

**GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 22 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-review20140522-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Stephane Van Gelder
Jennifer Wolfe
Avri Doria
Bret Fausett
Amr Elsadr
James Bladel
David Maher
Chuck Gomes
Michele Neylon
Rudi Vansnick
Rafik Dammak
Wolf Knoblen Ullrich
Jennifer Standiford
Jonathan Robinson

Apologies:

Thomas Rickert
Ron Andruff

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Larisa Gurnick
Glen de Saint Gery
Rob Hoggarth
Matt Ashtiani
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: At this time the recordings have started. If anybody has any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Sorry, Michele Neylon, Rudi Vansnick, Rafik Dammak. We have apologies from Ron Andruff and Thomas Rickert. From staff we have Glen de Saint Géry, Marika Konings, Matt Ashanti, Larisa Gurnick and myself, Teri Agnew.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks. Thanks. And sorry I jumped ahead of there. So again, welcome to everybody. Thank you so much for taking time. In our call last week we only had a couple of us from the community so it's really great to see so many people participating on the call and then certainly on list to see that we've got a pretty good group started.

So our agenda today you can see on the Adobe Connect is to talk among bit more about our membership and organizational structure and then the outreach to the community to participate in the 360 and then Larisa is going to give a little more details about the criteria and the 360 assessment and that's where our real work will begin in developing the criteria to be used for the 360 assessment.

So I'll go ahead and move, and lest anybody has anything to address at the outset, I'll go ahead and move into the membership and organization?
Anything anyone else needs to add to the agenda?

Okay so moving on to membership, you can all see the list on the Adobe Connect from the various stakeholder groups. Just want to open it up for any comments. Do you feel like we now have a sufficient group? Do we need to

do more outreach for this specific group and any comments about our organizational structure before we move forward?

Hey, Michele. I can't hear. Oh you can't speak?

Man: Hello?

Jennifer Wolfe: Now we can hear you.

Man: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Michele, are you on mute?

Terri Agnew: Michele...

Michele Neylon: No, I wasn't on mute. I've been spending the last 10 minutes - last 10 minutes waiting for the bloody operator to answer. I could hear but I wasn't going to use the microphone on my computer because it would drive you all to drink.

No the only thing there's a comment is that I think it would be, as has happened with other groups, be able to have alternatives and or observers or whatever I think would be - would not be a bad idea because to be perfectly honest I suspect that quite a few of the people I see on the list where all stretched quite thin and have plenty of other obligations and being able to make any and all of the calls for this group on top of everything else is going to be quite a bit of a challenge. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, sure understood. And I think at least at a minimum if we have everyone on the list we can at the least put out what's happening on the calls and get feedback. And I think you're right, if we can ensure we have some backup since we do have a fairly aggressive timetable to develop the criteria for the 360 assessment before the London meeting.

Bret.

Bret Fausett: Thanks. We actually had any Registry Constituency meeting yesterday and there was concern that we are limited up to three members. I'm not sure how we came up with that cap on Registries but we had sufficient interest in the Registry Constituency in additional participation that we left people who we think would be valuable contributors to the group off of our participation list.

So what's the purpose of the cap? And can we add additional people to our list here?

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, so I'll address that and then I know Avri has some thoughts on this too. The purpose for the cap was - the purpose of this group, which we had talked about in our last call, is to ensure that we have input from the GNSO community into the criteria and the scope of the 360 assessment.

So we want to make sure it's clear this is really a working party to develop that criteria. Certainly anyone can provide input to this committee and into the 360 process. And once the 360 assessment is launched then everyone in the whole community will have the opportunity to participate.

So I want to make sure there's no confusion between this purpose to create the scope of the 360 versus actually participating in the 360. So that will be open to everyone. I don't know if that was part of the issue.

But the reason we want to keep this group a little bit smaller is so that it's manageable and that we can get a lot done in a pretty short period of time. Any other comments? I know Avri, you've had a lot of thoughts on this issue. Michele, I see your hand is up.

Michele Neylon: No disrespect - it's Michele speaking for the record and then I'll hand over to Avri. ICANN staff deciding a cap on the number of community members that can participate in something is really not acceptable. I'm sure others can

speak to this more eloquently than I. I just find that very concept to be quite apparent. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, hi. This is Avri speaking. So (unintelligible) ICANN that decided but maybe it just decided by falling into a hole. I find it problematic, A, that we're as big as we're getting. I think six per stakeholder group is a huge for this process.

And I also am troubled by us not having balanced representation from the stakeholder groups. So if we need six to get to enough for CSG then I think we probably need 6 for Registries and Registrars too, or at least if they want to. But I don't think that we should limit them to three because of this old, you know, I mean, the current structure which has them have fewer people but still equal votes; it just doesn't make sense.

So I would say that the numbers should be equal. I'd love a smaller number but I can understand why we're stuck doing the six because it makes sense for all the constituencies within CSG since they don't work as an SG to be represented.

And the idea of there being an alternate makes sense too. So it makes sense that each of the constituencies, and if you're still a constituency bound stakeholder group should be there. So that's my mixed up thought but there should at least be parity between the groups even if we're going to be this big. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. And I see Stéphane's hand is up but I just want to note Marika made a comment and that is - that is accurate that the GNSO Council in its most recent meeting by phone did determine that the structure should mirror the Council. It wasn't determined by ICANN staff so I just wanted to read her comments into the record.

Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jen. Hi everyone. Just a comment on this discussion itself. We had a call last week and there was three or four people on the call and that was it. And we did discuss this point on that call and we're starting that discussion again. Whilst the subject of membership of the group is obviously of importance I think that I'd certainly suggest that we move on to actual - the actual work the group is tasked with doing.

If, at some point, there is a full complement of the people that the group is supposed to have in these calls then perhaps it will become important to look at possible caps, etcetera. But right now I think it's more important to get on with the real work rather than spend every initial part of our calls discussing the membership caps. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Stéphane. I think that's a great point. And I know a lot of you this is the first call and we did go through a lot of those issues in the last call. I 100% agree that given our very short timeframe to provide direction and feedback on the 360 assessment and that we have just a few weeks to do that we should move forward.

I think for anybody who has concerns about the ability to participate certainly, you know, all ideas are welcome and input is welcome from everyone into this process. But I think it's - I think that's a great point from Stéphane that - to move forward we want to get into the substance of our discussions and again certainly welcome input from anyone outside of this group to provide input to us to include in this process.

So I'll go ahead and move on into the next item on the agenda which is our outreach process which may start to address some of those issues that everyone was expressing in terms of how are we reaching out to inform and to engage the community about the 360 assessment.

One of the things we spoke about last week was ensuring that we get really good participation. As some of you know, through our Council discussions and on a number of different lists we've talked about the stakeholder panels and particularly the Multistakeholder Model had a process to provide feedback.

And they had a pretty small number of participants and we really want to ensure we get a large enough pool of respondents so that we have accurate data to draw from in this process.

So I - Larisa, I don't know if you have anything to present on the outreach program that's being proposed or if you just want to open it up for conversation about what is needed to ensure we engage the community fully to have the right type of participation. Larisa, are you there?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Sorry about that. The line apparently was mute.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's okay.

Larisa Gurnick: The reason this item is on the agenda is to provide an opportunity for discussion in terms of what other activities the group may want to undertake to broaden the reach of informing and engaging such as reaching out to other SOs and ACs and various other things that had been discussed at the last call.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay so you don't have anything specific to present? Oh okay. I see Chuck's hand is up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. The - it's not only who we reach out to it's what we provide for the 360 review. One of the things we can be confident of if it's a huge number of things - a bit of information that we're looking for we will get much less

participation. So if we end up that the 360 review is very large we'd be much better breaking up into smaller components if we want good response.

Jennifer Wolfe: And when you say smaller components you have something in mind?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I don't know what the - it may not even be needed to break it up, Jen. I - what I'm saying is is that for example, in the Policy and Implementation Working Group we tried to get a lot of feedback from the various stakeholder groups and constituencies and SOs and so forth. But we gave this huge list of things that wanted responses on.

We got very poor feedback. So in our 360 review that we want a lot of participation on if there are a lot of things we want feedback on I believe we would be better off breaking it up into smaller components rather than one huge effort so when people see it they say, oh I don't have time for this. You know, that's all I'm saying.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's a really great point. And I know we touched on that briefly in our last call as well that this will be an online survey that we want to ensure that people understand that it is a survey that we want them to spend some time on. Are there any thoughts on how much time?

I mean, it could be a 30-minute - is 30 minutes too long? You know, what do you think is a reasonable amount of time to ask people to spend on a survey on line so that we can get the kind of feedback we're looking for?

Michele.

Michele Neylon: If it takes longer than about 5 minutes most people won't bother. I'll be perfectly honest with you. I get sent surveys all the time. I don't care how interesting the thing is; I lose interest after a couple of minutes. Unless you've given me a massive carrot and ICANN won't be giving carrots.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay that's a great point. And this is an important point for discussion because to get meaningful responses it's probably going to take more than 5 minutes. But I see Stéphane's hand is up. Go ahead.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Sorry, coming off mute. It hurts but I think I agree with Michele that anything over 5 or 10 minute max people just won't bother. There's no incentive for them to go into a survey in depth unless they are either ICANN or GNSO anoraks which obviously we'd rather go beyond just the people that are already voicing opinions in this because they've been involved in this for a long time.

So I would suggest an extremely concise survey formatted to give the general kind of direction that we're looking for. And this probably needs to be worked on with the company or the organization that ICANN is, from my understanding, in the process of choosing to manage this review.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. And I see Larisa's hand is up. Let me let her go and then you, Chuck.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Thanks, Jen. This is really very useful feedback and I look forward to the next item on the agenda when I have the opportunity to show you something to react to and to help figure out how to make the assessment more concise so that we can get broader participation. So, Jen, whenever you're ready for us to do that walk through we're happy to do so.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, let me get Chuck and then, yes, please let's go ahead and do that. So, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. And so to follow up on my point and what Stéphane and Michele said, I think 10 minutes is probably a good - a good target at one given time. As Avri said in the chat, you know, maybe they can come back later. And you can design it that way.

I suspect, though, that we're going to need more than 10 minutes worth of involvement. So one way of approaching that is, again, like I suggested, is to break the review up into smaller components that only take about 10 minutes max each time and just reach out to the community at different times.

Now I think it will be very helpful for us to look at what Larisa and others have so that we can possibly, with some context, look at this further. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Michele, do you want to go before she presents?

Michele Neylon: Yeah, just very briefly, I mean, I just want to say I agree 100% with Chuck on this. If you send me - I mean, I'm just speaking from personal experience. I get sent these bloody surveys by the Irish government and other entities all the time. And the only ones that I actually fill out in their entirety or I get my staff to fill out are the ones which I'm legally obliged to fill out and I'm going to go to jail if I don't fill out.

If you send me multiple questionnaires that are short, up to maximum 10 minutes, fine. If you expect me to do one big one that takes 30 minutes or more I'm not going to bother. And I have no problem with doing multiple short ones and I'm sure I'm not alone in this. And I know Stéphane is physically in pain that he had to agree with me. And I am going to enjoy that. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Larisa, do you want to go ahead and start presenting? Because that may start to address some of these issues as we look at how do we break them down and get them into a timeframe that is reasonable for people to do.

Larisa Gurnick: Sure. Thanks, Jen. This is Larisa. So on the screen right now are just some very general introductory comments explaining, which we're going to see next, because the GNSO obviously is comprised of various structural components there is a framework that's recommended to provide people an opportunity to comment on the GNSO overall as well as each - what we are

calling structural components, the GNSO Council, stakeholder groups and constituencies and the GNSO working groups.

Based on feedback that we collected last week the idea is that all questions will be available to people to answer. There wouldn't be a filtering of any sort. If the information is not relevant or if someone doesn't care to answer a particular question they don't have to. They can pick and choose those areas that they would like to comment on. And there would be freeform opportunities available to add additional information and provide other feedback.

So with that in mind, Matt, if you can advance to the next page to show us the more substantive part of - thank you. If you can just zoom in on the questions themselves. Perfect.

So there are several sections here, as you can see and there may possibly be opportunities to break it naturally into multiple questionnaires or components as people were just suggesting. So there is a section on purpose, organization and membership, execution, outputs and other.

And within the Purpose there are two questions to start the conversation. And although these are presented here just as a starting point for the conversation to determine how many questions, what should be asked and how the questions should be formulated.

The column next to the actual question gives you some idea of the drop downs and the mechanics of the survey to give people options of how to answer as well as always having the free-form opportunity to add their thoughts.

So let me pause at this point and see if people have questions about the sections as well as the framework so far. And by the framework I mean the

fact that commenters could respond to relevant to GNSO overall, the GNSO Council or the various other structural components.

Jennifer Wolfe: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Like Larisa said I think we've got some natural breaking point. For example, the Purpose question could be one area of focus that we focus on. I forget what the total timeframe is for this review. But if we allowed a week for people to respond for the purpose only, just that, I think we could keep it down to a 10 minute response time.

Now I think that there's - I'm just looking at the Purpose one. There are some things we can do to make it clearer, simpler quicker to do. For example, it's good to provide a link. I mean, nice to have that but if people have to go to a link some people are going to do it.

So to the extent that we could end the question, and may be breaking the questions up into smaller sentences, I think we'll get better responses if they don't have to go to a link. So if we can briefly include what's in - describe what's in the link - it's okay to have the link also but if you can provide the opportunity to avoid that you will increase your participation in the time it takes to do something.

Now Number 2 on Purpose is too long. But it can be broken up into parts. So for example, the Purpose section could be, you know, broken up into a little smaller components and still accomplish what we want. At the same time it makes it real easy, concise on each one and I think will be more effective if we do that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. Does anyone else have comments should just structurally looking at - I think those are all great points and ways to break it down. And I think clearly just on the opening comments that as we look at this long list of

questions that's obviously not going to be something that can be done in 10 minutes so breaking this into the pieces I think it's probably a good next step.

Other comments? Yes, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Hi, one of my (unintelligible) with everything involving ICANN, choice of language. You know, if we can try to use simpler terms. I mean, responsiveness of the GNSO leadership, what the hell does that mean? I mean, I'm reading that and I actually don't know what the hell that means.

What do you mean by and accountability? I mean, you know, these kind of things that if you're, to borrow Stéphane's terminology, a GNSO anorak, and as he is one I think it's okay for him to self - label himself, I think it's great actually. Thanks, Stéphane; I'll have fun with this.

The thing is, you know, ultimately if we're not careful about the choice of wording and kind of breaking it down into terms that somebody who has a passing interest but who is materially impacted by the GNSO, I mean, they're the ones you want to get to answer these things.

Because, you know, people like James and Stéphane, Chuck, and a lot of the other people who are on this call, they're nearly always going to answer anyway. They're not the ones that you have to worry about. It's the ones that are going to be upset by stuff and things coming out of the GNSO who may feel that they can't participate.

And the choice of language and wording that's used even in questionnaires like this needs to go to that. I mean, Chuck's things about, you know, don't put a link in their, I mean, include a link sure but try to explain it. Just keep the wording as simple as possible.

I mean, if you're going to - if this is going to be translated into more than one language, which I hope it would be, then again the simpler language means

it's going to be easier to translate which makes it easier for the language's team. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Any other comments as we just start to look at the structure of the questions and the scope? Yes James.

James Bladel: Hi thanks, Jen. James speaking for the transcript. One thought that I had - and I'm not sure where this fits, it's probably a little - it might even be slightly off-topic is, you know, the thinking of a 360 would be that it would be accepting feedback from a variety of different relationships with the GNSO. And are we - before we dive into the substantive questions is there going to be some sort of preliminary self categorization section where, you know, they can establish whether they are a member of the GNSO or some other SO or AC or some to your organization or just a casual registrant or what the relationship between the survey respondent and the GNSO is.

And then that I think might help us to sort of, you know, lineup the different areas of feedback based on the relationship that the survey respondent has with the GNSO. So is that part of this or is that just so preliminary that it's not even included in this document?

Jennifer Wolfe: I think, yeah, Larisa, I think you're going - go ahead and answer that. Go ahead

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Yes, so as part of the development of the survey we absolutely have the opportunity to ask people to identify up front which of these areas they represent. And that can certainly be made an optional field or a mandatory field. These are choices that would be available.

In the beginning the thought was that perhaps depending on how the individual identifies themselves the relevant questions would be presented based on that or in a particular order.

But for ease and to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to answer everything that they might wish to we departed from that idea. But the notion of having people identify who they are should they choose to do that then which affiliation or relationship we can absolutely incorporate that up front.

Jennifer Wolfe: And I just say I agree that can be really important data, go ahead James did you want to finish up there?

James Bladel: Yes just a real quick response thank Jen, James speaking again. I just wanted to ask that, you know, while we're doing that that we very clearly understand or think about what it means to be a consumer of the GNSO processes or a peer organization of GNSO processes.

Otherwise I mean we can call it a 360 review but it really starts to look like something else. So I think that we would need to make sure that we at least have those different buckets very well refined, thanks, thanks for the response.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you, Omar.

Omar Kaminski: Great thanks Jen this is Omar. I apologize for a (newbie) question but I've only been on this group since late last night. I was just wondering regarding the structure here are folks who are going to fill the survey out expected to answer each question in the rows and how they apply to each group in the columns or are these columns just to collect information from each one of these groups, thanks?

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, sure and I know Larisa may jump on this. So this right now is just for our discussion purposes. The actual survey will be designed as a more user friendly online survey.

And I know one of the things we talked about in our call last week that we as this group would have a chance to test it and provide feedback so that we

really have that chance to be in that consumer position and say yes this works or no it doesn't and we need to correct it.

Larisa do you want to jump in there, did I state that correctly?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa Jen thanks yes you absolutely stated it correctly and to answer the question the idea is that people could respond to each question relative to each of the structural components of the GNSO should they wish to do that.

Obviously that's quite a bit of information that we would be asking people to think about and collect. But the survey could certainly be designed in such a way as to make that option available but not make it mandatory that people have to do that, that they choose to respond to those aspects that they find most relevant.

(Jennifer Sandeford): Hi this is (Jennifer Sandeford) for the record. Is the intent of the survey to be anonymous for participants?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa, in the (short) thought was that it wouldn't be anonymous but I would certainly welcome feedback on that point.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's a great point does anyone have comments on that?

(Jennifer Sandeford): I do again this is (Jennifer). I think perhaps you'd get greater participation if the survey was anonymous, that's just my thought.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes thanks Jen I appreciate the value of anonymity but we also have to make sure that there's not a flooding of comments from some people who will try and overly influence the process.

So anonymity I think is okay provided we have some way behind the scenes of making sure that we're not getting a bunch of duplicate responses from certain people or groups because it will...

((Crosstalk))

(Jennifer Sandeford): Maybe we could - maybe as part of the survey if you do decide to go in that direction you could have the participants state which group they're representing.

Chuck Gomes: But - Chuck again but you also even if you do that there's still the possibility that you're getting duplicate responses from people. Now you're probably not going to control that completely but having some sort of a control will increase the validity of the results and our ability to interpret them.

Jennifer Wolfe: Stéphane I see your hand is up.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jen, I think that we also just to add to what Chuck said have to ensure that the responses to the survey are - we are able to put them in the context of the work being done.

And what I mean by that is I'm sure the people sifting through the survey results will be helped immensely by knowing for example that 90% of the response they receive is from outside ICANN, obviously that's just an example I'm giving.

And so I think, you know, allowing anonymous responses I can see your view but I think we will fall short of the amount of information that we're trying to get if we don't know who's getting the information, what their agenda, where their main areas of interests are and what they're trying to do.

I think those are all bits of information that are interesting in the context of the survey itself, thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Magaly.

Magaly Pazello: Hi it's Magaly speaking for record. I think actually it may be a middle ground is what's really needed here. Normally I'm in favor of anonymous surveys but in this instance I'm actually quite opposed to it.

And I think Marika put something in the chat there about it not being anonymous in terms of, you know, the survey would ask for the persons name and their email address and they would - those would be able to get (unintelligible) possibly the stakeholder group if they have one and they would just have the option for it not to be published.

But I would be against the anonymity aspect or the self-declaration to groupings because anybody who wants to could say that they were from any group that they wanted to, how the hell are you going to know it's just not going to work, I just don't see that working at all, thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think you just made a great point that there is a middle ground here and that is that you do have to put your name in, you do have to put your email in so that statistically we know only - there is only survey per actual person out there but that doesn't have to be made part of the public report.

That it's used for the outside reviewer to ensure the statistically valid information but not necessarily published to the open community so that we get really good responses. I think that's a great point, Omar.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks this is Omar. I think I would agree with Magaly and Marika that we would - we probably do need to know who is promoting input to the survey questions and I'm not sure if it's very necessary to publish who those folks are.

But then I actually want to go back to the questions again, again I apologize if you all have gone through all of these already but I'm just having a bit of difficulty again with the questions in terms of rows and columns.

In looking at the survey I'm trying to figure out what are the sort of answers we are seeking to collect, what kind of information or what kind of data we're seeking to collect and what kind of sense are we trying to make of it all?

It seems from the columns that we have these questions in rows and then we have various kinds of the various groups in the GNSO as well as the working groups. And they're asking for details on what's the person being - the person filling the survey is thinking about these various groups.

But then, which gives a lot of work and earlier on the call we were saying we want the survey to be quick and easy basically. But then we sort of set the answers to scaling on one to five and some of them are simple questions like yes do, don't know.

Is there a lot of value in getting these answers in such brevity or are we looking to finding more in depth and qualitative value to the answers that we should be collecting?

And if so will we be able to manage doing that in a survey that is quick and easy to run through, thanks?

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa do you want to follow up on the point that we had discussed earlier about providing some opportunity for open-ended responses in addition to the more quantitative piece of it?

Larisa Gurnick: Sure this is Larisa. So the way that this initial framework was laid out is to form - provide the answers in such a way that it could be easily quantified and analyzed hence yes, no, don't know and scaling.

And in terms of scaling whether it should be one to five or something different obviously can be discussed further but this was just to give people an idea of how answers could be provided.

With the idea that free form opportunities to provide comments would always be available as well for those that want to submit comments. But in order to make the survey data aggregatable and quantifiable to some degree the idea was that drop down options would be provided in order to be able to do that.

And then on the back end obviously the survey the online tool would help quantify and assemble the responses. And then the idea is that that information that comes in input and a data point into the work of the independent examiner that will be conducting the review.

And this information will be considered along with other work methods, documentation review analysis and, you know, other methodologies that the independent examiner will be conducting in order to complete the review.

Jennifer Wolfe: And Larisa do you maybe just want to comment briefly on the structure of this spreadsheet to Omar's question about, you know, is it expected that they're going to answer across each of these or is this just that you have it structured so that you would be tabulating results across all of the different stakeholder groups.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. So there would not be an expectation that each question be answered for each of the structural components. Yet recognizing the differences between the way that different structural components operate and conduct their business and the fact that the GNSO review is intended to cover those structural components we - we're looking to collect feedback that would be more specific.

So comments and ideas from this group as to how valuable that is and whether it would give people enough of a clear understanding of what they're meant to do, you know, certainly is very helpful.

But ideally people would have the opportunity to provide that level of specific feedback on the GNSO as a whole as well as any of the structural components that make up the GNSO.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great thank you, any - yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: A question, it seems to me that a 360 review requires a certain level of experience by those who are responding to the survey otherwise we're getting - going to get responses from people who don't have any sufficient background to provide good information, good feedback.

What is our intent I mean for example if we reach out to people who don't know much about the GNSO at all is that going to help us at all?

Larisa Gurnick: Chuck this is Larisa, we had discussed this early on in the process and you're absolutely right depending on what the relationship is of the responder to the GNSO organization and their level of experience that they - some will have more or less basis for being able to answer these questions.

So the idea of don't know or, you know, having the option of not answering the question because someone doesn't have a basis for answering that question is certainly included in here.

And this is basically in place of the other method of doing this, which is to have different types of questions those that are directed to the more general members of the community that may not be as familiar with the workings of the GNSO and having more specific and detailed questions for those that would be more knowledgeable and familiar. I hope that addressed your question.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: And Larisa just to add to that I mean that is part of the gathering the data points each of these are scaled based upon where the person comes from in the community right?

So we'll have the ability to determine, you know, what percentage of people from each of these groups are saying different things. So I think we could wait certainly if we start to look at the results we could be weighting those differently.

And I'll just make one point since there's a lot of you who are new to the call this week from last week. One of the things we've been discussing as well is that once this 360 assessment is put out there if for any reason we feel like it's not comprehensive enough or we haven't addressed something we can certainly look at doing some of our own surveying within more niched areas.

And certainly we'll have the ability to look at the data and determine do we think responses were weighted in the right way, that's really part of the role of this group is to ensure that we feel like the data was gathered in the right way and that it's been weighted the right way and that we're using statistically valid information. So I see James your hand is up.

James Bladel: Thanks Jen, James speaking for the transcript I just wanted to circle back to Chuck's last comment and I think that, you know, we touched on it here in your responses but the responses are going to be - are going to vary along a spectrum based on the role or relationship that the respondent has with the GNSO.

Whether they're in a consumer role or a peer role, they're an insider, they're, you know, part of the board or some other (SOIC). So I think that, you know, we might - I know we want to make this easy and accessible but we might

consider tailoring the - structuring the questions differently based on how they self-identify because I think that we might get more valuable contributions from outsiders in some respects and some more insightful responses from folks who are more familiar with the process than others.

And I think, you know, it's difficult to predict that on the front end but I think we might want to consider doing that leg work up front just to make sure that we have what we get out of the back end isn't just kind of this indecipherable aggregate of all those different voices.

Jennifer Wolfe: No that's a great point and I see Chuck's hand is up.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I agree Jen that James point is a pretty good one. Asking questions of people who have very little knowledge and they just have to answer don't know or, you know, every time probably isn't terribly useful for us.

But if we could tailor it to particular audiences like for people who don't - certain questions are very useful from people who don't know very much about the GNSO but other questions it's kind of useless asking them.

So if we could reasonably do what James is suggesting that could accomplish a couple objectives. One of them it makes the survey easier to fill and more timely for those who don't have very much experience.

At the same time we get the value of those who have more experience and can answer certain other questions. Interesting idea I think worth pursuing.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great thank you, any other comments on those points? Just - yes Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks Jen this is Larisa. So would it make sense to consider how to break up these questions into perhaps just two categories? One being those people that are more as you suggested consumers with just passing experience and interest, that being one.

And the other one being people that are more familiar with the process and the workings and being more experienced. So would that be useful?

Jennifer Wolfe: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I think that it would be useful as an overall breaking up into two, I don't think that solves the 10 minutes problem. So in other words we still have to I think break it into smaller components so that it doesn't take longer than 10 minutes for someone to do it.

But in each of those components you could focus on those two categories, does that make sense?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes it does.

Jennifer Wolfe: Just one thing to note too I know we're coming up towards the top of the hour and I know for a lot of you this is probably the first time you're seeing the survey draft of questions that could be asked.

And this is really the crux of our work over the next couple of weeks is to dig deeper into this. So I guess one of the things I would ask everyone between now and our next call is to take some time and look through the questions and develop comments because I think, you know, what we've all talked about today is that we need to balance out the need to make this, you know, quick and easy 10 minutes or less in various steps or components to complete.

But that we also want to gather meaningful data and we want to gather data that we can weight so that we know is this someone who is knowledgeable and that's more credible information than someone in the community again also balancing with we want this to be a transparent process and for everyone in the community have the opportunity to respond.

So we have a lot of competing issues to balance its weight as we move this forward in our work. So I think this was circulated to everybody, if anyone doesn't have it let me know or let Larisa know and we'll make sure that you have this full spreadsheet so you can be looking at the data.

But I think we're going to want to dig in deeper into each of these sections and to the extent we're looking to have it bifurcated into those who are involved versus those who aren't. We need to think through, you know, how do these questions change as a result of that.

Any other comments I want to make sure that we talk about the (WIKI) because I know that's been set up and we want to start using that so I want to make sure we hit that before we go. But any other comments from anybody?

And Larisa do you envision taking this and modifying it based upon the conversation today or would you like us to continue to work through this structure for another week before you make modifications?

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks Jen this is Larisa. I realize that having circulated it just last night that folks didn't have enough time to consider this so it would be really helpful if you could take the next week to think about the questions and think about some of these things that Jen has outlined.

And then what I would propose is based on our discussion next week we could then turn around a mock version of the survey for this group to experience and see just how it comes across and how it feels and how easy it is to use.

So I think it would be more valuable to hold off and collect the feedback...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: ...next week and then based on that we will mock up the survey online.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay and what technology is being used for the survey do you know yet or are you still looking at that?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes the technology is CVENT.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: C-V-E-N-T.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, so just to recap and make sure we've all understood. Our goal will be to everybody have time to review the spreadsheet that's been circulated with the questions.

Come into our call next week and our focus will be to just dig right into these questions and providing feedback on the questions and responses and then a sample survey will be created and we'll have the opportunity to take it ourselves and really understand how people are going to think and feel as they go through it and provide feedback.

Is that correct Larisa I just want to make sure I recapped what you said correctly?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes that's correct thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, well I know we've got just a few minutes left. Matt did you want to briefly talk about the (WIKI) that's been set up?

Matt: Sure, hi everybody this is Matt. So I just set up a very basic (WIKI). If anyone uses it and finds that it doesn't work for them or there's stuff missing just let me know.

Let me just pop the actual link into the Adobe Connector. I'm going to just try to use it with our action item notes, (David Greens) recordings. If there's anything that I've missed just let me know and I'll be sure to update it.

But it should be pretty straightforward, if anybody needs me to do a one-on-one or just wants to discuss it just let me know and I'll make sure to follow through but that's basically it it's just a very straightforward Web site about as straightforward as I could produce.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great any comments or questions on the (WIKI)? And I'm noting in the chat a number of questions. The survey was sent out but it was just sent out very recently so a lot of you may not have seen it or you might not have been added to the list.

We will definitely make sure that gets sent to everyone so you have time to review it prior to our call next week. Okay well seeing as that we're at the top of the hour any other comments or questions?

Okay well seeing none I think we'll bring the meeting to a close, thank you all again for participating last week. We only had a couple of us and we were getting a little nervous we weren't going to have a lot of feedback.

But this has been really great feedback to move the process forward.
Stéphane I see you hand is up.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes sorry Jen just a quick question. Can we break off the (WIKI) link to outside of this group or is it just for this group?

Matt: Just to confirm everything on that (WIKI) is public. All the agenda's, all the recordings everything it's already public.

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's what I thought thank you Matt that's I thought thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay was there a concern about that or Stéphane did you have a concern about it being public?

Stéphane Van Gelder: No, absolutely not I...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great.

Stéphane Van Gelder: ...wanted to make sure before I sent it to my group.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great, great okay well pending any other comments again thank you all for your time I appreciate it and we'll look forward to next week.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thanks bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: And thank you everyone for joining...

Woman: Bye.

Coordinator: ...today's conference. Sun if you could please stop the recording.

END