GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 29 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-review20140529-en.mp3

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

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
Avri Doria
James Bladel
David Maher
Chuck Gomes
Michele Neylon
Wolf Knoben Ullrich
Jennifer Standiford
Ron Andruff
Klaus Stoll
Osvaldo Novoa

Apologies:
Thomas Rickert
Stephane Van Gelder
Rudi Vansnick

ICANN Staff:
Larisa Gurnick
Mary Wong
Matt Ashtiani
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Please go ahead, this afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO Review Working Party call on the 29th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have James Bladel, Jennifer Wolfe, Klaus Stoll, David Maher, Osvaldo Novoa and Avri Doria. We have apologies from Stéphane Van Gelder, Rudi Vansnick and Thomas Rickert.

From staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Matt Ashtiani and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would 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: Thank you. Welcome to everybody. Thank you again for taking time out of your day for this committee meeting. I know we'll have a few more joining probably as we get started but we have a lot to cover so we'll move right into the agenda.

James is on the phone and not on Adobe Connect so, James, again, if you want to jump in on any of the discussions please just jump in any time.

So we have two primary issues to address today. The first is we want to talk about having two different versions to the assessment, and then we want to move right into discussing the questions which hopefully everyone has had an opportunity to review.

Our goal is over today's call and next week's call to get through all of the questions and provide feedback so that we can then move towards the ICANN meeting to have all of the feedback needed on the scope of the questions itself. And when we meet in person in London to then start talking more about how this will move forward and be executed. So again I want to keep us focused so that we can get through this in the next couple of meetings.

So the first item is the concept. Larisa and I had spoke in the last week about the concept of bifurcating the assessment into two versions based upon our

conversation last week; one which would be focused on those who have in-depth knowledge of ICANN where - or of the GNSO in particular but that they would be able to self select to take a more in-depth review and an assessment in which they could choose to do it in segments, as we had discussed last week.

And then a second version in which, again, the survey could be a self selected to be a shorter version that is maybe you're less familiar with ICANN.

Larisa, do you want to jump in and add anything to that? I was just summarizing, you know, what we had discussed. I want to make sure I hit that correctly.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa Gurnick. Thanks, Jen. Yes absolutely correctly. And I would just expand it a little bit and say that for that simpler version of the survey for individuals that have perhaps less of familiarity with the GNSO one of the options could be for them to answer the questions in regards to the GNSO as a whole overall as opposed to in the more in-depth version people could choose whether they wanted to answer for GNSO Council as well as any and all of the GNSO structural components in addition to that GNSO organization overall.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Larisa. So I'll just open it up. Does anyone have any objection to taking that approach? This was really based on the feedback that we had from last week to try to, again, bifurcate this into more in-depth, shorter version and then the in-depth version having the opportunity to take it in pieces so we're not using up any - too much of any one person's time but also allowing us to get some meaningful results. Does anybody have any objections to that approach or comments?

James Bladel: Jen, this is James. Just to be...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, perfect.

James Bladel: ...clear, both groups are self-selecting which survey.

Jennifer Wolfe: Correct.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: No one's being shepherded into one direction or another.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. You would self select, that's the idea is you would choose which one to take. That would give people the opportunity if you want to spend more time completing the assessment you would know okay, this is going to take so much time over multiple sessions whereas if you want to take the short 5-10 minute version you self select, absolutely.

James Bladel: Got it. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well seeing no comments or objections I think, Larisa, that's the way we should proceed.

Let's move right in then to the discussion of the questions. Again, hopefully everyone had the opportunity to review in more detail. Teri, is it possible to put those up on screen so that we can talk through those just section by section and question by question?

What I'd like to ask is that if you have comments on the question itself or suggestions to add additional questions or scope to each section that we discussed that right now and provide that feedback.

As I said, I know a few of you just joined. Our goal is to get through this list between today and next week's call and then we can start preparation for the implementation phase.

Is it possible to make that a little bit bigger so that we can actually read - can you do that? Can we all do that? I suppose we can. Okay.

Okay, so moving right in to the purpose, any comments on these first two questions? I'll give everybody just a minute to reread in case you're refreshing your memory. And James, I'm sorry, you're on the phone so just to let you know that to questions...

James Bladel: That's okay.

Jennifer Wolfe: ...on the purpose - do you remember? Do you have your comments?

James Bladel: Yeah, well I - I'm listening so it's okay. And I will review after as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, absolutely. So the first section is on the purpose about the GNSO structural component and the accountability of the GNSO structure to the ICANN community. Any comments on this section from anyone?

Okay, seeing none. And again, if you think of something later certainly put it on the list so that we can get that feedback.

The next big section - and there's a number of questions here - is on the organization and membership of the GNSO. Any broad comments, questions? Yes, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. In a couple cases I think we could break them down into smaller components, like for example Number 5, it might be useful to separate whether or not there are sufficient human resources as a separate item from financial resources. It gives us more specific detail to work with in terms of the responses.

Similarly I think 10 is a natural for breaking down into two separate questions and then we don't have to go back and follow up on the question. So on Number 10, "Does the membership provide the necessary level of, A, technical expertise and, B, volunteer resources?" Separating that A and B into two separate questions gives us more precise information to use when we get the results.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's a great point. Thank you. Other comments on the scope of the questions? Are we missing anything about the organization and membership that should be addressed? Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks Jen. This is Larisa. In response to Chuck's comment, thank you Chuck, that's very useful. And I just wanted to mention that throughout these questions you will see a number of instances where there is an A, B, C and so on.

And the reason for setting it up that way was that once we plugged these questions into the software application that they would be separated in some fashion whether it be a separate question or a separate component but whatever measurement unit to allow us to capture data for just that one piece. So that's absolutely very valuable feedback. And as you see that throughout the rest of the questions that that was the intent. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, that's great.

Jennifer Wolfe: Any other comments? Yes, Ron, hi.

Ron Andruff: Hi Jennifer. Thank you very much. I'm coming late to this group and I'm apologizing for that. But I also - as I'm looking at this assessment really for the first time right now I don't find it to be very user-friendly in so much, you know, the first question and purpose, "Has the GNSO slash structural component been effective in achieving its principle mission?"

I'm wondering what the, you know, I'm really having to struggle to think about okay what is the structural component? I'm wondering if we might look through this and see if we can just dumb down the language a little bit and make it simpler for people to be able to respond as opposed to having to think about what that question really means?

So it's just a shot out of the dark having just joined. I may be way off base so I apologize if I've misstated anything. But I am struggling as I'm reading through some of these questions to - I really have to think kind of long and hard about what exactly are they asking me here. And so just wanted to bring that to the table. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Ron. I think that's a great point and we did speak a little bit last week about the importance of plain language so to the extent you identify those please do point that out because of that's important feedback. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. And, Ron, I think I struggled the same way as you did in on this. And then - and I want to test my thinking on this. This I think that one of the difficulties of that language is because the questions are being answered for each of the different elements as they're applicable over to the right. Is that correct?

So for example it's not - it's being asked with regard to the GNSO overall, with regard to the GNSO Council, with regard to the different stakeholder group and constituencies and working groups. Am I correct in that? And is that why the language is kind of the way it is now?

I agree with Ron, if we can make that a little cleaner maybe with the introductory remark at the beginning that makes it clear that the questions are going to be responded to to the applicable groups over to the right. Is my interpretation correct in the structure of the survey?

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa, I see you're typing in the chat, do you want to just briefly respond to that for everyone on the phone?

Larisa Gurnick: Sure. The Excel spreadsheet, or the version that you're seeing on the screen is really just a conceptual mockup and it does not reflect the structure of the survey. And based on the discussion that we started with this morning we would bring these questions and format them in such a way as to fit the two versions, the more in depth version and then a less tedious version if you will.

So the concept would be that in the more involved version people would then have the ability to select which of the structural components they would like to answer these questions in regards to.

So visually it would look different. And once we work through the two versions and the questions we will be able to show you a mockup of how that would lay down so that we could test user-friendliness of that approach.

But also regardless of the version of the survey there would definitely be an introductory section that would provide definitions and, you know, much more clarity for the kinds of items that you are flagging, in other words, what is the purpose of the GNSO with a little brief statements and links for those that might want to go exploring further but at least a very quick and simple plain English explanation for people to be able to glance that before they continue.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Larisa. Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Hello, this is Klaus. To come back to the same thing, I would go even a little bit further. I'm fairly aware that there are many in the Internet ecosystem who are absolutely not even aware about the existence of the GNSO. And I think we should combine this questionnaire, it's basically as it is even in both versions it's basically preaching to the converted or basically to those in the know.

And I think we should make an effort of trying to reach those who actually even don't know what the GNSO is and trying to get - to get some kind of this feedback. For example, it would be very interesting for a 360 assessment of the GNSO actually to know who doesn't. I think it needs to be much deeper.

It's also a question obviously of the GNSO and of ICANN as a whole because we need to take in those who are not part of the club. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Klaus. I think that's a great point. And just to reinforce, I think that also is why we're looking at the two different surveys so if someone isn't as familiar they could self select to take the shorter version or somebody who has a lot of understanding could take the more in depth survey. But absolutely I understand, we want to make sure people are informed and educated as to what the GNSO is so that they can respond accurately.

And, Larisa, I see you're typing, I didn't know if you wanted to respond to that further.

Larisa Gurnick: No, Jen, go ahead. I'll just put something in the chat for everybody to see. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, that's great. Chuck is that - your hand is up again right?

Chuck Gomes: It is, thanks. Sorry to jump in so much. But I'm looking at Questions 14 and 15 and it probably relates to others, and this is more a question as to the structure of the ultimate survey.

Question 15, which is, "How well aligned are the organization goals and objectives with the long and short range plans?" It's dependent obviously on whether or not there are long or short range plans in Question 14.

Will the survey be designed so that if the answer is "no" to 14 they won't be given Question 15? If not, then there probably needs to be a not applicable choice. And I'll let you respond to that.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Thanks, Chuck. Just absolutely it makes sense to do what you suggested. If the answer is no or not applicable we will make those options available.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: So just moving down, Chuck had moved down into the execution phase of the question...

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, no, no, absolutely we want to move through those. And that doesn't preclude anyone of course from jumping around. We just want to make sure we do cover all of the questions. As you look down into 14 through - I think we have what 22, 23 - any comments on the execution piece? Is there anything that we haven't addressed in terms of execution?

Chuck, are you raising your hand again? I'm sorry I didn't want to...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I thought I put it down. I'm sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's okay. That's okay, I just want to make sure.

Chuck Gomes: There I got it. Okay.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think - I just - as I look at it I think a lot of it goes back to Klaus's point to just make sure people understand what some of these terms mean when we talk about structural component. Klaus, yes please.

Klaus Stoll: I think we need to go further then just to translate the terms. We need to make it attractive for those inside and outside the GNSO. We have to give them a reason - and interest to fill this out and to get engaged. It's not good enough just to have a questionnaire which is easily explained, we have to give people reason to fill it out and we should think about that one. What is the motivation of people to...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely. That's a great point. And maybe we can add that to our list I think of topics to discuss in London just with our timeframe being the next two meetings we're trying to get feedback on the questions and then we'll be talking more specifically about how is it communicated to the public and how does the survey itself work. We will have the opportunity to test the survey system that's being used. Absolutely, absolutely that's an important point

                 Other comments on the questions themselves so that staff can continue to move forward and getting the survey into the system that will be used and we can look to test it. But if there's language that you'd like to tweak certainly we want to get that feedback. And again, if you do have a chance after the call, if you're looking at it in more detail please do put it out on list so we can tweak language.

                 Anything as you look down into the outcomes? I think again we have these sort of multipart questions that sounds like that would be separated out. Other comments from the group?

                 Are there areas that are not covered in these sections that have been created? Anything that you all think we should be covering as part of our assessment that we have not addressed?

                 Does everyone feel like they've had enough time to look at it? Do you feel like you need another - we want to come back and do this again next week just to

make sure everyone's voice has been heard? I certainly don't want to rush through this.

James Bladel: Hey, Jen. This is James. If we could have at least until the end of the week to put comments on the list that would be...

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely. I mean, we can do this again next week and give everybody more time to read through it and maybe put out on list that we want to make sure everyone knows that we want comments in on the questions by next week either by list or in this call. Ron, I saw your hand pop up, did you want to say something?

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jen. Actually I was just going to support James's comment that we - I don't think we need to go too much longer. It does look like it's pretty detailed. But for myself and others we might be just looking at it for the first time. And when you ask the question, is there anything missing, this does need a little more thought. So I just - I was just typing into the chat that I support James's recommendation through the end of this week...

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely.

Ron Andruff: ...and then we can move on next week. I don't think it's going to take a lot more but it does take the time to sit down and read through this and reflect on whether or not everything is there. Thank you very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely. Absolutely and I think that's a great point. So I think what would make sense is that we give everyone another week, we put it out on list that next week is the deadline to provide comments on the language of the questions or the scope of the questions. Let me know if everybody agrees with that approach and that way we complete the feedback part of our scope to provide to staff and to the SIC.

And then from there we'll be talking more about implementation and education and some of the technical aspects of how we move this forward. I see Chuck put a checkmark. Anybody opposed to that approach or want to add a comment?

Okay, well that was our agenda for today very we were trying to keep it focused so that if we had a lot of discussion we could get through it. Chuck, I see your hand is up go ahead please.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, one more general question going beyond the specific questions of themselves and that is have you given thought to how you would break these up into smaller components? Would we use the categories as they are so that we have these 10, 15 minute - so that it's realistic to respond to a particular set of questions in a brief period of time like we talked about last week? Just curious whether you given any thought to how this might be divided up that way in the end.

We obviously have some categories that are there. I don't know if they can be done - some of the bigger categories can be done in 10, 15 minutes. So I'm curious what your thoughts are there. Obviously when you get to the end may be a couple could be combined together because they're a little bit different but what's your thinking on that?

Jennifer Wolfe: So I see Larissa, would you like to respond to that?

Larisa Gurnick: Sure, thanks Jen. This is a Larisa. Yes, the thought was that we would maintain the categories and once we have a clearer picture of the phraseology and the number of questions we would think about a logical way to break it into components.

And to a certain extent I think since we decided to - seems like we've decided to have two versions, one that's more in depth and one that's simpler, it would be just a matter of seeing how time-consuming the simpler version would be.

Perhaps that version wouldn't require the breakdown so how we keep the two surveys aligned and not get confusion, you know, between the two versions I think will take some careful consideration.

But the other thought was that for in depth knowledge version of the survey it would be reasonable since most of those people most likely opting to use that version would be people that are involved in the GNSO and really their feedback would be more akin to the self-assessment that the GNSO would undergo so perhaps they would be willing to commit more than five or 10 minutes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: Does that make sense? And it actually would be wonderful to hear people's feedback on that point. Would it be reasonable to expect that are those that self select to do a more in-depth analysis that the expectation would be that that would take more thought and therefore more time and perhaps not break that into smaller components.

Jennifer Wolfe: You know, Larissa, I'll just respond to that and then I see Chuck. But I think the importance would be that however the survey is disseminated is that you could stop and save whatever you responded to and come back to it.

Because I think, you know, in my experiences in terms of getting good data we do need to have an in-depth survey from some people. But we certainly want to make it easy for everyone so that they could take it for 5 or 10 minutes, save, come back to it at a later point in time if they've self-selected for the more in-depth survey. Chuck please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Jen, you actually said I think mostly what I was going to say. It's true that people are - that are going to agree to provide more in-depth analysis may be willing to commit a little bit more time. But the same principle still comes into play that we talked about last week.

Those of us that do that also will get more responses from them as well if it's still broken down. So we shouldn't assume that the people providing in depth information still are going to be able to commit a large block of time to complete the survey or one portion of the survey. So I think we still need to try and break it down into smaller bites even for those people.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa, do you know the survey company that's putting this together, they have the ability that you can stop and save your work, right, and then come back to it? I assume that that's possible.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Yes, absolutely, that is a primary and basic requirement that people be able to do that. And I think there's many mechanics that could be applied to make it really easy such as links to the different sections and perhaps other means of helping people understand the structure of the survey that they're about to engage in and where they are in the process.

So to a certain extent as we work through the software application and its functionality we'll explore exactly what tools are available to make this as user-friendly as possible. But being able to save and come back is a basic requirement.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well, and with that, you know, Chuck have made the comment earlier, some of these sections are very long so they would likely take even more than say a 10 minute time to provide meaningful answers to them. So part of how we may look at creating sections that are nice breaking points is, you know, at what point is the average person going to reach 10 minutes and then allow a breaking point in the survey process?

But I think for everybody, you know, on the call part of this process will be that we're able to test it and provide additional feedback if we think that, from an implementation standpoint it's not working effectively once we get through this phase of providing feedback on the questions themselves.

Any other comments? I know this is a - we had in hour and we've gone through this in 30 minutes so that's great. Certainly want to give anybody the opportunity to speak on any other issues of concern or provide feedback on the review process. See none. I see Ron is typing. I don't know if you want to jump in, Ron, or - sounds like a good way, great.

Okay well then that will be our plan. We will reinforce on list that next week is our deadline to provide feedback on the language of the questions and the scope of the questions and on any missing pieces and then we'll discuss our plans to meet in person in London and our next steps from there. So anything else from anyone else?

Okay great. Thank you. I appreciate everybody working through this and appreciate your time today. I look forward to talking with you next week.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jen. Thanks, all.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, all.

Jennifer Wolfe: James, drive safely.

                              END