

**GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 05 June 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-review20140605en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
Avri Doria
David Maher
Wolf Knoben Ullrich
Ron Andruff
Klaus Stoll
Osvaldo Novoa
Rafik Dammak

Apologies:

Chuck Gomes
Stephane Van Gelder
Michele Neylon

ICANN Staff:

Larisa Gurnick
Marika Konings
Matt Ashtiani
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: At this time I'd like to remind all parties today's conference is being recorded. You can begin. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO Review Working Party call on the 5th of June, 2014. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Jennifer Wolfe, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Ron Andruff, Avri Doria, Klaus Stoll and David Maher. We have apologies from Chuck Gomes and Stéphane Van Gelder. Also just joining us is Osvaldo Novoa.

From staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Marika Konings 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, Jennifer.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks. Thanks, everybody, again for taking time to join us today to continue our work on the 360 assessment. As we had mentioned in the email list our goal for today's session is to finalize getting feedback on the scope of the questions so that we can give that to staff and to the SIC to move forward and to actually creating the survey.

I did just want to comment briefly, I know - Ron, I read through your list very carefully and those were all really great questions and I want to make sure we address all of those today. But one that popped up a lot in your list was, you know, where do I input this information? And I just wanted to be clear that the spreadsheet that's circulating around is just for our purposes of gathering what questions are going to be asked. It's not actually what anybody would use to take the survey.

So part of our process as we go forward will be to test out the actual software that's used. So once these questions are finalized and they get input into the software solution that's going to be used. We will have the opportunity to test it and see if there is any confusion about how you answer the question or where you put it.

So I think those are really great points because as we've all said how long it takes and how easy it is certainly impacts what kind of response we get so that will be a next step for us in our process. So I just wanted to make sure I address that.

Our goal for today is to focus in again on the questions. I think everybody had more time to review all of them so we'd like to make sure we go again section

by section and ask for any further comments on the language, on the scope, on how things should be broken down.

And then we're going to turn that back over to staff to revise and recirculate and we'll be able to comment further on list and our next meeting will actually be our in-person meeting in London at which time we'll talk more about outreach, hopefully we'll know the timeframe to be able to test the software at that point in time and we can also discuss if we think any additional data gathering is needed as part of a self review. So that's just mapping out where we're headed over, you know, the next few weeks.

So with that I'm going to pause and open it up for questions or comments on the scope. I know we've had some good discussion on list so I guess I'll look out to all of you for comments. Ron, please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jennifer. And thank you very much for the clarification with regard to the form versus the spreadsheet. Do appreciate that and that makes a lot more sense. The question - actually a couple things come to my mind. James Bladel brought up the comment I think was in his post last night or maybe another but the comment was who are we aiming this at?

And I think it would be good to have a little conversation about that today so we understand that a little better because the target group will be very important.

And then the second comment I wanted to raise was the issue of - that Chuck and I were sort of kicking back and forth a little bit, what are the names we are going to use or the terminology we are going to use whether it's groups or something like that.

We really need to nail that down; that's the core elements, who is the respondent that we're looking for and how are we going to frame these questions in a simple way. Those are the two things I think that are standing

in front of me that I have questions about and would like to see that kind of get resolved as quickly as we can at the top of this call and before we start getting into the questions themselves. So if anyone can help me with that I would be grateful. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. So I'll take a first pass at it and then Larissa if you want to jump in please do of course. So in terms of, you know, who are we targeting what we have determined in our last call was that we would have two versions; one is to the general community someone who may not be that familiar with ICANN.

So there will be one version of these questions that is streamlined and tailored for someone may be less familiar with the ICANN environment. And then there will be a more in depth. Now the user will self select, do I want to take the more in depth, I know a lot about ICANN survey; or do I want to take the shorter quicker version so there will be some self-selection. But that's how we've bifurcated the two target groups.

And then in terms of the terminology I agree we can certainly have discussion today what terms are being used and how do we make it as straightforward as possible. Klaus, I see your hand is up, please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Hi, this is Klaus. I hope you can hear me. I think we should go a little bit further than think about just to make it easier for people to participate or go into the survey. We first of all need to make people interested in participating indeed which means we need to make it relevant.

So maybe at least for the short version or what the you call the easier version there should be some outreach and there should some language before the thing to explain to people why it is important and why it is relevant (unintelligible) to these people to actually fill it out. Otherwise I really don't see any reason why should somebody fill it out and get engaged and that goes of course back to the language.

I think looking at all the questions until now the language I think for an outsider in practice is still much, much too complicated. I appreciate all the efforts but what's going on but again if it's not relevant it will not be filled out if we don't have the outside participation the whole GNSO review for me loses a lot of (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Klaus. Those are excellent points. Absolutely 100% agree. Outreach is going to be a big part of our work. And I think what we're trying to do right now is get through the question piece of it so that they can move forward with getting the survey created and then absolutely outreach and how it's phrased at the top is important and if anybody has suggestions on that let's definitely start capturing those.

I guess any other comments on the questions or anything else prior to digging in and we could pull up the questions and again do what we did last time which is go through section by section and provide comments or, Larisa, did you want to comment on any of these things first?

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks, Jen. This is Larisa. No, let's go ahead into the questions and as you already suggested the outreach and some of the items that Klaus suggested would be important. There is already some work going on for this working party to react to so you will be seeing some more information on that coming after this meeting. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. So I don't know if it's possible to pull up on screen the spreadsheet. Hopefully all of you have it; if you don't we can - I'm sure we can put a link in very quickly for you. But any comments as you look through the list of questions? I know there's been some discussion about the terminology, does anyone have any specific comments on terminology that they'd like to see changed?

I know we've talked a little bit about what does structural component mean and do people understand those things? Any suggestions on a different way to phrase that or other ways to make this easier? Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Jennifer. I wish Chuck were on the call...

Jennifer Wolfe: He's our master isn't he?

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Yeah, I mean, there is given more thought to this than I have had. But I do think that - and I made note of that in my post that it's very cumbersome the language we have - that terminology. And I'm inclined to agree, you know, the GNSO/structural components in one place and groups in another place, then something else in another place, members I think it is, in another place.

There's nothing to tie all of those elements together that one can simply see the logic of the tree kind of expanding before them. And I think that's one of the problems that we face right now. We need to really give some thought to give it just groups? Are we all just different groups within the ICANN structure?

And are we asking the respondents -- let me take my own example. I'm a member of the Business Constituency so am I coming in and just filling this out from a BC point of view and I'm just answering the - and m checking yes, no and so forth in the BC box?

Or am I venturing a little further afield and am I giving my opinion on the GNSO structure? And then even venturing further afield to start weighing in with my - and start to opine on how I feel about the other side of the house that I'm in?

I mean, that's where it starts to get really dicey because I don't know, these are just opinions. So I just want to try and understand that part. And if I could understand that part maybe I could understand what language would make more sense because I think for ICANN insiders - even for ICANN insiders, GNSO/structural components that was a tough one for me to try to get my head around.

I thought I knew what it was but I wasn't sure and we should never have a situation in a survey where someone has to try to figure out what it is in terms of a question.

So I do believe that the language we have right now is too cumbersome; I'm not sure if groups is the right or wrong way and that's why I would - I wish Chuck were here to weigh in. But maybe others who were privy to those conversations and can give some thought to it.

But I think we do need to harmonize this language somewhat but I don't know off the top of my head exactly which way to go. But groups may be it's, you know, it's self-selected group that I mean and I'm discussing. But I think it comes back to that first question, how am I, as a respondent, answering this questionnaire? Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Those are great points. And Larisa, I see you can comment on that.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks, Jen. This is Larisa Gurnick. We've thought through some of these questions and obviously are looking for feedback from all of you in regards to what would make the most sense ideally, the assessment is geared toward collecting information for all of these. And let me just, for the moment, refer to them as structural components recognizing that that wouldn't be the term that we would ultimately use because it might be confusing.

But the idea is that because of the GNSO structure the feedback would be gathered at each of those structural component levels. Now there's two ways

to go about that; we could ask the individual responding what their anchor is and whether they would be responding on behalf of what their involvement is with the GNSO, if they're part of the GNSO.

Or we could, regardless of what their anchor, if you will, is we could ask them to respond in terms of their opinion on all of the structural components of the GNSO, or we could ask them just to respond relative to GNSO as a whole.

So an earlier suggestion was that for the two versions, for the simpler version, once again it would be self-selected; someone would decide which way they would like to answer then they could provide feedback on the GNSO as a whole because that would be easier for someone that's less familiar and probably give them a better basis of forming their answers.

Whereas someone that's more in-depth earlier with the GNSO could actually, regardless of their personal or group affiliation, could respond and provide their opinion relative to each one of those structural components. That of course makes the response quite more cumbersome and complicated.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Larisa. If I may just a quick comment, Jennifer?

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, of course.

Ron Andruff: Yeah, I think that - thank you for that explanation. I'm wondering - and my knee-jerk reaction to that was we really want to gather as much what I'll call good data as we can in this exercise.

And my concern is that, take my own example; I know the BC well and I know the charter of the BC. I know that GNSO relatively well because I've been an active member now for a dozen or more years. So I know those two parts but I don't know the other parts as well.

So now if I start to - I don't think - where you get into bad data or not clean data is when I start opining on the registrars' or are not I believe that they're doing all of their activities according to their charter. I don't know their charter and I don't know whether they're doing their activities according to it. So than that data now it's not really good data, that's just an opinion.

And so that's where we want to maybe want to draw the line, that we just - we would want people to (hew) to their own stakeholder group or constituency with their comments and that way I think we would have people talking about things they know about as opposed to things that they're speculating about. So that's a really important distinction that we draw there is something that the committee might want to consider more deeply. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Ron. And I think that's a great point. And I think that's part of where we are going to have to rely on people somewhat for self-selection of, I am very knowledgeable, I want to take the more in depth versus the less in-depth. And I think perhaps another way to do it too may be the responses can be scored based upon some information gathered about the survey taker in terms of how long have they been involved or what roles have they played and maybe those who have been involved get weighted a little bit more than those who haven't been involved.

So I think some of it could come into how do we interpret the data, does that make sense, Ron, that maybe it's about interpretation...

Ron Andruff: Yeah.

Jennifer Wolfe: ...versus just the question.

Ron Andruff: No I like - I actually like the world you are walking down there with the idea that we would qualify the respondent a little bit. How many years have you been at ICANN? How many meetings have you attended? So forth so that they would give some qualifications to the data.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right.

Ron Andruff: I like that idea. But I also - I think that if the instructions are very clear about that, you know, we're gathering information and so please speak to things that you know about as opposed to speaking to, you know, as opposed to just opining on everything.

You know, in other words speak to - so the instructions are very clear about this is the information we're looking for so please help us with that and don't muddy the waters so to speak that would be I think another way to go on that. So those are two ways to qualify that data and to make sure we get as clean a data set as we can. I like that. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa, is that going to be an issue with the software that's being used? I assume there some way to capture data about the person taking the survey and then we can use that in the analysis phase, is that correct?

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, I'm so sorry, this is Larisa. I was coming off of mute and I missed that part of what you said, sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, no, no, no problem at all. We were just talking about, you know, A, how do we provide - we can certainly provide clarification and communication about, you know, what you're responding to and to try to respond to what you have, you know, experience or knowledge with.

But when it comes to interpreting the data is there a way that when the survey taker logs in to take the software are we going to be able to gather some information about them to know, you know, to ask some of those questions? How much experience have you had? Have you held any leadership roles, and things along those lines so that and when we gathered the data we're able to weight it.

I mean, I think this is a particularly important when we think about our self review that we want to take this data and allow the GNSO to analyze it and present our own conclusions so we can compare those with those of the auditor.

And so I guess my question, Larisa, is, will this software allow us to capture that data and then be able to analyze it based upon how much experience the person had within the ICANN environment so that we might be able to weight some data points more so than others.

Larisa Gurnick: Absolutely. We have the functionality regardless of which tool and how we formulate this ultimately. But there's always functionality up front to have qualifying questions which then enable us to summarize and aggregate and analyze data based on that.

Of course at the same time - so functionally there's absolutely no reason why we wouldn't be able to do that. We would just have to weigh how many questions we ask up front about a person versus their perhaps unwillingness to provide all of that information and causing them not to actually go through with the survey. So that's another fine point to consider.

So we want to collect enough information. We probably want to be careful about exactly how much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Any comments from the group on that point? That's a really fair point. No one? Okay. Okay well I think that's some good feedback, Larisa, that we want to make sure that when we have these two different surveys we're trying to frame it so that they can self select based upon their knowledge to answer questions based upon their knowledge and information.

And then to the extent we could briefly gather some of their experience within the ICANN environment that will certainly help us when we go to analyze data so that we can determine what we think has the most validity.

Moving on to the questions, we were talking about GNSO structure versus group. It sounded like there was some favoring of the word "group" versus "structure" is that correct? Because that's a little bit of an easier term to understand. Any comments about the general language describing the GNSO in each of these questions?

Ron, please, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jen. So this first question, "Has the GNSO/structural component been effective in achieving its principle mission as defined in its charter or bylaws?"

So the question that I have - I'm assuming - we've discussed this and I'm assuming that there will be information explaining these questions how we're supposed to - how a respondent should answer these questions. And so if that were in place then this first question would make some sense to me. But as a - just without any framework around this question it's pretty wide open.

I mean, you think about the kind of response one could give to this: "Has it been effective in achieving its principle mission as defined in the charter?" I don't know if the BC has a principle mission. It has certain criteria that we believe are important and we list of those often when we do public comments that we kind of state upfront in the first paragraph or two what the BC's view is and how we'd like to see the ICANN process unfold.

So I don't know if there is a principle mission; I guess that's what I'm saying is I don't know if there's just - if I can say from the BC's point of view have we achieved our principle mission? Have we effectively done that in our charter?

If we go across to Council, same story. I would have to ask myself the question, I don't know, have Council achieved its principle mission? But what

is its principle mission? So I'm having a little trouble with that word there; not sure what that question specifically says. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Ron. David.

David Maher: I like to go back to your question about structural component versus group. I think the present wording, GNSO/structural component, is confusing and I think the word "group" is preferable. And I think each of the questions really should be rewarded so it's clear that you are asking multiple questions; one about GNSO itself and the same question about the various groups. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Other comments? David, is that new or are you still?

David Maher: Yeah, no that's all. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Okay great. Any other comments on that topic? Okay well certainly if anybody has another thought and ones to jump back please don't hesitate.

So looking down through the remaining questions were there other terms that concerned people? I know some of the comments in the chat were about separating out multipart questions. So I think structurally, Larisa, you've got that feedback now right, so will be able to restructure some of those multi-parts into numerous questions, is that right? Or do we need to talk about that further?

Larisa Gurnick: No, that's right. We got that one.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, okay so that's been addressed. Any other comments or questions as you look through the organization and membership, concerns about how someone may be answering the questions? Again I think a big piece of this - we will, like I said will have the ability to test out the software and the interface. And I'm sure we're going to have a lot of comments when we see that. And the extent we can make it easier we'll be able to do that.

But if there's any other language or questions or there are any other questions that are missed? I know in the chat there were some discussions about the NomComm and there were some other issues. I'll pull up the list here in a second. But, Ron, please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Jennifer. On number 10 we use the word "membership," in fact we use it on number nine, question number nine first, it talks about new members. But number 10 says, "Does membership provide the necessary level of expertise?"

So I think again just more clarity, does the membership - does the membership - and again does the membership provide the necessary level of technical expertise (unintelligible). So does the membership of your group provide that?

Just again, to kind of to go back to who - membership in what and who does this membership belong to? So these places where there is ambiguity if we could tighten those things up to be very specific so that I can understand as a respondent what's being asked of me. Does the membership in your group provide the necessary level of membership - being a part of your group, do you find the membership as a whole provide these things?

I'm not even sure, you know, about this question itself on the whole. I don't know if we need - if every constituency has a certain amount of technical expertise or not and I would hope that they do but these are - again the question I'm just not clear about.

I'll noodle that a little bit. But I guess what I was getting at is just clarity, just get more clarity to that term "membership." Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay that's great, Ron. Thank you. I agree that since we don't actually formally become a member in some ways people can just participate so what

does that mean, I think. And, Larisa, I know we have a frequently asked question, do we have a definitions or should we maybe include some terminology somewhere in this process? Is that already in the...

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, that's what I'm thinking as I'm listening to this that there would be a mechanism to define some of these terms as they relate to the survey.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right, maybe even in an opening section, you know, for the purpose of the survey these terms mean, and provide some clarity since (unintelligible) ambiguous.

Ron Andruff: Yes, Jen. This is Ron. That's exactly it. If we have a - that terminology defined up front then there's no problem with this.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right.

Ron Andruff: But as long as those definitions are clear and presented in a way that no one can miss them. As we know, people read that they really don't read so they gloss over things and so that has to be read up front and easily read. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great. Avri, I know you have made some comments about including questions about NomComm appointees and then Chuck had said he that that might be structural. Did you want to comment on that or does anybody else have thoughts based upon the list discussion?

Avri Doria: Sure, this is Avri. I can comment. Basically, I mean, we were looking at each of the stakeholder groups. And while - and so that to me - in the columns are indeed already all structural items, the GNSO is a structure, the Council is a structure, and each of the stakeholders are structures.

So basically we're asking all of these questions based on various structural elements. Now one of the ones that I thought that we should include in the column is even the house structure. And the other one I had thought was - and this is less structure but still it's a critical structural component of the GNSO Council is the whole notion of the NomComm appointee.

And after the last set of so-called improvements we very much changed the role of that particular structural element, the NCA. So it occurred to me that in looking at all of this that we needed to ask these questions against not only the various constituencies and stakeholder groups, etcetera, or the Council itself but also against the houses and also - and I know it's sort of a different kind of structure but really it is a structure, the NomComm appointee.

Now perhaps I see it more as a structure because - the previous architecture for the GNSO, the three NomComm appointees were not divided among groups; they were in a sense a pseudo-group that supported each other and worked together and covered each other's gaps because they all have the same workload.

And so now it's a little bit more diffuse as a structure because they've been stuck inside different houses or left homeless. So but basically that is a structure. And by the way you've done better with homelessness than any of your predecessors. But - you've made it work.

And then that - indeed it was looking at what you've done versus what happened before where a person basically just sat there. Looking at it, as the structure of the NCA, which is critical to the sort of accountability, of the GNSO to the greater community how is that working?

And so these questions seem to apply across that column too so that's what I was driving at. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, thanks, Avri. And, yeah, speaking as the homeless NCA councilmember I think it would be great to get some feedback. I'd certainly love to provide my perspective in this process. So in my opinion it would be great to add at least a question even if it's not labeled a group that at least have a question about it.

And I know Chuck was concerned about it falling over into structure but maybe there's a way to draft the question so it's more seeking feedback about the use of the NCAs to give us some important data points. Ron, I see your hand is up first and then we'll...

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Jennifer. I support Avri's comments and I think what struck me as she was speaking is that we're talking about a GNSO review so indeed we have to address all elements of the GNSO and certainly NCA NomComm appointees are very much a part of the structure. So yes and we have to have some kind of questions in their addressing NCAs.

And the question about voting, you know, if we go back to the improved version, as Avri noted, we went and created this house structure, and we started to move away from the issue - GNSO Council of voting and how we were always getting logjams at Council level on voting and we moved into this PDP and working group structure.

Now it seems that the votes in Council are rare and certainly more collegial. I guess that's me looking from the other side in. I'm not sure if that's true or not. But so that issue of making sure that there were the right amount of votes and the NCA good kind of break that tie I think that's maybe historically where that came from. I may be way off base but it seems to me that's it.

And so now the question is, of voting, I don't think we can do too much with that in this particular survey but it certainly does have to be addressed as part of the GNSO review and as much with the NomComm review that's going on I think with the ECG right now.

So the voting issue I think we may want to keep that separate but guess we do want to ask questions about the NCA and, you know, do we understand them, do we appreciate them, should they be voting or not voting? Those are good questions because they are certainly elements of the GNSO.

The second part that Avri went into was talking a little bit about the house structure. And I think that's also an important question that we need to ask because that was an 11th hour and 59th minute compromise that created this Contracted Parties House and Non-Contracted Parties House and in the NCPH you have the Business and the - you have Commercial and Non Commercial side as well.

So .structure - I don't know if that's - if others would agree with me but it's been cumbersome and I don't think it's been as effective as one would have hoped. So we should be asking questions about the house structure. Is a good? Not good? Like? Don't like? Or something along those lines to get a sense of what the community's feeling is on the current how structure and do we need to be going back and looking at that more closely? I support both of those things that Avri brought up. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Ron. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah thanks, Jen and Avri for your question. Well just, well, for clarification, not to be misunderstood because the answer to the list as well to that question.

I'm very convinced, well, that the NCA - let me say, relationship to the GNSO and the inclusion so is a question which should be dealt with in this questionnaire. That my only question was how about - how to do this.

And so as I understood from the - from Ray's presentation of what was the intention at the SIC at the time being this - that the structural issue means the

question whether the houses - house structure and the GNSO structure itself is under discussion at the time being that is - that should be not the case in this round of the review. That's what I understood.

However so I would also encourage, well, to have some questions with relation to the NCA engagement - to the NCA inclusion here in this environment. So I personally would like to think about that and try to come up with a question. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa - thank you, Wolf. Larisa, I'll just ask, do you think you have enough that maybe we could add a question on that issue and circulate it and get any feedback on list?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes absolutely.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay I think that might be helpful. And that way - I want to be fair to Chuck too since he had concerns and he's not on the call. So perhaps if we could, as we make the modifications we can circulate it on list and get feedback, that would be most helpful.

And just looking at the structure it might fit well into the organization and membership section of how it's broken down right now. Are there any others - I'm trying to go back through our list - the emails and make sure we've covered all the points that were bounced around back and forth. Are there other questions or topics that you think have not been covered? Yes, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Sorry, that's an old hand.

Jennifer Wolfe: That was still - that was the old one? Okay, Ron. I think that's new.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jennifer. Number 25, the question is, "What is the perceived quality of the GNSO/structural components products/outputs? Considering such characteristics as..."

Let's not talk about the GNSO structural components, let's just say what is the perceived quality of the groups? And then comes the question, "products/outputs." There's no product as output. There's no product developed by any of these groups so that were doesn't even belong there in my view.

So what's the perceived quality of the output - outputs, plural sign, considering such characteristics. So it's - components/products, there aren't any products and I think that's just that's more confusion to this. So for my view if we can strike that word and let's try to tighten up that language as well. "What's the perceived quality of the group's output considering such characteristics such as." I think that's important. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, thank you Ron. And just looking at that I'd just add I think, you know, maybe there are two questions there too. There's the outputs which is the quality. And I think probably what they meant by product is maybe the actual policy, you know, the writing and the actual, you know, document that gets circulated, what's the quality of that document?

But then there's also the outcome, you know, how does it actually work in practice. So do you think there is a good enough reason to separate those into the outputs, what's actually output, and then what the outcome is?

Ron Andruff: Yeah, I agree.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Absolutely. Absolutely. And this is the kind of clarity that we need. I do understand where you're going - why that word was put in here. But again I have never heard anybody in the ICANN in 13, 14 years I've been around here talk about the product they delivered. So at the end of the day, you

know, bringing in terms that we don't use doesn't help us. Output and outcome, those help us. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great. Other comments on any of the language or again I think probably the big one I want to make sure we hit on is if there's anything that you think has not been addressed that we would want to address because our goal is that this can be used to gather data and we don't need to go conduct a separate self review; we will conduct a separate analysis.

But we want to make sure that we're gathering all of the data points we need. So is there anything in any of your constituency groups that you think you would want data on that we are not asking here or gathering? Ron, please, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Just want to reflect back on one of the comments that I put in - I posted to the list. And that was about the fact that there was a question - the question is whether or not our constituencies or groups are getting the work done on time. And, you know, are we managing that properly? And I noted that in fact it was actually ICANN that is - are they giving us enough time?

And I think that was more around the question - I can't remember exactly what it was but it was a question about timing and are we being effective in our timing and meeting the timelines. But for all those who've been on - around ICANN for some time we've watched the pace just increase radically where things are just coming down so rapidly that we don't have a chance to review and do the work because ICANN and the Board and staff are throwing so much stuff out at us.

And even to the extent that this is - I didn't know where along the way the new term "work parties" was coined because we had working groups that were chartered by the GNSO Council; all of a sudden now we have a work party. So we have a whole new structural element that we've been walking down a road on.

And I don't see anybody in the community ever even questions what is this new thing and where did it come from because we have work parties. And then what's the difference between a work party and the working group? And how did we get these things because I don't remember the GNSO Council ever talking about okay let's use these things called work parties.

So it's an example of stuff just coming out of ICANN at us and the timing that we have to respond and deal with these things because it's - our work is voluntary, is very often short and we don't have the ability to meet the timelines or be able to address all of the things that are coming. So I think that we need to address not just what's going on within the GNSO but within ICANN.

How does that community feel about the rate of activity that is being generated by staff and foisted upon the community to deal with on short time frames. So if we could capture a question or a couple questions in that vein I think that would be very helpful as well. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Ron. I think that's a great point so maybe we need to add in maybe the execution stage, you know, is there sufficient time or, you know, are we effectively using mechanisms to respond more timely to, you know, the changing marketplace and the external factors?

Ron Andruff: Well, no, Jen, where I was going was the fact that it's not the changing marketplace, what it is is the model of ICANN, the bottom-up consensus driven model is being driven by staff, it's not being driven by the community or maybe it is and I misunderstand it. So that's the question.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh okay, I'm sorry, I misunderstood.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Does the community feel that there is a lot of - does the community feel the pace at which the staff that's flowing out of staff to that community - do they feel that's a good - a reasonable pace? Do they feel it's too fast or too slow or do they feel it's too much? Do we feel as a community we have enough time to deal with these things before all of a sudden there's another one, another work party and another this and another that and, you know, it doesn't really get completed.

So that's the question, it's really a question of do we feel like we are being - we're having drank from a fire hose or do we feel like the water is coming through the hose at a rate that we can actually swallow it and do what we need to do?

Jennifer Wolfe: That's a great point.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: I totally understand. And just to follow up to the group is do we want to ask - I mean, is it that staff is doing it or is staff responding to the external environment that's pushing them to do it? I mean, it is sort of a chicken and an egg? Are staff just trying to be responsive to the global community or is it staff self generating? Is that a question worth asking? And I'm just posing that as a question.

Ron Andruff: Certainly from - yeah, it certainly is from my point of view. I mean, we've gone through, you know, I have a dozen CEOs over the last dozen years and each one has had their own style.

But as staff has continued to increase, you know, back in the day a decade ago we were all waiting on staff to get documentation out to us because we as a community were working ahead of the staff. Now what's happened is quite the opposite. And so I think it's good to query the community as to

whether they think it's - that the CEO is driving this too fast for us to be able to keep pace or do we believe it staff or do we believe it's of our own making?

But these are the kinds of questions that would be very helpful for us as a - as the GNSO to kind of sort out amongst ourselves as we do this kind of review of ourselves. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's a great point. Does anyone else have any comments on that? Do you think that would be effective to ask that question? Does anyone disagree, I guess I would say? Larisa, do you feel like you have enough to go on to add the question on that topic?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes I do.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay that's great, Ron. Thanks for raising that point; I think those are some really good questions and data that we could be gathering in this time period to utilize effectively.

Anyone else have other topics that you think were not addressed because this is certainly the opportunity we want to have those questions into the mix. Anyone else? Going once, going twice.

Okay well seeing none, that was our agenda for today was to get through these questions. As I said, the next step - we're not going to meet next week because we're going to give staff time to take all of this feedback and rework the questions. And those will be recirculated, so we'll have one final opportunity to comment on the questions themselves.

We are working on a meeting time in London. I don't know if that has been set yet. Does anybody from staff know if we have a scheduled meeting time?

Larisa Gurnick: Jen, it's Larisa. I know Matt is following up on that. The tentative time that has been submitted is a Sunday, 22 June at 5:00 pm, 1700 London time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sunday at 5:00 pm.

Larisa Gurnick: But we will - that has not been confirmed yet so...

Jennifer Wolfe: Not confirmed so just...

((Crosstalk))

Larisa Gurnick: ...we have a confirmation we'll circulate to the group.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So our next time to convene will be tentatively Sunday at 5:00 pm in London together. And at that time we will be seeing - we should - Larisa, I just want to confirm we'll be able to see the revised questions by then, correct?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. And, Rafik, I see your hand is up, let me pause and go ahead please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Jen. About the timing of the meeting in London on Sunday at 5:00 pm it can be an issue because that's kind of allocated time for stakeholder groups to have their internal discussion if I understand it. So GNSO at 4:30 and then 4:30 and then we've got time after it for internal discussion with the internal stakeholder groups. So...

Jennifer Wolfe: So, Larisa, do you know if there is any flexibility on that timing?

Larisa Gurnick: We will certainly check.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay so we'll check on that. I know it's really hard, everybody always has some sort of a conflict so we'll do the best we can to find a time but at least we will have something scheduled to reconvene in person. And of course if you can attend, you know, please always feel free to reach out to meet and

share with me, you know, your comments and do so on list as well and we'll make sure everything gets incorporated into the discussion.

So our agenda will be, when we meet in person, is to, you know, review the revised questions provided from staff, provide some comments and discussion on what sort of outreach and education there will be about the survey. We'll get some updates on when we'll be able to test the actual survey, the actual software, so we can see how it looks and feels and provide comments.

And then we can further discuss if any sort of supplemental self review data-gathering is needed. So that will be on our agenda at the London meeting. Any other comments or questions or, Larisa, do you have anything you want to add or wrap up here on the call?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. The only thing that I'd like to add is parallel to this effort we do have the evaluation of the independent examiner proceeding. And while the appointment of the independent examiner will likely take place by the Structural Improvements Committee in London, but from the proposals that have been reviewed and the conversations that we've had I think that there will be interesting and helpful resources to bear to assist with the 360 process and the questions in terms of making sure that they're phrased in a way that people will find useful.

So we're looking forward to getting some outside expertise to take what this group will develop and provide some additional feedback before we launch the 360. So that will be useful because we will leverage expertise of others that have done this on a regular basis.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you. And we'll have an opportunity to see their suggestions, correct?

Larisa Gurnick: Of course.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Great, great, that's very helpful. Okay well great. Well thank you, everybody, for your time and your thoughtful comments. Again, if you do have further comments don't hesitate to put them on list. We'll be looking to meeting in a couple of weeks in person and seeing the revised questions and moving this process forward. So thank you to everybody for your time today, we really appreciate it.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Jennifer Wolfe: Bye.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, everybody. Have a good day.

Coordinator: At this time all parties may go ahead and disconnect. At this time all parties may go ahead and disconnect from the call. Thank you.

END