. Those who would be noisy if they're not interviewed I think is
                  reasonable too.

                  But any other comments? Ron, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jennifer. Yeah, I think that - well what struck me, as I'm hearing
                  Richard say 20 and 20, the question that came to my mind was how do you
                  manage - how do you intend to implement that? Will you have a desk in the
                  general area where all of the trade stands are and so forth and people can
                  sort of sign up for an interview? Or will you actually be doing it off in a hallway
                  where people won't be exposed to you?

                  I'm just trying to understand what the methodology will be. And also I'd like to
                  know why 20? Because I would assume that with, you know, several
                  thousand people in LA at the ICANN meeting more could be interviewed. I'm
                  just trying to understand the rationale for 20 and how this will be done. Thank
                  you.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. If I could comment direct, Jen, thank you. First of all, no, we weren't proposing to, if you like, set up a stall sort of (unintelligible) here; we were aiming to reach out to people ahead of the ICANN meeting so that we can set a number of appointments so they would be set aside. This is something that we have done quite successfully and quite extensively in the past, not only in relation to work with ICANN.

And the other question, why 20 and 20? As much as anything, overall scope and size of the assignment. When we first completed the response to the RFP if I remember, Larisa, the wording was something along the lines of funnel up interviews if required and it was - the assumption was it would be a relatively - a very small - well, a relatively small number.

It's one of those things where you could interview perhaps 100 people. But my experience is that once you had - as long as you've got a reasonable cross section you have something like let's say an 85% solution really after you completed your first 8 or 10 interviews.

And from there on it's very much doing two things. Firstly, filling in the gaps that are still remaining but secondly, just testing to make sure is the first impression actually (unintelligible) or are we missing something. But I think you do get very rapidly to the point of diminishing returns in terms of the overall quality and value you get from the interviews.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Richard. So since the timing is during the ICANN meeting, can I assume that during our next call there may be more refinement on what is the criteria and how are those being selected? Is that correct?

Richard Westlake: Indeed. And in fact, Jen, I think we have to start reaching out to people within the next week because I'm very conscious of how people's calendars fill up very rapidly around an ICANN week.

Jennifer Wolfe: And is the list of who's interviewed, is that intended to be confidential or will that be - that will be public?

Richard Westlake: Certainly the - who we are interviewing would be something we'd anticipate completing, again, if people are willing for their name to be released. It would normally be part of our final report just as those who agree to have their names forwarded in the survey.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great.

Richard Westlake: If, on the other hand, somebody says no, I don't want anybody knowing that you've spoken to me, but this is really important stuff, we will have to make our own judgment as to the value of what they're telling us, but we would have to respect that confidentiality.

Jennifer Wolfe: Any other comments or questions on the interviews to be scheduled? Okay. Yes ,Larisa, please.

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, it's Larisa. I just wanted to also remind everybody that there will be a working session and we'll be talking about this later in the agenda - a working session for this group, the GNSO Review Working Party.

                    And certainly that would be an excellent opportunity to provide feedback and we can talk about how to structure that working session in a way that would facilitate this sort of discussion between the Westlake team and this group which in its own right represents 20 people from diverse parts of the GNSO community.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. That is a perfect segue into that next item on our agenda which is the ICANN working session. It looks like you have a note here, we have room available on Sunday I think is October 12 at 2:30; is that correct? Am I reading that...

Matt Ashtiani: That is correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Matt Ashtiani: But just one point - and this is Matt. The ICANN schedule is not finalized. That's what we've requested but the schedule is not absolutely finalized.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay so that's tentative. Any comments or concerns about that timeframe on Sunday afternoon? Okay, seeing none - and that's something we could certainly put on list as well just for any comments. Yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Sunday at 2:30 that's as well in the middle I think of the GNSO meeting with the Board so I'm not really sure...

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh.

Marika Konings: ...if that is something that members may want to attend. I probably already (unintelligible) with Matt as well and maybe suggested that actually after 4:30 on Sunday may be better, the GNSO is schedule to meet with the GAC from I think from 3:00 to 4:30. So and I think after that some stakeholder groups and constituencies may have private meetings but at least there are no GNSO-wide meetings after 4:30 on Sunday as far as I'm aware.

Jennifer Wolfe: Is that something we can take into consideration?

Matt Ashtiani: Yeah, this is Matt for the record. I can follow up on that. So let me just check back with (Sharla) and the meeting team and see what's going on.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great. Because I know - I know for many of us that's - the GNSO Board meeting on Sunday is typically a very important meeting and I'm afraid we would lose a lot of people. Philip.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah, just on the same topic, I mean, if I remember correctly sometimes we have sort of also various technical sessions on sort of Sunday morning and maybe running in parallel to one of those could work as well rather than pushing it to late that day.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think indeed that was the case in the past but I think the schedule at least as it was for the last couple of meetings and I think as is also shaping up for this meeting or at least of course it depends on confirmation and availability of people that have been invited is that because Sunday morning it's likely, again, meeting with GDD, Teresa and Fadi.

I think more of the working sessions have been moved to Saturday and a lot of the meetings with either ICANN executives and - or other groups like the Board and the GAC are now taking place on Sunday. So just, you know, free to take into account.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah, okay. Well, maybe Saturday is an option then. But anyway we'll leave it to you guys to see what's best.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. I know it's not an easy task to find a slot and there's always going to be a conflict for somebody. But certainly if we can try to find a good window that has the least amount of conflict for those particularly maybe looking at those who are actively participating in these meetings and trying to take those voices into consideration. So thank you - thank you for...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: ...during ICANN. Okay. I think that moves us to our next item which is to review the timeline update. Larisa, is that you or Richard?

Larisa Gurnick: That's me, Jen. I just wanted to update this group on the fact that obviously we are taking a look - closer look at the timeline - the original timeline that was published.

We need to extend that timeline for the fact that the survey timeframe has been extended in taking very careful look at all the details and steps in the process to make sure we've got ample time built in to the timeline for all the work that's underway but also for meaningful and productive exchange between Westlake and this group, the GNSO Review Working Party as the findings and the initial recommendations start taking shape so that there would be good opportunities for this group to provide feedback, corrections, clarifications, and such.

And then of course follow the normal process of having a draft published for public comment. And of course we're hitting the holiday time right around then. So we expect to have a proposed updated timeline to this group that will also consider the feedback regarding the supplemental working group survey and kind of pushing off that timeline.

So we will take all that away and come back to you probably next week with some proposed new dates to plan around.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. We will look forward to that and we certainly appreciate the flexibility so that we can ensure we get, you know, sufficient data and to be taking all the feedback into consideration and so we're - I think the - at least I know from our meetings within the GNSO there's been very positive response to the ability to have some flexibility so we appreciate you working with us in that regard.

Any other comments or questions? Well, seeing none I think that brings us to the end of our agenda. Our next meeting is scheduled for two weeks from today, Thursday, September 18, same time. And we'll continue any other discussions on list and look forward to regrouping in two weeks.

Thank you.

END