

**GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 15 May 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/gnso-review20140515-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Stephane Van Gelder
Jennifer Wolfe
Avri Doria
Volker Greimann

Apologies:

Oswaldo Novoa
Thomas Rickert

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Larisa Gurnick
Matt Ashtiani
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Thank you. The recordings are started. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Miguel). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This the GNSO Review Working Party call on the 15th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Jennifer Wolfe and Stéphane Van Gelder. We have a tentative apology from Oswaldo Novoa. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry, Larisa Gurnick, (unintelligible) and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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. This is Jen Wolfe. We'll go ahead and get started with our agenda. We don't have very many participants as of yet but in the interest of time we'll go ahead and start moving through the agenda. And I think part of what we might want to discuss is if this is the right meeting time or if we just haven't allowed enough time for more people to volunteer.

Our first item on the agenda is the actual - the membership updates. And so, Stéphane, I guess I would just ask, you know, again now that we're on the record, you know, any thoughts on what we might need to do to get more participation in moving this forward? I know we have a number of Council members who are not currently on the call.

We've also had, just to raise the issue, the Brand Registry Group has requested membership and because the Council determined in the last meeting that it should be just for existing GNSO membership they were declined membership in this working party. But if we're struggling to get volunteers I just wonder if we should perhaps open it up to them to have some others participating. Stéphane, do you have any thoughts on that?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, thanks, Jen. This is Stéphane Van Gelder. So I think there's a couple of issues - some of which we were discussing before the call that we can repeat now that we're on the record.

First of all the information on the group itself is probably not disseminated through the community quite yet. The Business Constituency, for example, was made aware I believe last week and that's when I asked to join. So I didn't actually know that the group was already up and running.

So we probably want to - we may want to put out another short information point on the fact that the group's up and running and may be the way it's organized, which I still don't know, I mean, who's leading it and what's the, you know, the format of the group might help.

And we probably also want to review membership at this time and just see, you know, if we feel we have wide representation from the community. And the last point is probably that this was mentioned in earlier discussion as well and I believe that the current GNSO chair, Jonathan Robinson, has put out a call for the SO and AC chairs letting them know that the group exists. So just maybe a gentle reminder that they might want to be - to have some observe or be involved in the proceedings. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. And I see Avri and Volker just joined. We were just discussing if we - our membership - and you can see the list on the Adobe Connect of the current working party members but - that we only have a few of us on the call and that was the same during the last call.

So I don't know if either of you have any comments to add to anything else we might do to recruit members to actively participate? If not we can go ahead and move on to talk about the scope of work. Oh yes, Avri, thanks.

Avri Doria: Hi. Yes, I just had one comment to make - and for me it's sort of unfortunate that this blew up -- in a sense -- the way it did. When we last talked about it at our meeting we were kind of a - there has to be at least one from every stakeholder group at these meetings. And then that spread to at least one from every constituency.

And now we're up to two's and three's and yes, we should do some reach out. But it's growing by leaps and bounds and that's okay. I mean, that dye has already been cast. But, you know, this isn't going to be a lean group anymore; this is going to be another one of those sort of unwieldy, now we get to talk about a charter for months and so on and so forth.

I worry that, you know, as opposed to making sure that we had at least a representative from each of the stakeholder groups which had been the point we started from. So I just wanted to sort of log that disappointment. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, Avri. Thank you for the comment. And I understand in terms of the invitation that's been extended but at the same time there's only a couple of us on the phone so, you know, from a practical standpoint it may or may not become a large issue.

Stéphane, yes.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, Stéphane again. Interesting point there, Avri. Obviously I wasn't privy to the discussions that went on at Council level so I didn't realize that the initial intent was to have a very limited group. I was going to say what Jen said that even though the call has gone out more widely it certainly hasn't been answered more widely or at least it doesn't seem to have been judging by today's call.

And I also note, as an additional point in the list that we've got on the Adobe Connect that some of the - at least the registrars don't seem to have put up a volunteer yet although Volker being on the call I suppose that would tend to indicate that there is a registrar presence.

And we don't have any SO AC observers. I don't know if that was the intent initially or not to open up the group to those kind of observers. But I would certainly think that we'd want to have those observers if we can. I fully appreciate the limited group size sentiment. It's always been a problem with these kind of groups in ICANN. But I also think we need to be properly representative of the community. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Stéphane. And, Marika, I see your hand is up but I'll just add one other point. Avri talked about forming a charter, I mean, this isn't a formal,

you know, PDP process; this is a pretty short-lived process where we're on an aggressive timetable between now and the London meeting to provide the feedback for the 360 assessment, which we'll talk about in the call today here in a moment.

But this is really going to move forward pretty quickly which is why if we don't have people showing up for the calls we're not getting the input that we're going to need. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. This is just to confirm that invitation has also gone out to the SO and AC leaders from Jonathan to note that, you know, they have the ability to point an observer to this process. And also to note that in the call for volunteers of course we made very clear that a certain time commitment is required to participate in this group. As Jen noted, you know, quite some work is expected to be undertaken in a relatively short time.

So I think that may also already put a natural break on the number of members we may get and we may need to accept that and maybe a smaller group of people that are actually able to dedicate the time to that.

So I think as well it's very important for this group to think about how to communicate and, you know, reach out to others that may not be able to dedicate that time but still are able to provide input, you know, either through comments or discussions, for example, on the Council or within stakeholder groups and constituencies that may still feed that into the discussions of the working party.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thanks, Marika. Avri, I see your hand is up again.

Avri Doria: Yes, just a quick thing. I wasn't suggesting that we needed a charter. It was just from the conversation that I joined the meeting in the middle of I got that feeling of that landslide that happens once you have great masses of people and then, yes, I know we've only got a few on the call.

And then you start sliding into all these other - oh but then we need - then we need - then we need.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure.

Avri Doria: And so I was really just worried. I very much agree that we need at least one from every stakeholder group and it's good to have one especially from, you know, the ACs that do advise and interact with GNSO a lot. So, yes, I agree with that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great. Thank you. Well let's go ahead and move on to looking at the responsibilities and the scope of work and the timeframe that we're on because it is a pretty short timeframe. And then as we move on we can always circle back to this issue in terms of getting other participation involved in the process.

So as you can see on screen, you know, the responsibilities and the scope of work for this working party is to function as the liaison between the GNSO as a whole and the independent examiner who will be hired and the SIC. So that's our primary function.

We will be, through the course of the next few weeks, providing input on the review criteria and the 360 assessment. And that's probably the biggest role that we have is to really help frame that so that we feel the 360 assessment is accurately capturing the review points and the measurement criteria that we think are important as part of a self-assessment.

We will serve as an additional conduit to provide input from any of the constituencies or stakeholder groups. We'll act as a sounding board through this process with the independent examiner to answer questions or help ensure they have accurately reflected the GNSO structure, scope and dynamics.

We'll coordinate with the community to prepare the implementation plan once that's completed. And then provide support and communication and awareness. So obviously at this stage we are at a point where our primary role is to be providing input on the 360 assessment.

And one piece that we had talked about in our last meeting was that we will have the ability to provide input but the SIC will ultimately make final decisions with the independent examiner about how the 360 is conducted and what criteria are used.

And so we had discussed to the extent we feel as though the 360 assessment is not exactly what we would like to see we could conduct a supplemental self review if we think that's important. So those are really our two primary goals between now and the London meeting. And then thereafter it will move forward as the review continues into the implementation process.

But I'll just pause right there. Any questions or comments from anybody about the scope of what we're trying to do between now and London, which is really just a few weeks away.

Okay. Larisa, did you want to provide some feedback on how input is going to be requested and what that's going to look like for us so we can be prepared?

Larisa Gurnick: I'm sorry, Jen. This is Larisa. I was unmuting my line and I didn't hear the last part of the...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. No problem. No problem. I know in our - we had had some email exchanges I had inquired about how, you know, what is the SIC going to pose questions to us or do we need to just start to frame what we'd like to see the 360 and you said you would be able to provide some more input on

how that process will work for us so we can be prepared as we move into these next few meetings that we come to the meeting with whatever preparation is needed.

Larisa Gurnick: Sure, that would be great and I can certainly provide an update. By next week's meeting I expect to be able to have an illustration, if you will, a proposed set of criteria and a framework for how we are beginning to develop these criteria. And I can certainly explain the rationale behind it now to get feedback and input from this group which would be most helpful.

As a starting point we're using the work that has been done over the course of the last several years, and actually I'll provide a link to this which is posted on the community wiki. But it's the various criteria that had previously been bucketed into two categories, macro and micro, based on other work that had transpired.

So that's our starting point, looking at that criteria that had already been proposed and refining it, updating it for what's relevant for this review. And essentially looking at base categories such as purpose and that would be applied all these criteria would be applied to the GNSO Council, to the working groups as well as to the stakeholder groups and constituency. That's kind of the three part organization for the review as well as for the 360.

So there is a category of purpose, a category of how work is executed and conducted, a category for outcomes. And, you know, within the GNSO working group as well as the GNSO Council and stakeholder groups there is a component for charter membership, participation, communication, outcomes, things like that so it's a specific criteria and questions that are developed within these groups.

And the idea is to look at all these criteria and of course refine them as well as determine based on the kind of criteria that it is whether that criteria would be best satisfied through a review of documentation, research, interviews and

such, the kind of work that would be conducted by the independent examiner versus the kinds of information that would be useful to be included in a 360 assessment.

And of course certain criteria fall in both categories. But that's how initially we are looking at these various criteria. And then for those that would be appropriate to include as a question on the 360 assessment, as you may recall the 360 is intended to reach diversity of audiences; one being that GNSO community, also other SOs and ACs, certainly the larger community, the broader ICANN community as well as the Board and staff.

So depending on which of those groups the questions would be directed to some may be more relevant to certain groups than others so there is a consideration as to whether to tailor the questions based on relevance if that would be helpful to give people a good basis for responding.

And that's the general approach to developing the criteria at this point. And like I said by next week I expect to share something more concrete with you to react to.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great. And I see Stéphane's hand is up. But just a clarifying question, so you'll be presenting information and will be responding to it will be the way that we provide the input, not that we are expected to come with a framework, is that correct?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jen. This is Stéphane. Just a question or maybe more of a comment. On the refining the questions with specific audiences in mind I would be wary of that because it sounds to me like we would be predefining the outcomes in a sense. I would be, just on this initial reaction, I would be

more comfortable with seeing everyone get the same questions and put their own slant on to it in their answers rather than having the originator of the questions put a slant on it before they even go out to the people. Thanks.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Stéphane.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: I appreciate that feedback. Would you think it would be useful in that case to offer the option of no comment, not applicable or just let people basically not respond to those things that they don't feel they want to respond to but at least give them the opportunity, is that what you would suggest?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, I think you need to allow people not to respond or the questions can be framed in such a way as to allow different groups to give their own perspective without feeling too constrained. But I just think the basic list of questions themselves should be the same.

Obviously care has to go into drafting those questions so that they are, you know, they do provides an effective measure of the answers that the GNSO and the rest of the community is looking for.

But I think, you know, you certainly want to give people the option not to answer everything if they don't feel it's appropriate.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa, do we know what technology is going to be used to issue the survey? Is it something - go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, we are doing the research right now and as a matter of fact hoping to do a small pilot. And I would love the opportunity to include this group and that just to make sure that the technical aspects are easy and intuitive for people

to use. But the platform that is being recommended for this that we already have access to is called Cvent.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great. That was one of my questions is would we have the ability to preview so that we could ensure it's easy to use exactly and that it doesn't deter people or that they don't get part of the way into the survey and then they just simply stop because I know those are all going to be important pieces to ensuring we actually get good data.

And just on that note I noticed with the multi-stakeholder panels and some of the wikis that were tried to be used there wasn't a lot of participation. And I think if, you know, just as I see we don't have a lot of people on the call, if we don't get enough then statistically, you know, is the data even really valid?

And so how it's structured technologically in terms of how easy it is to use I think will have an impact on the type of data that we get.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Yes, Jen, you are absolutely right. And I know Avri and I have past experiences of how technology got in the way of good work so I'm very mindful of that and appreciate this group being willing to be a part of a small pilot and just give me feedback. So I expect to be able to get that launched within the next couple of weeks.

And we've already flagged the notion of not enough broad participation and information not being either statistically valid or even just enough to draw conclusions on as the important trigger point.

So some of the contingency plans for that that would be put in place is the ability to do multiple reminders and use various communication methods to ensure that the community is aware of this process and knows how to participate so a variety of links back to the survey and such. So that's definitely something that we will pay close attention to to make sure that we get broad participation.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great, great. Stéphane, is that a new question or was that from before?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Sorry, coming off mute and I'll bring my hand down, I forgot to...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, no I wasn't sure if that was new or not. Okay. So, Larisa, I wasn't sure, are you presenting about the wiki as it we're talking about communication out to the community and the formation of the wiki? Is that set up now and we could look at it and provide feedback or where is that in process?

Larisa Gurnick: It is in the process of being set up. And what is being displayed up on the screen is the proposed framework for the GNSO review wiki. So the thought here is that, on the community wiki, there is currently a tab actually for AOC and that's where the work of the AOC review has been located.

So we're hoping to get another tab like that for bylaws reviews and under that set up a space for the GNSO review. And within that of course there will be a space for the work of this working party. And what you see are some of the areas that we've already identified as being useful with the homepage, front page of the wiki being used to update on most relevant developments, calendar announcements, upcoming events and that kind of thing.

So, yes, I would love feedback on this and what you think might be useful to expand or make this wiki better as well as different ways to get the word out. Information is on the wiki and how to access it and publicize it.

Jennifer Wolfe: So did you say - I just want to make sure I understood - that you'll be sending out a link to it, it's not yet live?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct, yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: Not live yet but expected to be by next week.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So for next week it sounds like by next week we should be able to be responding to the wiki and the communication outreach as well as initial comments on the 360 assessment, that'll happen for next week.

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Okay. Well then if - does anybody have any comments on the wiki? I think we'll probably have a lot more obviously after we see it and I think ensuring that - I think really thinking through how are we reaching out knowing that we have a small group here to ensure that people know that this is happening, the importance of it and that they have an opportunity to participate will be really important.

So just moving on in the agenda, in terms of our timeline do you have a slide on the timeline, Larisa, by any chance?

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, I realized that I did not set that up and...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay no problem.

Larisa Gurnick: ...if I can just direct you to the FAQs. I was just looking at that in preparation for the meeting. And just - there is a timeline actually that's included in the FAQs. I will make some minor adjustments for...

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: ...that weren't accurately reflected so I don't know if that's coming up on the screen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. No, I see the timeline. Hopefully everybody else sees it too. Why don't we just talked through what that timeline looks like and, you know, we can gather any other questions or comments.

So at this point we have been hoping to have our working party together by today. I think the call for volunteers went out until Monday the 19th. So by our meeting next week - we have set weekly meetings to try to move this along to be prepared for the London meeting. So hopefully by our meeting next Thursday the 22nd, we have a little more participation in the call particularly since we'll be moving in to some of the more substantive issues.

But we have a pretty aggressive time frame here to assist with refining the examination criteria by May 30 and to have the 360 of assessment developed by June 15. And then July 1, after the London meeting, it's really moving forward into launch to get the community to respond with a summary results by the end of July.

So that's what gives us our pretty aggressive timeframe. Does anybody think that that is too aggressive and for any reason we should ask for this to be pushed back to give us more time?

Okay. Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, Stéphane again. Thanks. Just why was the timeline that in this way? I suppose we are trying to meet the actual review - or match the actual review timeline. But with regards to the seemingly low participation in this group we may at least want to - you may, Jen, want to inform the Council that there might be a bit more time needed to reach those objectives.

Jennifer Wolfe: And, Larisa, do you want to comment on the timeframe? Because this was determined by the SIC, is that correct?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, sure. I'm happy to and add a couple of different elements to this. So in parallel with the timeline that you see here I'm sure you're aware that the proposals - the responses to the RFP were due on the 13th of May. And we've received a number of proposals and are evaluating those and working with the SIC to confirm and appoint an independent examiner so that's a parallel track.

As that information is being considered there is some input and timelines and ideas included in the proposals, obviously that will need to be considered, that may relate to the timeline as well. But, yes, the timeline as you see it here, which is part of the broader timeline of the overall review, was set by the Structural Improvements Committee with the idea that the work, this phase of the work would be completed by early part of 2015 with the implementation to begin in January or February timeframe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well perhaps - I will definitely reach out to Jonathan and reach out on the list to the Council to let them know that it's important we have participation from those who have volunteered or someone from the various groups.

I think if we don't have more participation by our next couple of calls then it might be worth requesting an extension of time to get more participation because my concern is if we don't have enough people participating in the feedback for the 360 then we would potentially have problems, you know, down the road where there's people feel like they haven't participated or that the 360 doesn't accurately reflect everyone's concerns or suggestions in terms of the scope of the review.

We do have - I'm just looking at the calendar right now so our next Council meeting is on June 5 so we'll have two more calls before then. I will certainly reach out on list and I know we'll have this on our agenda. So hopefully within the next week or two we'll see more participation. But if it has not been

resolved by then definitely we'll raise this issue with the Council on the June 5 meeting and evaluate how we would go forward from there.

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, this is Larisa. Speaking of calendar I'd also like to bring up the question is of that meeting in London to see if there would be an interest in holding a face-to-face session perhaps on the Sunday before the meeting in the late afternoon or early evening if that would work? And I realize this is a small group so it may be hard to reach that agreement today but...

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. Right.

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: Exactly. With the deadlines for submitting session requests, you know, on the meeting planning side and all that that we are trying to be responsive to its may be a good idea to at least request a session that suits the calendars best based on what we know today. And there would be an opportunity to change but at least that way there would also - already be a placeholder for this meeting.

So to kind of get that started the proposed time would be Sunday 4:30 in the afternoon for about a 90-minute session. It could be open to the public; could have a briefing component and then a working session that may be needed is based on the progress of the working party by that time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Marika, I see your note in the chat that the GNSO Council meeting is on June 8. I have June 8 as a Sunday. Is that right? I have the Council meeting on Thursday, June 5. Is that not right?

Marika Konings: Apologies. I was actually looking at May.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, okay so it is June 5 right the next...

Marika Konings: You are correct, yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, all right thank you. Sorry, I was concerned. I thought I've never seen a meeting on a Sunday before but maybe it was. Yes, Stéphane, I agree, I think an open session during the London meeting would be a great opportunity to get feedback and particularly within that time frame so that we can be closing out the comments on the self-review.

I noticed - I was just looking at the agenda and I mistakenly skipped over the FAQs on the communication piece. Did anybody have any comments on the FAQs to provide. I know it went out on list as well. And this would be part of the wiki in connection with everything else so it's certainly something we could look at as we provide comments next week on the overall communication. But did anybody have any comments at this point to provide?

Okay, seeing none we can certainly add this back in as we talk about the wiki next week.

So I guess at this point I'll just ask if there is any other business, anything else anyone would like to discuss in addition to what we party covered today?
Okay.

Well I think we'll look to - I will reach out to Jonathan's and to Council on list and we ping our group again here too to try to encourage those who have volunteered to try to participate particularly in these next couple of meetings since we're going to be really digging into the substance of the 360 and that their participation is really important. Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes thanks, Jen. Just a question. Will staff be sending out some kind of notes of the meeting? I'm just thinking that if there's a ready-made document and I can do a forward easily to that Business Constituency and others can do the same to their own groups and that helps bring this group more visibility.

Larisa Gurnick: Stéphane, this is Larisa. Do you mean something to summarize the discussion and the action items from this meeting? Is that what you're asking for?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Exactly right, yes. Probably just a quick, you know, one-page summary of the action items; just something to say what's going on and...

Larisa Gurnick: Sure.

Stéphane Van Gelder: ...and make sure there's interest maintained.

Larisa Gurnick: Sure. We'd be happy to come up with a simple standard summary. And perhaps that would be also a good place to, once the wiki is up, include kind of as a part of the signature on that page, if you will, links to the wiki and links to the FAQs and various other key information for people to access easily.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, good idea.

Jennifer Wolfe: Any other closing comments or questions? Well thank you for those of you who participated today I appreciate it. I know we're getting started and we're going to have an aggressive time frame to provide a lot of feedback. I appreciate you being here today and certainly appreciate any support you can provide in encouraging those who have volunteered or from the various stakeholder groups to participate in the coming calls as we start to frame out the 360 assessment; this'll be very important work. And we want to have as much input as possible.

So thank you all for your time, I appreciate it. And we'll look forward to our meeting next week same time.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jen. Bye everyone.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Jennifer Wolfe: Bye.

END