

**GNSO Review Working Party  
TRANSCRIPT  
Thursday 10 July 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-review20140710-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Klaus Stoll  
Jennifer Wolfe  
Avri Doria  
Mike Rodenbaugh  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen  
Chuck Gomes  
Rudi Vansnick  
Philip Sheppard

Apologies:

Ron Andruff

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings  
Larisa Gurnick  
Matt Ashtiani  
Lars Hoffmann  
Terri Agnew

Terry Agnew: Good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO Review Working Party Call on the 10th of July, 2014.

On the call today we have Klaus Stoll, Mike Rodenbaugh, Jennifer Wolfe, Avri Doria, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Chuck Gomes, Rudi Vansnick, and Philip Sheppard.

We have apologies from Ron Andruff.

From staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Matt Ashanti, Marika Konings, and myself, Terry Agnew.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and back over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Welcome to everybody. Hope you all had safe travels back from London. I appreciate you taking time for this call today so quickly after the last meeting.

Our goal today as you can see from the agenda on Adobe Connect is to circle back on feedback on the 360 assessment as we had discussed during our meeting in London, but hopefully we can gather feedback from everyone today so that that can be finalized.

Larisa from staff will be updating us on any other feedback or clarifications from London. We'll then move on and Matt will give an update on outreach and engagement and we can provide feedback, and then we'll discuss what our schedule looks like for July through September to continue on with our work.

So with that I'll start with the first item on our agenda and open up the floor for additional feedback. I will just comment, I know we've seen some written comments from (Phillip), from Chuck, and from Ron, but I'd like to open it up now for anyone to provide comments on the questions, the scope, or anything else related to the 360 survey that will be conducted.

Mike, I see your hand is up. Mike are you there?

Can anyone else hear Mike? I can't hear him.

Terry Agnew: Mike, we're unable to hear you. If you could check your mute?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Can you guys hear me now?

Jennifer Wolfe: Now we can hear you. Go.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, cool. Sorry about that. I haven't used Adobe Connect in a while I must admit.

Okay, so yes, we met in the IPC yesterday and had a few comments on the survey. I can put it a few written comments on the minor points, but there's only a couple of the significant points I think.

First of all on the confidentiality, we went around about that in London, and we just wanted to state our position that we do agree that the responses should not be confidential by default. It should remain as it is on the draft where the respondents can elect confidentiality if they so choose.

The other sort of overarching issue that we wanted to raise was around the nature of the questions seeming to be backwards-directed or directed to the current situation, not asking people enough about how they might like to see things change, how things could be improved.

Just thinking maybe in every section we could add a question along those lines, you know, if you're unsatisfied with the current situation, how could things be changed?

Jennifer Wolfe: Mike, would you see that as just an open-ended question?

Mike Rodenbaugh: And another (unintelligible) is just...

Jennifer Wolfe: Is that what you mean? I just wanted to ask that clarifying - is that what you're recommending is that there's an open-ended for each section of any other comments or suggestions? Is that what you mean?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Specifically aimed at you know what could be done in the future to improve the situation? And yes, I think it has to be open-ended because we don't have any other concrete proposals that we can put into the survey.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, Mike, did you have further comments? I don't want cut you off.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. Thank you.

And Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen, and thanks Mike for the input from the IPC. One concern I have about having too many open-ended questions is that a lot of people will skip those, so the feedback we get will be limited to those who are willing to take a certain amount of time.

Now my understanding is this is an assessment of the GNSO rather than a tool for looking forward. I'm not opposed - we obviously at some point need to look forward and get ideas. I'm not sure this is the right tool to do that with, but I mean if the group wants to do that, that's fine. I just think we'll get even less participation because of the fact that they're going to have to think and write ideas and so forth, so we'll predominately get those who already have ideas and are willing to take that time.

But, I'm willing to go with the group on that.

What I raised my hand for was to talk about something I put in the email when I submitted my changes to (Phillip)'s changes, and that is I'm really convinced, and I'm curious as to what others think, that the best way and the most effective way to get good feedback from people regarding different groups would be to have them identify the groups that they want to provide feedback on and then fill out a separate questionnaire for each one.

And, I think that would accomplish two purposes. First of all it makes the survey itself much simpler on any given iteration of it so you're not having to answer each question for each group that's there or leave them blank, or whatever. You're just - for example, if you want to respond for the registry stakeholder group, you pick that one and you complete the survey for the registry stakeholder group. If you - and you identify whichever ones you want to respond to.

Like for example, I might respond to the registry stakeholder group and the GNSO in general, or some other (unintelligible). And then, I would do a separate survey for each one.

I think the second thing that that accomplished besides simplicity and clarity is that it would allow - and it's another way that people could break up their responses to the survey into smaller bites so it's more realistic to sit down and do one in one short sitting.

So I haven't seen any comments on that on the list, so I thought I would raise that today and see what others think. See what problems you see with that or any comments that people want.

Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck.

I see Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks, Jen, this is Larisa.

Chuck, your comments have been discussed with the West Lake team. As a matter of fact, they are working on formulating a test survey for this group to engage with and trial to make sure that it's going to be user friendly.

And as part of that process, they're actually laying out some proposed architecture and some ideas for how to accomplish exactly what you were suggesting on several different levels.

One is to provide more context around very large, broad thematic questions to give people better perspectives so that they can respond with understanding of what the context is and then have kind of a leading headline type question for a given topic that then follows with further questions that they can chose to answer or not. That they would be optional so that there would be sort of this survey lite versus survey more in-depth notion baked into the survey.

But also, so that there would be an opportunity for people to say, "I would like to respond on behalf of a particular group," as you suggested.

So this should become clearer when we have some - a sample survey to look at and for people to react to, but I just wanted to assure everybody that that is being considered in the actual architecture and design of the survey which is underway.

Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. That's helpful.

Mike, is your hand still up or is that - no? Okay.

(Phillip).

(Phillip): Thank you very much. Apologies I missed the first few minutes of the call, Jen. You might already have covered that.

As many of you have all seen, I've submitted just some editorial changes to questions and it was mostly based on my own fairly long experience of GNSO and previous organizations. And I thought when I would struggle with answering them, it was a good test of maybe we needed to rephrase.

I saw on the list there was some nice support, and thank you, from Chuck and also from Ron expressed directly, and I just wanted to see how others felt about that and if that was genuinely felt helpful and if indeed Larisa had had a chance to share those also with the independent evaluators.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, (Phillip). And I think we did reference your comments right at the very beginning, so that was part of the process here was to get feedback on your comments, and appreciate that. And it sounds like - I think the - West Lake is already taking that into consideration, but did anyone else have comments on (Phillip)'s comments that went around on the list?

And Chuck I see your hand is up next. I don't know if you were commenting on that or if it was something new, so I want to give anyone an opportunity to comment on (Phillip)'s comment?

Chuck Gomes: No. I, like him - this is Chuck. I, like him, would like to hear other people's feedback on the edits that he put forward and I added and Ron commented on.

But I was going to actually talk about something that Larisa said so I can wait and let's just let people respond to (Phillip)'s request.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. Okay, great. Any comments to (Phillip)'s comments that went around on the list?

And thank you (Phillip) for - those were some really detailed comments. I appreciate you taking the time to go through and provide that feedback.

(Phillip): Sure.

Jennifer Wolfe: Any other comments?

I see Larisa just put in the chat that all of these have been shared with West Lake and they are considering those as they put together our test survey that she had mentioned.

Any other comments to (Phillip)'s - no? Okay.

Well then, Chuck, why don't you go ahead and provide your next comment.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen.

I wanted to make sure I was clear in terms of my suggestion with regard to whether people complete a survey for a specific group. Certainly, we need to allow them to clearly identify whether they're speaking individually or speaking - representing a group and what group that is. But I was saying something really different than that. I was saying that if I, for example, as an individual even want to do a 360 on the registry stakeholder group, I can do that separately in a separate survey than I would when I do one for the GNSO in general, regardless of whether I'm representing the registries or just speaking as an individual or whatever. I just want to make sure I was clear on that.

Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Chuck, I appreciate that.

Larisa, I see your hand's up.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa.

Yes, Chuck, certainly from my perspective, very clear and the distinction is very clear and I think what we're suggesting is to incorporate both of those elements. Have people provide an identification of what their affiliations are as part of the general data gathering up front in the beginning of the survey. But, also give them the opportunity to respond relative to - not on behalf of but relative to a given group, whether it be GNSO as a whole or any one of the GNSO groups.

I think we're very much clear.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Larisa.

(Phillip), I see your hand is up again.

(Phillip): Yes, thanks.

I certainly agree with that, that approach to groups. I think that that sounds sensible because I mean clearly within the current standing structure of the GNSO at the moment, you have groups within groups. You have constituencies within stakeholder groups and within Council, so you could potentially answer for multiple groups and not just one. So making that delineation clear is going to help us all.

My question really related to working groups. I recall at our in-person meeting in London it was suggested that this general (unintelligible) group could also include experience in working groups, and I wondered if that was still to be

the case? Because that struck me as being an area of additional complexity that may be difficult to assess.

And, I wondered if there'd been some rethinking of that, or other comments on how we would approach the (unintelligible) transitional and larger structure that we might want to comment in terms of the policy development part of the GNSO.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa, I might just ask you has there been any feedback - and I know we're going to move on to you know feedback from you here in a second, but anything from West Lake to that point?

Larisa Gurnick: Hello, this is Larisa.

No, not yet. They're still working through - as I suggested, they're working through the architecture and it's quite possible - and I just wanted to remind all of us that in addition to the survey, West Lake will be assembling a review plan, if you will, and go about collecting data in a variety of other ways.

So, the survey is a very important data collection effort, but it's not the only one. So, they've already highlighted for me, where appropriate, that in some cases it may be easier to complete the assessment and to look into you know certain attributes through research of documents as opposed to asking questions of individuals.

And certainly, you know, follow-up questions may be considered as part of the one-on-one interviews that will develop out of this process, so there will be different means of collecting information.

And then relative to (Phillip)'s specific question on the policy development process, as you may recall there was quite a bit of work done in that regard by an independent examiner that was engaged by the accountability team, ATRT2, so that work, recommendations, and then body of work, if you will,

will be considered by West Lake as they get into you know the substantive part of the review to figure out how that can be incorporated and not duplicated.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Hope that was helpful.

Jennifer Wolfe: (Phillip), did that address your question, (Phillip)?

(Phillip): Yes, that's fine. Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, great. Great.

Any other comments on the questions? Anything else that you think should be included? I do just want to reiterate I think we've come a long way from where we first started in terms of expanding the scope of the questions. And Mike, to your original point, I think having these open-ended spaces I think hopefully should accommodate the need for people who want to comment about future structure and to comment on these issues, that there's a place to do that, so we haven't blocked that off.

But also, by creating this two-tiered structure, we're trying to encourage as much participation as possible, and we have on our agenda to talk about outreach and engagement, and that's going to be an important piece to try to ensure we really get enough responses. That we have some statistically valid you know pool of data to draw on as we move from information gathering into analysis and recommendations.

So if there aren't - I'll give sort of one final - if there are other comments on the 360 assessment. And if there are no other comments, we can move on and let Larisa report on any other feedback and additional clarifications. But let me just open up one more time any other comments?

And this is really - we're coming to the end of our time period to provide comments, so want to make sure I give everybody a final chance.

Anyone?

I don't see any hands up so if you do still have something on the call, please do raise your hand and come back, or if there's something else to put on the list please do. But, I think we're going to be moving forward at this time to receiving West Lake's sample survey and we'll have an opportunity to comment on that. But at least in terms of the substantive scope of the questions, we need to bring that to a close after this call.

So any other comments?

All right, seeing none we'll move on to Larisa. Do you want to provide any other feedback or additional clarifications from London?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, thanks Jen. This is Larisa.

So it was very helpful to meet with the different groups and hear feedback and questions, and that certainly prompted us to expand the FAQs. So you will see updated information that addresses some additional questions that were raised, and we'll continue to do that. So, I hope that you and the - you know, the rest of the community finds this useful because it is a complicated review and we've shared quite a bit of information.

So, definitely our goal to keep addressing questions and making sure that things are clear.

So the types of things that have been added to the FAQs based on the feedback that we received was what is the role of the Structural Improvements Committee of the Board in this process? And, I'm not going to

get into the answers in the interest of time, but I just wanted to give you a flavor for the kinds of questions that we heard and you'll be able to see the responses. We'll share the links with you within the next several days.

There were questions about selection criteria, how that process went along. How many people responded to the RFP? And, how - what criteria were used to make the selection? So that information has been added.

There were questions about qualitative versus quantitative nature of their review and I think we've provided some information in the various meetings, but also in the FAQs that the review will incorporate both qualitative and quantitative elements.

And then of course there's been quite a bit of discussion, as you all know, about the scope, and we continue to evolve the commentary on that to make sure that its clear what's within scope.

So I just wanted to use these as examples of several of the larger topics that we heard through the various meetings and feedback in London that are being incorporated and considered as part of the overall communications for the GNSO review on a go-forward basis as we continue to support the outreach and engagement efforts.

Of course, with the idea that we want to make sure that a very good substantive number of people have an opportunity to comment on the 360 and then continue to provide feedback throughout the GNSO review process.

So with this I will pause, and then unless there is questions on that, I will turn that over to Matt, who can give you a highlight of the different activities that we've got targeted over the next couple of months for outreach and engagement.

Any questions?

Okay, Matt, let me turn it over to you then.

Matt Ashanti: Hi everybody. This is Matt Ashanti.

So I'm just going to very briefly go over the community communication and engagement plan that we currently have in place and some of the current mechanisms that we're planning for.

As Larisa noted, we have an updated FAQ, so we're going to work on getting the PDF updated and to also create a new, more user-friendly work space, more interactive, which should be live within the next few days.

We're also going to be reaching out to all SO and AC staff leads to see if they would like us to be on any of their monthly calls to help promote the 360 assessment as well as answer any questions that they have regarding the GNSO review.

We're also going to reach out to the SO/AC staff leads to see if any of their constituencies would like an update on the GNSO review while in Los Angeles. And, we'll also be working on hosting a Webinar on the review in general before the LA meeting.

Are there any questions regarding this?

So I guess hearing none, I'll hand it - hello?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

No, this is Jen. I was just going to say are there any other suggestions, particularly from all of the various stakeholder groups? I want to make sure we get feedback.

Is there anything else that you think we should be doing to encourage communication?

One of the questions I had is you know with all of these new gTLD applicants, should we be sending some sort of an email or invite through the CSC portal to take the survey and to encourage some of these new members of the community to take the survey?

Matt Ashanti: If that's (unintelligible) that the working party would like to target, I'd be happy to follow-up on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: I mean, any comments to that? I mean it seems like an easy way to try to engage a lot of companies and new participants to the process.

I see Avri has - Chuck - thank you. Any other comments? Any other suggestions on outreach?

Okay. Seeing none - certainly, that's something that if you have ideas we could put that on list where we want to continue to think through ideas to engage as many people as possible and try to ensure that we have the numbers in terms of validity. And that's one of the big concerns I have is if we don't get that, then there could be questions as to the authenticity of the 360 assessment.

Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: I also wanted to add that - thank you, Jen, for being so flexible and willing to do a video on the spot in London. I haven't seen the outcome of that yet, but we will definitely use that footage when the 360 is ready to be launched to really make the invitation to participate and relevance of why people should spend their time to provide the responses as interactive and as diverse as possible in the sense that there will be emails, announcements, video, and we really hope that all the groups represented here will also take those

different tools that will be available and you know pass them along and encourage participation within the communities that you are involved in.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa.

Any other comments on outreach and engagement?

Okay. Seeing none, our next item is to just set our schedule. In our in-person meeting in London we had talked about an every-other-week which should be sufficient for us to respond timely to anything that's happening with regard to implementation.

And certainly, our next big agenda item will be to test the actual survey, provide feedback on that, and continue to support outreach efforts. Does that sound reasonable to everyone that we continue on with an every-other-week, have a call set? If we don't have a lot to discuss, then that's okay, but at least we have it on the calendar to keep us moving forward.

(Phillip) has a checkmark.

Any comments? Any concerns about that schedule? That we would just put this on the calendar every other week until probably the end of September until we get towards the LA meeting?

Chuck - I see Chuck's. Nobody is opposed.

Okay, if there's no opposition to that, we'll go ahead and schedule that in.

I have to say I saw on the email list that staff is going to start to send out calendar invites. I'm really excited about that because that helps a lot in ensuring that it gets on the calendar in the right time zone.

So we'll stop. Larisa, will somebody from staff be able to send out a calendar invite to this group?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, absolutely. We will take care of that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: And in the mean time, we will continue to use the email list to circulate any additional information. So it's my goal to share with this group early next week exactly what the timeline will look like leading up to the next meeting. And also, would be a goal to have the link to the sample survey available to all to engage with before the next call.

Jennifer Wolfe: That would be great. That would be great, so thank you.

Okay, well great. Well so everyone can look for a calendar invite, but this will continue on an every-other-week basis until we get to LA, and then we can assess where we are and what will be needed. But obviously right now, the big pieces to get feedback on, the actual survey, how it works logistically and provide feedback, and continue to help with outreach. And then, we'll move forward into reviewing the data and assessing it.

And as the GNSO, conducting our own review and that data to provide our own analysis and recommendations.

So, any other comments from anyone before we close out?

Okay, see you then. Thank you very much. We appreciate your time and we'll look forward to talking in two weeks.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you everybody.

Man: Thank you everyone. Bye.

Terry Agnew: Once again, that does conclude today's teleconference. Please disconnect all remaining lines at this time.

(Andre), if you can please stop the recording.

END