

**GNSO Review Working Party
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 18 September 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/gnsoreview20140918-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
Wolf Ullrich Knoblen
Ron Andruff
Chuck Gomes
Avri Doria
David Maher

Guest speaker: Richard Westlake & Colin Jackson

Apologies: none

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Larisa Gurnick
Lars Hoffman
Matt Ashtiani
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have now started. Please proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks ever so much, (Damon). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party call on the 18th of September, 2014.

On the call today we have Avri Doria, Chuck Gomes, David Maher, Ron Andruff, Jennifer Wolfe and Richard Westlake. We received no apologies for today's call.

And from staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, (unintelligible) Glen de Saint Géry, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Jennifer.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And thanks to everybody again for making time out of your day to participate in this call. We really appreciate your continued support and effort in our outreach and trying to get as many people to participate as possible.

I'm going to turn it over to Richard in just a second to provide an update on where we stand. I know we - I sent out an email yesterday just letting everyone know, we've only had about seven people from this working party actually take the survey.

So I want to make sure we talk about that as well to ensure that we at least get our working party to have completed the survey and of course, you know, continue our outreach. And I know there's been some questions about the numbers so far and who's responding so that we can continue to support that outreach.

So, Richard, I'll ask you to go ahead and just give an overview of the responses we've received so far and then we can turn it over to some questions. I know Avri and Chuck have had some questions on list and we can move over to discuss those. So, Richard, please go ahead and give us the update.

Richard Westlake: Well thank you, Jennifer. I'm actually just having a quick look at the updated numbers now and the numbers in total is up to 123 as we speak right now. But you have the analysis yesterday when we had 118, as you see. We had a few increases over - or a few come in last week; thank you, Jennifer, after your further commentary out to the Review Working Party.

There are still some quite significant gaps in areas where we just don't yet have a proper perspective coming from those areas. And you'll see those on the charts, we've forwarded them to you.

In particular, for us, we think the GAC where we have four and the ccNSO where we have only three and the SSAC where we have only two are probably the most disappointing in terms of really triangulating properly on the perspectives of the GNSO.

GNSO itself not surprisingly nearly half of those who completed have nominated that as their affiliation. And of course we have got 16 people who are putting down no affiliation. So some of those may indeed have participated on behalf of some of those but I still don't think - I don't feel comfortable that we've got an adequate representation from those. And as you also see approximately 1/3 of the Board has been in there.

And when we wrote to you, as Jen said, I think we're up to seven members of the Review Working Party out of a possible 20. Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Any immediate questions from anyone in the chat in the group? Yes, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Good morning, Jennifer. Thank you very much. Thank you, Richard, for that update. I'm probably feeling the same as Avri, Chuck, David, others, Jennifer, yourself, this very low number is very disheartening.

And it's disheartening because there are so many things within the GNSO that we all know need to be updated and improved and so forth, yet, we can't seem to awaken the community to come in and give us that feedback that we need so badly.

Apologies for the window being open. In any case we now have a situation where we have just such a small number how do we increase this number fivefold to give us some real data to work from? That's the question I'm putting towards the group. It's disheartening, we need to get more and there's no doubt about that in my view. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Ron, I 100% agree, it is disheartening. And I think particularly when you sit in in all of the meetings and listen to people with their gripes and they have an opportunity to really express what their opinion is or suggestions and they're not taking that.

So, you know, I mean, obviously I'm a NomComm appointee so I don't have a specific stakeholder group or constituency group so I guess I would reach out to those of you on the phone and ask what can we do? What can we do to inspire or motivate people to take the time to complete the survey? Is there anything further that you think we should be doing?

Should we be extending the time through the next ICANN meeting so that we could really push it during the meeting and get people maybe to complete it while they're there? Is that even a possibility? So, Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Yeah, actually Jennifer, you just spark something in my mind as you were speaking. And perhaps that's what we should be doing is taking this through the LA meeting. And Fadi always has his opening remarks, here's the roadmap, this is where we are, this is where we're going.

So maybe that has to go right into a Fadi's opening speech where the is - not the opening speech but when he rolls up his sleeves and starts talking about

where we're at, maybe we want to get back into his speech and see if we can push those numbers.

Because I think if we were able to do that we would see a significant jump. But clearly you're right about those of us (unintelligible) them up to get more information and that's exactly what I will do following this meeting. I was actually waiting to get the results of this meeting to do that with the BC.

And that's something we have to do, but perhaps we could take it to the ICANN meeting. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Ron, and I see Chuck, your next. But I 100% agree. And to staff and to Richard, I know that's pushing it out. But I think the more meaningful data we could gather the better this is going to be received in the community.

And I think that absolutely if they could be announced during the opening ceremonies not only will we get the people who are engaged, which is what we have right now but, you know, all of the thousands of people who are coming to the ICANN meetings probably have no idea this is occurring, they haven't seen it yet, they haven't seen messaging.

And if they hear it and maybe there's some way to, you know, really try to push, you know, participating in the survey or if there's any kind of a marketing play we could have, you know, I mean, I'm just trying to think like maybe we have a - if you complete the survey you get entered in something to win something. I mean, I don't know what we might need but at least announcing it that would be really helpful.

So, Chuck, please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. I guess first I have a question for Westlake in terms of what are your estimates in terms of the number of - sorry for the echo. What are your

estimates in terms of the number of responses that are needed to get statistically significant results, if that is even possible?

First of all from a - and overall point of view and then secondly, so that we can analyze responses by individual groups. So there's two different questions there. Some of them obviously are way below what could give us any statistically significant results. Do we have enough in the GNSO? Where do we have more and so forth. So that's - those are questions for Westlake, I think, if they can answer those.

Secondly, I guess I'm not sure that giving more time will really bump up the numbers. I know on my part I've done quite a lot of pushing of this and will do more in the Registry Stakeholder Group.

But bottom line, you know, we may discover that this particular method isn't very fruitful in our community and that's something we'll have to evaluate when we're done.

And extending it over the LA meeting, everybody is so busy at those meetings I'm not sure that it would necessarily increase. And maybe I'm being too pessimistic but I'm not convinced that just giving more time is going to produce more results.

And then finally, when we're done I think what we have to do is analyze the cost of, you know, look at the cost for the 360 assessment and decide whether the results justify the expense that was made as we consider things like this in the future. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Ron, please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks Jen. Chuck, I would agree with you that we really do have to look at the cost versus the outcome, the results of the assessment like this, there's

no question about it. That's I think an absolute step that needs to be done to see if there are other more effective ways of gathering this information.

But I would say that if it's framed in the right way, if the whole conversation is framed in the right way about the fact that the GNSO 360 review is underway and we have the CEO explaining about this review and the importance of the review and if we could have as many members of the community as possible please come in and take that 15 to 20 minutes and give us that input so that we can help shape ICANN as we move into this new regime of accountability and so forth.

We are the bedrock of this whole organization; the GNSO is that, that gives the accountability and the credibility and so forth to the Board and the staff. So if we don't have a proper review of what we're doing and a proper assessment of what we're doing at the GNSO level than that bedrock foundational element is not being rapidly reviewed to make sure that we can grow or develop in the decades to come as an institution.

So I think if it's framed right and Fadi really puts an emphasis behind it I don't think we can lose; I think we can only gain. And certainly right now with 100-ought responses it's certainly not enough. And even if we pick up another 20 or 30 in the next week or so that's, you know, if we get to 150 I still don't believe that that's a representative sampling of the community to get the kind of information that were looking for.

So I don't know, for my part I would say we're, you know, three, four weeks away from LA. We might as well just push it out there and get Fadi to promote it as well as internally we all go back to our constituencies of course. My two cents worth. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Ron. And I'll just add to that too - and, Chuck, I 100% understand that the people who are deeply involved and ICANN are swamped during the meeting and that might not be enough to urge them to spend the time.

Although people are also sitting in meetings at their computer and if there's, you know, away to prompt them to do it while they're sitting there listening and doing it multitasking that might be a way to get more people to participate.

And certainly being able to go to the Board and say only, you know, so many Board members have completed this; go to the GNSO Council meeting and say only so many people have completed this, please take some time, I think that could be enough to get us a little bit more in terms of a meaningful response.

And then certainly when you think about the thousands of new people coming to ICANN who may not be as familiar but certainly their opinion I think would be welcome and helpful. I certainly think we would get more responses from those people because they probably don't know about it and if they hear it during the opening ceremony it might be enough to prompt them while they're sitting there. And maybe if the link is sent out and very easily available to say yeah I'll go ahead and take the survey.

Richard, please go ahead.

Richard Westlake: Thank you very much, Jen. Probably two or three comments if I may on exactly what you have just been talking about. Firstly, timing, the question I have as a caution if we push out to the Los Angeles meeting plus some time maybe beyond that that's taking us certainly middle of October at the very earlier to close the survey. I just get concerned about the - the push out of the overall timeline.

And to reassure ICANN, as I'm sure Larisa and Matt will, I hope, endorse, the cost of ICANN's purposes at this stage are pretty close to zero, the marginal costs because it is incorporated, we're in fact the ones who are carrying the

cost of that just at present. So on that ground I would certainly welcome a review of it at some stage but I'm not anticipating it.

Secondly, if I could go into the whole factor of raw numbers we've done some work - well quite a lot of work on various surveys for the types of work we do in our reviews not just in the ICANN world but elsewhere. And there's fairly strong body of opinion that numbers, in fact, become a very marginal additional benefit as you go up. There's a very rapid decline in marginal gain especially if you are starting to see repetition.

And I think there are two other factors. Firstly, there is the quality and the consistency of what you're seeing. Following that there are, within the ICANN processes, in fact three more opportunities, if you like. Firstly, we find, usually, the richest sets of responses come from the interviews we do both in person and remotely.

And that is number three - I think is number three on the agenda today; who were we talking to - who will we be talking to. Because typically you get three types of things you need there. One is the - just probing in further bits because you've seen some issues arising.

Secondly, because you just want some clarification as to what's gone on. And the third thing is to talk to those people to get to increase the breadth of the representation to target specifically we would like to talk to you please.

Now if you get a, no I haven't got time then, either at the ICANN meeting or before or after it then we do start to have a problem with the lack of engagement.

And the final thing of course I that the ICANN process, PDP or otherwise, is blessed with two significant opportunities for public comment on the reports. So we would have a draft report out there. There is then going to be a period for the opportunity for public comment. There will then be a second draft

which currently we're looking at early in the new year - very early in the new year which would have a public comment period.

And finally of course there would be our final report which again would be in the public forum before you and the rest of the working party get to the point of formalizing your decisions.

So I'm not as despairing possibly as Ron. But, again, I am disappointed. And anyway anything we can do certainly in the very short term to increase some response rates would be terrific. Thank you, Jen. I'm sorry I've gone on a little bit.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, and as you were talking it just occurred to me, and I understand all the work flow needs to move forward and there's a timeframe that we're trying to meet.

Is it even possible that we could close it as anticipated but then have a special reopening during the week of ICANN, have it announced and then if we have supplemental data come in that tells us maybe these things need to be done in conjunction with the meeting versus in between. It could give us a lot of data points if we're able to have a special opening. I just am wondering if that's even possible.

Larisa, I see your hand is up, please you can probably address that. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, Jen. Thank you. This is Larisa. I think that the idea of reopening the survey may be somewhat confusing and of course I wanted to remind everybody that we do have the supplemental survey that's waiting in the wings for this primary survey to close so that we could collect some additional information specifically focused on working groups.

So I don't think anyone's mentioned that but that's another consideration. I think it was decided at the last meeting that we didn't want to have both of those surveys out there at the same time because that would be confusing and that's a really good point.

So we would need to think about how to do that so that not to confuse the public further. But also I would echo what Richard is saying that the time in LA has been really earmarked for the Westlake team to be able to do one on one follow up and continue to fill in the gaps and collecting information particularly from groups of people that perhaps did not respond through the 360.

So maybe rather than reopening the survey what we could do is just very specific and direct outreach with the help of this group to a diversify number of individuals that could supplement the information that Westlake is looking for through one on one engagement which is so well suited for the LA meeting.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. And that is a great point that we are doing the supplemental survey and to the extent that might be promoted during the meeting that I think would be really helpful. Ron, I see your hand is up; please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much. Thanks, Larisa. I appreciate those comments and actually just kind of leads to what I was suggesting before. If Fadi were to say, okay, ladies and gentlemen, we have the 360 review that's been underway and it will close right after this meeting. And as soon as that closes right after this meeting we will be opening up the working group supplemental review - survey.

And in that way if he were to introduce the one as closing and it's really important we get that data and introduce the second one that's about to happen because working group has been the cornerstone of the GNSO and the whole procedures that we've had since our last review, if he spoke about

the working groups and that this is our opportunity to comment on those to improve our systems, that would kind of get - capture both of those because certainly we're going to have to now make clear as to why we have this supplemental survey following the first survey.

And if we could couple the two like that that would be - I think would get us exactly where we're looking for. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Ron. Colin, please go ahead.

Colin Jackson: Hi there. Yes, can you hear me? This is Colin.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes we can hear you. Go ahead.

Colin Jackson: Thank you. Thank you, Larisa. Yes, I just wanted to comment on something an earlier speaker asked about the statistical relevancy. I think the main concern of - there's an obviously far too few numbers to make statistically valid conclusions in a whole load of areas here.

The biggest concern I have though is from people who are outside the GNSO. There are considerable groups of stakeholders here, and I'm looking out the SSAC, the Board itself, the GAC, who have contributed extremely low numbers of 360 results here. And it will not be possible to draw any kind of quantitative result from that so quantitative conclusion from what they've done.

We will of course able to mine any comments they've made and to dig based on that. But as we go out getting any kind of sensible conclusion as to what these people think about GNSO and its structures and capabilities, we will be left with trying to do this through one on one interviews as things stand.

That is a little bit of a concern to me because from my perspective those particular bodies I just named, the SSAC and the GAC, particularly would

have interest that would intersect with the GNSO; it may well be different from, and that's something that we would want to understand in some detail in order to form valid conclusions about the GNSO's effectiveness. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Colin. Are there any other comments on this point? Is there any consensus that we want to provide as the working party as to whether our recommendation is to extend the survey during the ICANN meeting or close it as anticipated and then move forward with the working group assessment? Any comments anyone else would like to make? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. I mean, I'll go along with whatever the group thinks is best on this. But one other point I wanted to make is getting the numbers up, if those numbers are mainly people that aren't very familiar with the GNSO, I'm not sure that data really helps us very much even if the numbers look better.

So if we do allow more time on this, we've got to shoot for getting people who are somewhat informed because I'm not sure the data is all that useful if it's just filling out a survey and they're telling us that they're not involved in the GNSO, that they don't know much. So I just throw that out for thought.

Jennifer Wolfe: And, Ron, I see you're commenting in the chat that closing now would be a lost opportunity and too little data provides limited input. I mean, any other comments from the group? Any sense of - is there a general consensus that we should - or is our recommendation to provide an extension? Seeing a few yeses. A couple. And is their big opposition to closing it - excuse me, those who agree we should close it now.

Okay so based on what I'm seeing in the Adobe it looks like our recommendation, Larisa and Richard, would be to extend the survey. We'll let you to determine if that is something that we can do. I'd like to go ahead and move on. Chuck, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, just real quickly, if we do extend it, let's not announce the extension until very close to the end of the current deadline because let's not just give - a lot of people may be putting it off to the last minute; let's let them - let's see what we get and then announce the extension maybe on the 23rd, not any sooner.

Jennifer Wolfe: Agreed. Agreed. Richard, please go ahead. Richard?

Richard Westlake: Sorry. Jen, I'm sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's okay.

Richard Westlake: Can you hear me now?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Richard Westlake: Yeah, first thing is that I would absolutely pick up on Chuck's point which is that, yes, to give a sense of urgency is always good. So I'm in two minds about the best way of communicating it but I certainly wouldn't announce extending it too soon. And I think really that would be the main point that I have.

The second is, Fadi has already tweeted, there has been an announcement in the newsletter. And I am a little bit concerned that if you announce it to the masses at ICANN 51 is all you're going to do increase that, if you like, the twittering classes who know nothing about what they're talking about responses as opposed to the valid responses from those - or more valid responses from those who genuinely do have a perspective. And I do think we need to think about quantity versus quality in this particular area.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, Avri.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I think I was getting all my mutes unmuted. I agree that extending this is good. I actually really like - I put in the chat - I really like the idea of the do it now and I think we need a certain amount of PR.

I'm not sure what the connection is to a Fadi announcement of facts on the ground is I have a slightly different view than Chuck, probably actually very different on this particular issue - of the importance of the so-called twittering classes, though I don't think he used that term.

I think it is actually very important to know what this looks like to people who aren't us. I think they are indicating were they involved but there are a lot of observers. I know an immense number of people that just read the archives and never say a word, never participate anywhere.

And reading archives and twittering is one of the places where they may be connected, Facebook, other things like that. I think getting their opinions, especially since we did give the ability for people to indicate their, to some degree, their level of involvement.

I think it's important to know that we think something works great and everybody looking at it thinks it doesn't work at all. And that doesn't mean we need to change it necessarily so that they think it works, it means there's something though that needs to be done.

So I think getting both of those data points is actually good so I think going for quantity is good. And if our survey has sufficient quality in terms of being able to discriminate different types of answers so that when we run the stats we say, "What does this look like to those who were experienced?" "What does this look like to those who are casual, you know, observers?" Etcetera. We get a much better picture.

And I'm assuming that the survey was constructed so that when we're doing the end data analysis at the end those kind - as opposed to just, you know,

the very simple categories pulled out on this picture - that really that level of data analysis can be done and various queries can be, you know, developed based upon what we collected, thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Avri. And I just want to add I 100% agree with you. I think that while there are many who may not be deeply familiar with the GNSO or may not be involved they are observers, they do participate in ICANN. And I think when you look at the mission of ICANN and expanding its reach that understanding what they think whether it's right or wrong based upon their knowledge base, is important to know.

And I think gathering more numbers of those people who are the outside observers, the thousands of people who come to the meeting who might answer it, I think that could be very, very valuable. We have a way to distinguish between those who are involved and those who aren't so we can wait.

But I think what their response is - but I think understanding their perspective is equally as important to understanding the people who have been involved for the last 10 years.

And from my perspective, as somebody who's relatively new to the ICANN environment, I think that perception is really hard because people kind of tell you over and over if you haven't been involved forever you can't contribute because you don't know.

And I don't think that that's true. And I think this survey could help us understand that better. So that's just my perspective. Ron, I see your hand was up first and then Larisa, I see you just raised your hand. So, Ron, please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jen. I think it's - I agree with everything that's just been said, what Avri said as well as you. I don't believe that we're going to get what I'll call

false data or bad data as a result of Fadi and the PR department, you know, talking about it throughout the entire LA meeting. I think we're going to get a lot more very qualified data.

But I think what Richard pointed out in the chat is really important and that is that we have zero responses to the non-English versions of the 360. And that's really telling in so much as what we're trying to achieve with ICANN to really make it a global institution and to really build it up - the underserved market and here we've gone through the trouble of translating this thing now into five UN languages or so, five or six I would imagine, and not one response in those languages.

So again I hate to keep harping on it but Fadi is multilingual and he could stand up and he could say in Spanish and French and English the same thing three times and say, you know, this is important that we get this out to the community as broad and far and wide as possible in all of our various cultures and languages and get answers to these questions.

Because failing that what - the crucible is too small. There's not enough information there. And coming from, you know, I'll say North American predominantly and maybe some European responses because that's just how it always is with ICANN. We need to get this far and wide and so I really support the idea of - that Avri's recommended to get PR pushing on this throughout the entire week of the meeting. I think we'll get some good information back.

And as you pointed out, Jen, when people are sitting in meetings we often are catching up on other mail, filling out surveys and doing various things because our computers are open. So I think that's why we will get that data. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Ron. Larisa, please go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks, Jen. This is Larisa. So a couple of thoughts that come to mind too as we're discussing these possibilities. Certainly I'd like for staff to have the opportunity to discuss the logistics with the Westlake team as well as with PR and Communications and, you know, just to be able to really identify what opportunities there will be at the LA meeting.

Certainly a couple of things come to mind as possibilities. There's newcomers events that we could get on their agenda and talk about the importance of this. There's various other events as well as we could push another wave of outreach, if you will, to, you know, the regional VPs and see if we can get some reaction and action within their regions.

So I'd like to propose that we take an action item from this to come back to you with some ideas as to how all of these outreach items could be accommodated and what that would look like.

I think also the GNSO review and particularly the 360 from the get-go we've been talking about how this is something new that we're doing and piloting to a certain extent. So we don't have a real good baseline of expectation in terms of what kind of responses we should receive.

I know everybody feels that we ought to be getting bigger numbers but to a certain extent we are developing a baseline as we speak. So certainly it would be good at the end of the day to feel like we've exhausted all ideas and all possibilities in trying to get the 360 to work so I think everybody is on the same page that we really want this to be successful. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. Thank you. And I think we'll go ahead and move on on our agenda in the interest of time. I would just ask Richard or Larisa if you could let me know how many of the GNSO councilors has taken the survey. We have a meeting next week and I will be sure to announce the number of actual councilors to have completed the survey to try to push them a little harder too.

Okay moving on, the working group supplemental assessment. Richard, did you want to provide - or Larisa - I'm not sure who's providing the update on that piece?

Richard Westlake: Larisa, are you happy to? We have sent you as of yesterday the final amended version.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. Thanks Richard. So the update there is actually quite a brief. All the feedback has been considered. The survey is ready to go. And as a matter of fact is being sent to translations as we speak. So it's really now tied to the discussion that we just had in terms of the timing.

So the take away is that we wouldn't launch the survey - the supplemental survey as planned next week as we are considering the extension to the initial survey. But it's ready to go and will be ready to launch based on our schedule.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Larisa. Any questions or comments on the working group supplemental assessment? Okay, seeing none let's move on to the next item on the agenda, the interview implementation plan. Can you provide an update?

Richard Westlake: Jen, if I can start. And again perhaps Larisa can pick up on this. We have certainly been doing some thinking about the types of people that we need to speak to and have been discussing a number of names with Larisa and Matt.

But I think what we're really keen to have from you is, and your group, is your feedback on people that we ought to interview for a few things. Firstly, their more detailed understanding of how the working group model works particularly, especially post-the implementation of the changes from the 2006, 2007 review.

We certainly want to reach out directly to some of the underrepresented groups but in terms of constituencies, with a small C, as well as geographically and other demographics. Thirdly, it would be really useful to get a range of those who have different experiences, in other words not just those who have attended 20+ GNSO ICANN meetings but also those who are trying to participate and trying to learn it from the start.

And the final thing obviously, which is part of our terms of reference, is the degree to which the previous reviews' recommendations have been implemented; have they solved the problems they were designed to solve? And does solving those problems in fact help or created new problems? So we're certainly very keen now to get your feedback on some of the people or maybe even just some of the groups that you think that we should be interviewing.

We've put a list together. We certainly identified some of the areas. But we're very open now to being directed on this one are being pointed on this one. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: And Chuck has, in the chat, just to put it into the record that it would be helpful to have the chairs of the working groups as well as a sampling of working group participants interviewed.

Is this - I apologize if we've discussed this before and I can't remember but this is the list of who is interviewed will be public, correct?

Richard Westlake: Yes it will.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, okay. Is that a list that you can circulate so we know, you know, who you're looking at right now?

Richard Westlake: We're at a fairly draft stage. In some cases it is, if you like, it's a name of a group or a constituency or a category.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Richard Westlake: Certainly I think within the next week we will - well, well within the next week, we have to - want to finalize that so we can start making the appointments both for some remote interviews before Los Angeles but also to get into people's diaries for Los Angeles. So yes, Jen, I think we should be able to do that very soon.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay great. Larisa, is not a new hand up?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, Jen, it is. I just wanted to follow up on what Richard was saying. And with the help of the policy team, Marika, Mary and others, they were able to provide a really good list for a broad list of individuals that have experience with the working group model as well as previous experience.

So that's really the one area that I think has been - has had some really good input. And as Richard was suggesting there is other categories that it would be really useful to get this groups' point of view or even ideas as to who might - who comes to your mind that would be a good candidate for Westlake to interview.

So we'll send out a follow-up email reiterating the categories that Richard just mentioned and perhaps, Jen, if you and the working party could respond with ideas as to individuals that should be targeted for interviews during LA and even not necessarily just in LA because recognizing that not everybody might be in LA or able to meet in LA so it's certainly not restricted to face to face interviews.

But, you know, specific names of individuals that fit into these different categories that Richard mentioned would be definitely very helpful. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: I see there's a couple of hands. I just had one question; will you be recording those interviews? Is that not determined yet, Larisa or Richard?

Larisa Gurnick: I think Richard was probably in the best position to respond but I'll jump in and just say that just as a reminder interviews are typically held confidential, Richard, right. That we - that the names of individuals that are being interviewed will be public but the nature of their discussions that's really between Westlake and the individual being interviewed depending on what their preferences are for how their information will be shared.

Is that correct, Richard?

Richard Westlake: Yes, yes indeed, Larisa. And we find by recording it you do - you constrain people and they get quite put off if you ask if you can record their comments because we do typically and assure them of confidentiality. And a tape recorder or something on the table seems to fly in the face of that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, okay thank you. Colin, please go ahead.

Colin Jackson: Yes, yes thank you. Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the - specifically on the - again on the non-English-speaking angle of the whole thing. This is something we will need to figure out a way to gather a set of people who are may be on the periphery of the GNSO or maybe they're very involved. But they are fundamentally non-English speakers or maybe they're not involved at all but would really like to be. And we would like to get some interviews from them if at all possible.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, excellent, excellent point. And maybe that does require specific interviews with people we know are non-English speakers and involve during the interview process. Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jen. In the interviews is it fair to assume that there will be some qualifying questions at the beginning just like in the 360 assessment? For

example, it's, you know, it's helpful to know if there are questions about a working group whether the person interviewing has participated in a working group in terms of analyzing and correlating the data.

Now, I do agree with Avri that it's helpful to get in people's perception even when they haven't participated. But we need to be able to differentiate those kind of responses so that we draw a more accurate conclusions. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Chuck. Colin, I see your hand is up again. Please go ahead.

Colin Jackson: Yes, that was really just a comment on - or to answer Chuck. Yes absolutely, Chuck, we would certainly, early on in the interview process, we would attempt to discern the relevance of that person and the status of that person in order to interpret their views.

So, yes, if it turns out that they had had extremely little to do with the GNSO then we would know what to think of their remarks and we may make an interview relatively short if we felt that was the case. So, yes, effectively, Chuck, you're quite right. The extent of somebody's involvement is completely germane to how we interpret their comments.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Any other comments on the interviews? Seeing none let's move on to the next item on the agenda, the ICANN 51 working session. Larisa, did you want to provide an update there?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes thank you. The LA session is scheduled for Sunday, October 12 at 5:30 in the afternoon, 1730 LA time. And we will - please reserve this on your calendars as much as feasible recognizing how busy everybody is. We tried to make this time the least conflicted times as much as the schedule permits and a calendar invite will follow shortly with all the particulars. But once again that time is Sunday, October 12 at 5:30 in the afternoon, 1730.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. That's great. And thanks for making that work with all of the working sessions. I know there's never a perfect time to appreciate you trying to find a time that could accommodate as many people as possible from the working party and certainly those of us who have been very active. Ron, please go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Jen. Larisa, with regard to that - with the calendar, I know stuff is working very hard to get all of the meetings slotted. But are there - do you have access to that calendar to advise whether or not the constituencies are having some, beginning of the week meetings, briefings?

I thought that on Sunday evening or Sunday afternoon there was some CSG things going on, IPC, ISPs and BC, but I'm not aware of that; just wondering if you have that at your fingertips. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: We just got access to the tentative scheduling, literally, maybe a day ago. So I'll have to see if that - what that looks like. I don't have that right in front of me. But in coordinating this time we worked very closely with Marika and Mary and Lars just to pick a time that would be - I'm not going to say not conflicted because that's virtually impossible - but the least conflicted. So hopefully we've managed that okay.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Larisa. It'd be helpful if when you're sending out this announcement that you might just put a note in there that there may be other things happening at that time just so people can keep that clear in their minds because I'm sure we'll be all running from room to room to make sure we can attend all of these. Thanks very much.

Larisa Gurnick: Sure.

Jennifer Wolfe: Marika, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. Just to confirm that we did, you know, try to avoid as much as we could, you know, potential conflicts. I do note that there may be some overlap with some of the stakeholder group meetings that may be scheduled in that afternoon. But, you know, I think as you all know it's basically impossible to avoid conflicts in general. There are many meetings going on so - that this was.

And I think it's the same slot we had for the last meeting which seems to work well for most. But of course, you know, it's never perfect for everyone. So hopefully we'll get enough people from the working party able to attend.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I think, and I'm not the scheduler so I don't know for sure, but I think one significant conflict, depending on actual timing and maybe we'll be done with our meeting before then is the GAC GNSO discussion is going on alter afternoon. But again like has been said, we can't avoid all conflicts.

Marika Konings: Yeah and Chuck, this is Marika. That meeting is actually scheduled from 6:30-7:30 so we already had to push that one out to, you know, now there's 15 minutes overlap so hopefully that won't be, again, too much conflict. But indeed we're trying to accommodate everyone also noting indeed that some of the stakeholder groups requested the time after the GNSO meeting but as said, we're trying to minimize as much overlap as we can.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. If there are no other comments then we'll move on to the last item on our agenda, the timeline update. It sounds like we've got some consensus from this call that our recommendation would be to extend the timeframe and use the upcoming ICANN meeting to really try to promote and get more participation.

Larisa, it sounded like, if I heard you correctly, you need to have that discussion with Westlake, is that correct?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. And actually what's coming up on the screen right now is the timeline that we worked on prior to the discussion of the extension of course of the 360. But it might be useful to spend a couple of minutes and just see what the rest of the cycle, the review cycle, might look like recognizing that the dates now may not be as meaningful but the duration of how long things would take still is applicable. So if I could just call your attention to that that's up on the screen.

So you can see right now we're in the 360 assessment area. And the other key elements of what's happening obviously is the supplemental assessment as well as interviews. And the other component that's not reflected on the timeline specifically of course is the desk review and documentary review and all that work that Westlake continues to do in the background as they're collecting feedback.

So the idea was that the draft report, the very first draft report, would be available towards the end of November and that would give Westlake a chance to compile and analyze all the information from the 360 assessment and the interviews and be able to generate the first draft, which really would be for the purpose of providing clarification, input and feedback from the working party GNSO as a whole and of course, you know, the ICANN staff perspective.

So then after that feedback and dialogue would take place then draft two of the report would be generated and depending on the timing once again, not to get hung up on the actual dates now, that would look like something that would probably happen either right before the holiday season or after, most likely after.

Then at that point there would be a second draft generated and that would be the one that would be posted for public comment. And of course the schedule being what it is the will overlap with ICANN 52 which, when we originally set

out to do the review we didn't anticipate that but it's actually a good opportunity to collect some additional feedback and as the public comment, the formal public comment period continues.

And then depending on the number of comments and the nature of feedback obviously Westlake would need some additional time to respond to that and consider the input that they've collected with the final report being generated somewhere towards the latter part of March.

And then that final report would then be presented to the SIC. They would accept the report and move it on to the Board for the acceptance of - or recommendation of the report be accepted and then - then from there we would move into implementation.

So I just wanted to highlight and remind everybody of what the general process steps are in the timeline and, you know, certainly would welcome any feedback to this. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. Any comments in the group or questions? I'd just like to add I really appreciate both with Westlake and with staff how we've been able to be very flexible and - with these dates and realizing that it's pushed off the original plan dates but that we're focused on trying to make this as effective as possible and just want to note that that's very much appreciated I think I know by myself and I think the community that we've been able to push the dates out to be able to be as effective as possible. But any other comments from anyone?

Okay seeing none - and I'm sure we'll be talking about the timeline in more depth certainly during our in-person meeting. Any other business? Any other comments? The only comment I had is our next scheduled call is October 2 which is right before the ICANN meeting. Does anyone want to - should we go ahead and have that call and just be prepared for the ICANN meeting or

should we bypass that call and then focus our efforts on the following week when we're all together? Any comments there?

Chuck Gomes: Jen, this is Chuck. Sorry I didn't get my hand up but...

Jennifer Wolfe: That's okay.

Chuck Gomes: I think it's better to leave it on the schedule and then...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...cancel it if we don't need it because...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...we might have a need.

Jennifer Wolfe: Perfect. Okay, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Chuck just took the words right out of my mouth. If you've got it scheduled it's easy enough to cancel it as we get closer. I think that's - let's see if this next push gets us a little bit further down the road and if we have a reason to speak. Appreciate it. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Perfect. Perfect. So, Larisa, I'll circle back with you and if we don't have anything new really to present then perhaps we'll just send out a notice that we'll wait to meet in person. But if we have new items or planning to do for our time in person then we'll plan to talk as scheduled on Thursday, October 2.

So we're right at the top of the hour. Want to make sure we are respectful of everyone's time and thank everybody for participating. And, again, please encourage your groups to take the survey and do anything you can to help

with the outreach. And we'll continue to move this forward. So thank you, everyone, for your time.

END