

**GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 13 November 2014 at 1500 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/gnsoreview20141113-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
Wolf Ullrich Knoben
Ron Andruff
Avri Doria
David Maher

Guest speaker: Richard Westlake

Apologies:

Chuck Gomes
Michele Neylon
Marika Konings

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong
Larisa Gurnick
Lars Hoffman
Matt Ashtiani
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Please go ahead. Today's conference call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you so much (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO view working party on the 13th of November, 2014. On the call today we have Ron Androff, David Maher,

Jennifer Wolfe and (Richard Westlake). Avri Doria will be joining us shortly. We received apologies from Michele Neylon, Chuck Gomes, Wolf Ulrich Knoben and Marika Konings. From staff we have Marie Wong, Larissa Gurnick, Lars Hoffman, Matt Ashtiani and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Jennifer.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you and thanks for those of you who took time to make the call today. We really appreciate it. I know there are a lot of other calls going on in the ICANN space and a lot of overlapping time. So I appreciate those of you who made the time to be here.

We don't have a lot on our agenda. So it probably won't take too much time today but we did want to touch base a few weeks after the Los Angeles meeting and really focus today on what's coming in our work because we will have some of our heavy lifting coming as the Westlake report will be presented to us in December and we'll just review what those dates will be and what our workload is going to look like between December and January and how we'll manage that.

So we'll go ahead and get started on the agenda. I don't know. Is there anything in follow-up to the Los Angeles meeting? Did anyone have anything they wanted to respond to or follow-up on from our in person meeting in Los Angeles?

Matt: Hi. This is Matt.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. Go ahead Matt.

Matt: So I just wanted to give a quick update of just some general activities that went on during the Los Angeles meeting. So just so we all are aware we did almost ten official presentations to various groups including the GNSO

Council, ALAC, SSAC, NCUC and CSG, ISPCP, IPC, BC and RRSC. So we also had a blog from Jen on circle I.D. that went pretty viral.

So that was another really great way for us to get the word out and have the outreach. We also had the video displayed during the public forum including a social media campaign. There were many side meetings and unofficial outreach that eventually led to approximately a hundred and - over actually 152 people completing the survey. So we had an increase of about I think around 30%. But I think overall we had a pretty good run at the L.A. meeting.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's great. Thank you. That's great to hear that the efforts were successful. Ron please go ahead.

Ron Androff: Thank you Jennifer. I just wanted to comment on that as well Matt. I think it's a real tribute to the efforts that staff made to really try to get this out into as many forums as possible during the L.A. meeting. And that's probably one of the first times that I'm aware of where such a concerted effort has been made across all fronts even getting into the opening ceremony and so forth. So really well done and I just wanted to commend all of you for the good effort on that - in that regard. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Ron. Absolutely and it's great to see that the - it turned out in results in the increase in people taking the survey. So thank you yes absolutely everybody for making that happen. As I always say you guys make it very easy to volunteer. So thank you very much. Any other comments on Los Angeles? Okay well then let's move on and get an update from the Westlake. (Richard) would you like to go ahead?

(Richard Westlake): Thank you very much Jen. Yes (Richard) here. Following on from (unintelligible) something like 20 or I'm trying to remember the exact number but about 20 in person interviews in addition to everything else that was going on. We've subsequently also have - we have both launched, promoted and closed the supplementary assessment.

On that one we had much smaller numbers but what we have ended up with is something that I think is very, very helpful for us. In the end in the fortnight or so that the survey was open we had about 50 people start the survey and of those 26 completed the short survey. And a few of those, not many but a few, did two, three or more working groups. So it came through the survey. So the 26 is the total of completions.

What is quite (unintelligible) about that is when somebody's done two or three surveys - sorry two or three working groups you can see the change in time and the change in opinions. So it gives you a bit of a benchmark against which to make sure somebody who simply if you're not coming and talking about one working group.

So we've had a few people who really were very constructive. Now the numbers aren't what you might refer to as statistically valid but they've given us some very useful pointers and again (unintelligible) about what they've given us is that they have given us information which is not always exactly the same but certainly consistent with what we have picked up from both previous observations, interviews, the major survey and also working through the desktop research.

Now for the last two weeks or so in particular we have been heavily involved both in analyzing the results of the original survey and also in completing our desktop research because (unintelligible) or are in now as you can see from what's just gone up on the timeline on the Adobe workgroup is that on the 19th of December we deliver our draft report to you. So we have a lot of work to do over the next few weeks. Thank you Jen. I'm happy to take questions.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Are there any questions for (Richard)? Yes Ron please go ahead.

Ron Androff: Hi (Richard). Good morning or good evening to you sir. Thank you very much for that report. Just wanted to make sure I understand. So we had the 360

assessment that went out and we kept that open for some period of time to try to get as many respondents as possible. So I'd like to speak to that in a second. And then we did the supplemental. That was a much shorter window. That's what you just referred to in this last piece where you said 26 surveys were completed which as you see is not - certainly not a value in terms of the numbers but I appreciate there's some statistical value there. The question I have for you today is not having completed the 360 part and how many - how did that work out for you in terms of numbers? Were we satisfied with the numbers? I'm sorry. I've been working on a lot of things lately and I'm not up to speed on this. So if you could just give us a little bit of information about the 360 itself and what your takeaway was from that after we finished up L.A. Thank you.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you. Okay when we got to do 150 something that had - that completed the major 360 that really did give us some quite substantive material to work with. And we really only in the last week or so have we really started to get the I think a fuller analysis of what was in that.

But we were very comfortable with that because it was a workable amount that I would say there was sufficiently large numbers and sufficiently large number of comments on most of the key areas for us to really get a - both a sense of the range of views but also some very clear understanding because a few people went to considerable lengths in the final three questions to provide further explanation or to address something that weren't even in the original 360.

So the 152 (Marissa) has just put up full responders who got to a certain point within that survey which we regarded as completion is actually quite a healthy number and but still also a manageable number. Thank you. Did that help you?

Ron Androff: Yes it did. Thank you very much (Richard).

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Any other follow-up questions for (Richard)? Okay seeing none we'll go ahead and move on to what our next steps are and I see we already have up on screen our dates which is what's really important. We have next - our next step will be we receive the draft report on December 19 from Westlake and then we are working on scheduling calls for the first and second weeks of January for our work to really begin where we review and discuss and determine the comments that we want to provide back to Westlake.

Matt I know there was a Doodle poll that was circulated. Have we - did we find a good date that was going to work for everyone, a good date and time?

Matt: Hi this is Matt for the record. So I think we were actually going to have both calls. That was the intent.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right.

Matt: And so right now - last night I checked and each one had about ten people that had chosen times.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Matt: So I think that's pretty reasonable...

Jennifer Wolfe: Do we need a reminder out?

Matt: Yes. I can send a reminder out today but just so everybody's aware it closes tomorrow at 23:59 UTC.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. I think that's where we really want to try to get, you know, everybody on the working party to participate in those calls. That's probably the most important part of our whole scope of work is providing that feedback to the Westlake report. So if we can try to get more people to at least select a time I

think that would be helpful. And then our plan will be since I know that's over the holidays but, you know, whatever timeframe works for each of you to invest some time and review the report we'll plan to come together after the first of the year and really dig through the comments that we want to provide and be prepared by January 19 to provide those comments. (Larissa) I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

(Larissa Guernig): Hello everybody. This is (Larissa Guernig). Staff is working on a space on the community wiki that once the report from the draft reports from Westlake comes out we will set up wiki pages for each observation or recommendation or finding or however the report is structured to give everybody a central place to post their comments, questions and discussions to make it easier given the holidays and the - and a lot of work that the working party has to go through. We thought that that might make it easier to aggregate everybody's comments.

So if people have feedback on whether that would be useful or there are some other tools that might be preferred we're happy to consider that. But at the moment the plan is to create wiki pages to collect everybody's comments, feedback and questions. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you (Larissa). Ron please go ahead.

Ron Androff: Okay thanks and actually my question goes back to the update from Westlake. I didn't know we were moving through it so fast. So I'm happy to let others speak before I come back to that.

Jennifer Wolfe: No go ahead please.

Ron Androff: Okay thank you. (Richard) coming back I'm just looking at the agenda. We talked about the 360 assessment. We talked about the 360 supplemental assessment, pardon me, but we didn't talk about the interviews at all. I just wanted to get a sense from you how many interviews were conducted.

What was your general take away from the interviews? Were the interviews face to face interviews? Did they jive with the assessments themselves or were you finding new information coming from them? Just wanted to get a little more understanding of that. Thank you.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you Ron. This is (Richard Westlake) again. As far as the interviews went we did something I forget the exact number but 20 or so interviews during the Los Angeles week. We're still processing. We had a number of other people still to call but what they're trying to do is really to refine down whatever it is we still need to probe so we can have a really valuable and relatively short question set.

I think as you'd expect the people we spoke to the vast majority of those interviews were actually very valuable indeed and certainly put a lot of reason and if you like rationale behind the comments that came out in the 360.

There was probably nothing in terms of - nothing much more in terms of the breadth of the comments but in terms of the depth of explanation and understanding and sometimes even seeing why various comments had been made it was absolutely priceless, absolutely invaluable in terms of giving us a deeper understanding both for people (unintelligible) position but also what some of the issues were.

So there's been absolutely no question to my mind. However our typical finding in reviews of this nature with our (unintelligible) and with other customers is that it's those one to one interviews that really give you the richness of your data research. But it was only so much you can say in a survey or only so much you will say in a survey. Whereas when you're sitting with someone you build a bit of trust over half to three quarters of an hour. They were quite a number of people who really did open up quite extensively to us both in a positive and a dare I see emotional sense in a couple of times. Thank you.

Ron Androff: Great. Thanks (Richard). May I follow on Jen?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes please go ahead.

Ron Androff: This is Ron continuing then. So when you had these face to face interviews and people were really forthcoming was there a percentage of people that you could say were concerned about the structural issues within ICANN in terms of the GNSO structure and those types of things? Or did you find when you had those conversations that the structure of the GNSO, the house structure that we've talked often about, whether that was a non-issue for those? Any comments on that? Thank you...

(Richard Westlake): Well I would have to say that even though we said - we made the point a few times and some people made the point to us that this is not a structural review of the GNSO, we had quite a material number of very consistent comments saying you cannot review the GNSO without making it a review of the structure. And some people had very strong views indeed on the structure.

So I would say no. They certainly did not ignore it. And they felt it was very relevant. Many people felt it was very relevant to the whole review process. So we've got to work out how to balance that but remain also within our overall terms of reference. But Ron absolutely that was one of the issues that a lot of people did focus on.

Ron Androff: All right I'm grateful to hear that response insomuch as this was the feeling of many of us on the committee on this work party - I well this is a work party. In any case many of us had this thing nagging in the back of our head and we were a little concerned that we didn't put enough attention to it in terms of the survey and other things. So I'm glad that it did come out and it means that you're going to be giving a lot of significant thought to that. So obviously if

there's more that we can be doing here as a work party to inform and support that please bring it to our attention. Thank you.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Ron. And so just to clarify (Richard) so there will be some reference to that in your report. Is that correct? Is that what we heard?

(Richard Westlake): Jen I think to be quite honest we couldn't do a report with integrity based on the information we have without referring to it even if we do have a (unintelligible) that this is strictly outside the terms of reference.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. That's great. Thank you. (Larissa) did you still have a comment or a question you wanted to raise?

(Larissa Guernig): Thank you Jen. This is (Larissa). I forgot to put my hand down but since I have the floor I did want to just clarify and follow up on (Richard's) point that the request to Westlake was to conduct a review which didn't necessarily include re-structuring or proposing a - the way that the GNSO may need to be restructured.

But it was very much within the purview of their work is to look at how effective the organization is which necessarily would include whether the structure is working and this is something that they will be expected to analyze and comment on based on all the feedback including their own analysis.

So just to continue to clarify that point that it's how it should be restructured, if it should be restructured that they weren't asked to do but certainly we fully expect that a review of the structure would necessarily have to address the fact of how the organization is structured and whether that structure is working for the purpose of the organization. I hope that that helps. I know that

we've tried to clarify and refine this point and make sure that it was clear and please let me know if that clarifies things. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. So just to be clear on December 19 we'll - will we be receiving an email from Westlake? Will it be a word document that we can mark up? Will it be a PDF? What should we expect in terms of what we receive? (Larissa)?

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

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead.

(Richard Westlake): Sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: (Larissa) did you want to respond or (Richard)?

(Larissa Guernig): Yes I'll be happy to respond. This is (Larissa). Our expectation is that the report will be shared with the working party in its form - whatever form it comes in. And we will probably to make it easier for everybody we'll circulate the document itself. For those that may not have access to, you know, the wiki we will also post it on the wiki.

And as I said we will within a few days after receiving the report when we see the structure of it we will also set up wiki pages to capture the working party members' comments, questions and such to make it a little bit easier to aggregate feedback and see the substance of the report. Having said that of course we don't know what the actual report is going to look like yet. So we're anticipating this as best as we can and we'll continue to work with Westlake to make it useful for all of you. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: And then just a follow up question to that. As we look at and I think that's great if we have a wiki and we can make comments and we can all, you know, go through the document as we need to. But when we look at preparing our formal feedback on January 19 it - is the expectation that that

would be in the form of some sort of written report or recommendations or that it is a red line of what they provided. What's the expectation of what we are going to deliver back as our final product?

(Larissa Guernig): I will let (Rich) - this is (Larissa). I will let (Richard) answer that question.

(Richard Westlake): Thank you (Larissa). Thank you Jen. (Richard) here again. We would certainly not expect you to come back by means of some sort of thesis of your own. What would be helpful would be rather than having perhaps the entire working group 20 people each putting individual sets of comments against a markup word version of a document.

If it was possible to break the various components of our report and provide if you like a range of responses as a separate document though that would certainly be very, very helpful to work through it if you like section by section. The easier it is for us obviously the - sorry the purer it is - the easier it is but I wouldn't want to be prescriptive about how you respond to us. Thank you Jen.

But likewise I don't want to put too much burden on you recognizing you only have one month and as you say it is over the holiday period.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well I think as a working party once we actually see the report and see what we're dealing with and see some of the initial comments, you know, that can certainly be one of the first things that we address in our calls in early January is how do we want to present the information back to you. But that was helpful to just get some perspective from you.

So look at the dates just moving forward then. So we'll have our - we'll have a call in the first week of January, a second call the second week of January and then we will be working to deliver our feedback by January 19. The next step is to have updates and discussions during ICANN 52 in February and then the draft report will be posted for public comment. I just want - oh so I'm

sorry. Was there a date where this is publicly posted for the first time or is that in - that's February 13? Is that correct?

(Larissa Guernig): That's correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. I was just trying to make sure I understand. So the first time it's presented is February 13 and it's open for comments through March 27?

(Larissa Guernig): Yes Jen and as - this is (Larissa). And as of course everybody probably realizes by now in February we have the next ICANN meeting. So the expectation is that the time of the next ICANN meeting can also be used to continue the type of outreach that we've done in L.A. and in London in terms of making sure that the community and the others that haven't had a chance to participate fully up to this point would have the opportunity to be familiarized with the draft report and be aware that the public comment period is coming up. So we'll do a lot of the same type of outreach as was done in L.A. that Matt had discussed to ensure that everybody's aware of the public comment period and also has an opportunity to engage. Thank you...

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And the final report on April 30 will we have another opportunity to provide further comments once we see the public comments or is the what we provide on January 19 the last time we have an opportunity to provide our input?

(Larissa Guernig): This is (Larissa) Jen. I think that's an excellent question. We were very focused on filling out the timeline leading up to the first public comment period.

So I think that maybe with some input from you and the working party we can come up with some more detailed steps in terms of opportunities for feedback from this group. Certainly having done this much work going through this process we want to make sure that if there's still substantive conversations and questions and topics being discussed that your group would have the

opportunity to provide feedback to Westlake before the report is finalized. But I know (Richard) shares my, you know, sort of question too to a certain extent not knowing - not having seen the report yet it's hard for us to anticipate the number of topics and the length of time.

So as we've done all along we'll continue to look very carefully at the timeline and if it looks like there's not sufficient time for either Westlake to consider all the feedback or for, you know, them to complete their report and summarize all the feedback we will take a closer look at that timing.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Thank you. And I think you're probably absolutely right. Once we see the report and we see where we are in early January we could discuss that again as part of our agenda. Does anyone else have questions about the timeframe or expectations of our work over the next couple of months or any other comments, questions? Okay. Seeing none is there any other business that anyone needs to discuss? Yes (Richard) please go ahead.

(Richard Westlake): Jen thank you. (Richard Westlake) again. I think I really ought to take - just take the opportunity to in this more - this forum here just to apologize for our error during the working group 360 for the time that we did in fact put the set of addressees into the two column in our invitation email. We have apologized and we do apologize for that oversight. I hope it hasn't created too much problem for anybody.

I'd have to say from our end only three people in the end, one person (unintelligible) with us and two people did respond after we had brought it to their attention. It's one of those things you can't undo but we had in fact devised processes to make sure as far as possible that it can't happen again because now should there be any further mass mail outs we have a two step authorization process now which will take place before anything does go out. So again my apologies.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you (Richard). Did anyone else have any questions or comments about that issue? Okay. I see in the chat there's some discussion about circulating the time table that's on screen. I think that that will be circulated so you can have those dates on your calendar. Is there any other business that we need to discuss today? Okay thank you. I know this was largely administrative just discussing what we have coming up but I appreciate all of you making the time for the call. And our next couple calls will obviously be much more substantive and in depth. So we'll look forward (Richard) to seeing the report on the 19th and to getting our call set in early January. So I look forward to speaking with you all after the holidays. Okay thank you. Thanks very much. So that'll bring the meeting to a close.

Man: Thanks Jen (unintelligible).

Man: Thanks Jen. Thanks everyone.

Woman: (Unintelligible) you will now stop the recording. Have a good day.

END