

## **GNSO Review Working Party TRANSCRIPT**

**Monday 4<sup>th</sup> May 2015 at 1500 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-review-04may15-en.mp3>

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

### Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe  
David Maher  
Jennifer Standiford  
Klaus Stoll  
Philip Sheppard  
Chuck Gomes  
Avri Doria  
Jeff Neuman  
Wolf Ulrich- Knoblen

### Apologies:

Rafik Dammak  
Bill Drake

### ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong  
Marika Konings  
Larisa Gurnick  
Charla Shambley  
Lars Hoffman  
Glen de St Gery  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator:       Recording has started. You may now proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party Call on Monday, the 4th of May 2015.

On the call today we have Jennifer Wolfe, Klaus Stoll, Jeff Neuman, David Meyers, Philip Sheppard, Avri Doria, Chuck Gomes and Wolf Ulrich-Knoben. We received apologies from Bill Drake and Rafik Dammak.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Larisa Gurnick, Lars Hoffman, (Charles Chamblee), Glenn Desaintgery 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 (Jen).

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you so much. And thank you to all of you for taking time to be here and to review the report and come prepared to have discussions with us.

As I was mentioning before we started the recording of course we're waiting for the Westlake team to join so that they can provide a brief overview of some of the changes that they've made and how they address some of the feedback.

And then we will be moving over into the Q&A opportunity to talk to through the entire report, ask additional questions, provide additional feedback to the Westlake team.

We do have a subsequent call scheduled I think it's for Tuesday of next week to continue on in this conversation if the two hours today is not sufficient. So hopefully within a four hour time slot we should be able to get everyone's comments heard and answered by the Westlake team. On screen right now staff has posted what our review timeline is right now revised as of March 2015.

So you can see, as of April 24. The draft report that you've all received is what we're talking about right now. And these next two meetings are for the working party to provide additional comments, additional feedback for the Westlake team to take under consideration prior to June 1, where the initial official reports, official draft report, excuse me -- I want to make sure I use my words properly -- will be posted for public comments.

If additional meetings are needed, we can certainly have is in Buenos Aires. The public comment period will close on July 20. And then the final report will be issued by August 30.

So that's our overall timeframe. Are there any questions on that right now? Okay. Seeing none, do we know, do we have (Richard) is he on the phone yet?

Nathalie Peregrine: Richard is not on the phone line.

Jennifer Wolfe: He's not in the phone yet, okay. Okay well are there any comments that anyone would like to post just procedurally, anything that we need to address prior to the Westlake team joining the call?

Okay. Okay. Well, great. And thank you to Avri. I'm sorry I missed your email over the weekend. But Avri, Philip and Chuck thank you for taking time to provide detailed comments.

And for anyone else following the call if you do have additional comments or you want to redline, please don't hesitate to send those out.

I really appreciate everything that staff has been doing to track all of the comments and then allow Westlake to go in and provide details on how they're responding. I think that's helpful for us from an accountability standpoint, but certainly encourage all of you to take time to do that, following

the call if we don't have - if we don't get any comments that you have during the call.

Any other questions or notes anyone has before Westlake joins?

Great. I suppose if you think we're going to be significantly delayed we could go ahead and start discussing the document and capture those comments for the Westlake team. Yes, Chuck, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jen), just wanted to point out something that I think everybody's fully aware of. The timing of this it makes it extremely challenging because we're at a high point of an already very, very busy set of activities with regard to the IANA transition and ICANN accountability.

My understanding is that the CCWG report for public will be posted this week. The IANA transition one's already up for public comment and is consuming huge amounts of everyone's time. So it is what it is. We just need to be aware that and realize that not only our time but everybody else's time is going to be spread extremely thin, maybe as thin as ever in the next few weeks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. No, that's a very good comment. And I know and I certainly appreciate everyone's time and working their way through the report and providing these comments.

Jeff. I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. I just wanted to announce myself and this is Jeff Neuman. I've been asked by the registrars how have been a little bit absent from this group to take the place of James Bladel.

So I just wanted to announce that I have a statement of interest with ICANN I think. So hopefully they'll post that. And I look forward to participating.  
Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you and welcome Jeff. We're glad you're here. Larisa please go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Hello everybody. I'm Larissa Gurnick from staff. Welcome Jeff.

And I wanted to respond to Chuck's comment the concern about the timing and the bandwidth and capacity for the community to absorb yet another public comment process and a significant one.

So on that point I - while we're waiting for the Westlake team to arrive I would very much welcome feedback from the working party from (Jen) and Chuck and the rest of you on additional ways that we could make this process more user-friendly and easier for people to engage with the lengthy report and to be able to absorb the significant components of the report and provide useful feedback.

Some of the things that staff has already discussed, and began implementing with the Westlake is a couple of videos to highlight from Westlake to highlight the key points of the report.

There's also been some discussion about formulating the public comment responses to include a template to give the community an opportunity to provide their feedback within some sort of a templated to approach to help people focus on the primary questions and issues.

And if that would be something that you all feel would be useful if you have any ideas on how to formulate the appropriate template to make it productive. So I'll pause with that and would really appreciate feedback on this topic.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Larisa and I'll just go ahead and provide something. And I see Chuck's hand is up as well.

One of the things I noted as I read through the report and obviously its' a very lengthy report in there's a lot of, you know, cross-references throughout the report I think there a lot of recommendations that are already being addressed by other working groups or other, you know, other work that's being done across the ICANN community.

It might be helpful to take all of the recommendations into a spreadsheet or some kind of matrix and then identifying if some other group is already addressing that issue.

To me, that would be very helpful because then we could look and see what recommendations are - have been made that are not currently being addressed elsewhere.

I think just from my perspective that would be very helpful. Chuck I see your hand is up. Would you like to comment on that as well?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, I will. Let me start by saying that Larisa and (Jen) both made very good suggestions. I as probably some of you know, I'm a strong supporter of structuring the comment as much is possible for two purposes.

Number one, to make it easier for people to respond. But maybe the most important thing is the summary and analysis of comments. If comments are just free form it's so much more time-consuming and challenging. And that's a critical part of the public comment process.

And if it's not structured even in a minimal way the risk of missing comments and not taking them into account I think increases significantly.

So I definitely support structuring the comments in some way. And (Jen) I like your suggestion. I think breaking it down into those that are being addressed elsewhere I think people should still have the opportunity to comment on those recommendations but where the - even more important focus is on

recommendations that aren't being addressed elsewhere. So I think dividing them that way is a good step.

And even if we just ask people to submit comments by recommendation that's better than just reform comments in my opinion. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck, agreed. I think the more we can create some structure and help people in responding the better.

I know there have been some comments in the chat that I just wanted get staff's input on in terms of potentially creating, you know, further extensions of time or giving people more time for the comment period or Philip or Avri if you'd like to speak to that, you know, please go ahead and jump in.

Okay, Larisa is there any feedback? Is that something that's possible or if that is needed by the community to be able to respond in a meaningful way?

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks (Jen). This is very Larisa. As you know, throughout this process we've done our best to be flexible and to respond to these requests.

We hope that with the additional time and some of the additional mechanisms built into this timeline that's been provided that we might do our best to hold to this schedule. But let's see how it goes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Thank you. I think maybe if we're able to see, you know, the structure, you know, looking at some of these things to help us be able to break down the report and make it easier for comments that may certainly help. And certainly, we've got to, you know, between June 1 and July 20. Hopefully that should be enough time.

But I agree I think if we continue to have concerns from the community we want to make sure we address those.

Chuck I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jen). Just another suggestion with regard to a template or any sort of the structure that we use to the extent that elements in the template can be made relatively self-explanatory without - people having to go back I think that's helpful.

Now ideally we'd like them to read the whole report. But I think we have to be honest, a lot of people won't do it and just because of time constraints.

And so to the extent that elements of the template can be made relatively self-explanatory while still brief and with links to the element of the report that they can look at that will I think increase people's ability to respond in a reasonable time period.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck, agreed. Any other comments on how we structure the ability for others to make public comments or any other suggestions to staff as they try to streamline this? Chuck? Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry for...

Jennifer Wolfe: No.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks so much. But we learned a lot in the Policy and Implementation Working group where we actually used a survey.

And I'm not suggesting doing a survey because a survey type approach because it's very time-consuming to develop one. But one of the things we learned is that you have to deal with the issue that groups will need to respond with collective comments.



And when you're doing a structured approach the group needs to be able to gather their input - and let me give me you a specific example of we're I'm coming from.

In the case of the Policy and Implementation Working groups comments we provided a survey and we provided a PDF of the survey so that that could be used to gather the group comments and organize them.

Unfortunately some of the people responded with a PDF file instead of responding to the survey online. And so then staff had a go back and enter all those comments into the survey.

So we just need to keep in mind that we'll not only be getting individual comments we'll be getting group comments. And we need to do as much as we can to make it easier for groups to work together to develop their collective response but then put it into the format that is requested.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. That's an excellent point. And Larisa I see your note in the chat. I would be certainly happy to help work to develop the template. Chuck I don't know if you have time available or if anyone else is interested, but certainly we can help staff in doing that.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I'll help if I can. I'm busy just like the rest of you so but I'll do my best.

Jennifer Wolfe: No. And certainly we all understand the more we can structure this to make it easy for groups to assess and provide feedback we appreciate it. I find it perhaps comical that we asked people to fill out a survey about how the survey works. But I certainly understand how that can work.

Well we're at about 20 after the hour. I'm thinking if we don't have the Westlake folks on the line we could go ahead and just start talking through the report and capturing comments that they can obviously then review.

We do have another call scheduled the. And I think that's at a different time of day. So maybe this was - certainly I didn't realize that when this was scheduled. Perhaps this wasn't the best time to try to get them on the line.

Larisa is - do you know if they're trying to dial-in or...

Larisa Gurnick: (Jen) it's Larisa. We are trying to dial out to Westlake folks. And we're attempting to contact - there's three of them that at least two of them were planning to join the call.

So I apologize about the delay. Their presence was confirmed at this time. This was all squared away, you know, weeks ago. So I don't know what the problem is. And once again my apologies for the delay, but we're trying on the backend to get them on the call as soon as possible.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well, in the interest of time, unless anyone has an objection why don't we go ahead and just start talking through the report and receive comments? That way we can track those and ask for Westlake's response if they're able to join later today or certainly in the call that we have scheduled next Tuesday.

So does anybody else have any other opening comments or we can start talking through the document?

Okay seeing none, so I'm going to go ahead and just pull up the draft report that was circulated and we can just go through section by section. I, you know, I've noted comments that have been provided by Avri, Philip and Chuck. But if you all can jump in where you had comments and make these comments that would be very helpful.

So in the first section which is the summary would might be actually probably one of the more important ones is to ensure that the summary is clear since

that's probably what most people will read and then we get into a lot of detail.  
I'll ask for comments from this first section as we go through the summary.  
Any comments? (Terese)?

Chuck Gomes: And (Jen)...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Do you want us to those of us who've submitted comments to communicate those on this call or is it sufficient for the people just seeing them in Adobe? How do you want that?

Jennifer Wolfe: I think it's sufficient if you'd made the comment to Westlake team if you feel like it's something that should be discussed by the group then please go ahead and raise it. But otherwise, we don't want to belabor, you know, restating comments that you've already made.

So I think I would just ask that if you would like to have it discussed or just reinforce something above and beyond what was included in your comments that were circulated because staff is pulling those out and putting them onto a spreadsheet so they can be completely tracked.

But if there's another point that you'd like to make and certainly for those who haven't had a chance to circulate comments, please do so.

Philip I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you very much. Can you all hear me?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes we can hear you.

Philip Sheppard: All right, thank you. I have a cold so I apologize for the tone. Just a couple of things, I think (Jen) I agree with you absolutely that the summary is a key part

of this document. There will be those who only read the summary and I know next to that, not having time to go through the (unintelligible) it's important to get it right.

I'm familiar and I have submitted to Westlake more than once. I repeat it into my email earlier today. There was a key element of context which is missing in the summary again, which is the board resolution Summit 2013 that I put in my email.

And I really think we should stress the importance of that being there because it's fundamentally explains what the board was asking for in this review. That's it. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you Philip for that comment. Chuck I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Let me comment on my first, which was right at the beginning of the summary. And, you know it - the - I really think it would be helpful as I say in my comments there if some recommendations were made as to how this total package of recommendations could be managed.

Because there are 41 recommendations as has (Jen) some of them are being dealt with in other areas. And that's good.

But even if you delete all of those it's going to take a lot of time and effort by the GNSO Council and the GNSO as a whole to deal with these. And there's really nothing in the report that suggests how that might be managed in a way that's not just totally overwhelming to an already overwhelmed GNSO and community as a whole.

So that's - that was my point there. I don't have any magic solutions to how it can be managed. But if we don't the risk is that very little will be done because it's overwhelming.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. That's a great comment. And it's something that I think as the working party we can put that on our agenda if we have time to meet during the ICANN Buenos Aires meeting which will be in the middle of the comment period at that time. That might be a good opportunity for us to talk as a working party about any recommendations we have for how this moves into implementation.

But I agree if Westlake could provide, you know, it's expert advice, having done all this work that would be very helpful.

Avri I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. This is Avri speaking. I'm not sure this is the right time for comment.

As I indicated in my comment that while I have issues with some of the descriptions for some of that I really didn't have any strong issues with their recommendations except that is two places.

What I had an issue with and I think if I interpret correctly what Philip had an issue with - and I apologize, I have not read Chuck's comments so I don't know whether Chuck gets into the structural issue at all. But it was what was missing.

And one of the recommendations that I made in mine this is something I really just wanted to put on the table for the working party, but don't necessarily, you know, suggests that we go steeply down that route at the moment.

But given that Westlake aren't used quite extensively that they don't consider the structural issue as something that should be dealt with and both Philip and I seem to believe that it does. And I believe that there's others that do.

And as I said in my comments I've gotten feedback from several board members, some of them I guess past Thick members was that if we felt strongly about such a process whether it's just the upfront investigation or actually proposals that there was nothing stopping this working party from taking on that task.

Perhaps we would have to go to the GNSO Council to make sure that it was okay that we extended our work not only to reviewing Westlake's work and cooperating with Thick but that we actually get our own.

But I just wanted to put that on the table that just because Westlake, you know, I'm not criticizing their viewpoint I'm not that they reviewed it, they evaluated it and they decided no biggie.

But a lot of the people in this room think it is a big issue. So I just want to put that do we take this up ourselves notion on the table? Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Avri. I think that's a great point. And I think you're exactly right. We can build on what Westlake has done. We don't have to necessarily be limited by it. And I think that's something definitely to put on our agenda. Once they issue the report out for public comment.

Larisa your hand was up for a little while please go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Thanks (Jen). This is Larisa. Two comments and I think that the recommendations for the GNSO Working Party for this group to have these conversations both about the structural questions as well as the method for implementing voluminous numbers of recommendation.

It was strictly from a process perspective the conversations with the structural improvements committee it was envisioned that that would be done during the implementation phase of recommendations that once Westlake as the

independent examiner provided their findings and recommendations analyzing to what extent prior review recommendations have been implemented and new emerging issues have or have not been addressed that that would give the opportunity for the team working on implementation to determine what that means, what that might mean for the structure and consider that as part of the implementation process.

And it seems at that time it would also be productive for the Implementation Team to offer some suggestions on feasibility and advisability of timelines for implementing recommendations and perhaps prioritization.

So certainly I'm sure that Westlake - not trying to speak for them, but I would mention they would have a professional point of view on how to conduct the implementation in such a way that things actually move forward and get done to Chuck's point.

But the specifics and the topics that are most relevant to the GNSO and to all of you as you articulated there would certainly be a very significant influence into that process in the implementation of recommendations in that phase. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Larisa. And I see there's been a couple notes in the chat between Avri and Philip. And I just want to make sure we capture those well.

But if we don't have the recommendations it may be difficult to add them in the implementation phase.

And so, as these comments are provided to Westlake perhaps again, you know, ask them to pay attention to that, that if there's something that might want to be included in a recommendation or that could be considered a implementation that we add that at this point in time.

Also Larisa to your point, I think that's where for me, having that matrix of what recommendations are already being addressed in some way would be very helpful as we start to break this down into an implementation plan.

And I think to Westlake just a comment to them. I think if they could potentially prioritize, you know, which of these do they think, you know, should be weighted more heavily that would be helpful from their expertise as well.

Chuck, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jen). And I'll come back to the structural issue later because it comes up later in the report. But I wanted to go to my second comment which is at the top of Page 6 where it starts off these points imply that the working groups are not effectively open to everyone.

I don't think we need to talk a lot about this one but I just did suggest some rewording of that. I think the key word from Westlake's perspective - I can't speak for them as effectively. I think I know what they're trying to say.

But I think it's a little - it would be much better to reword that. Because I think all of us in the working groups are (unintelligible) to everyone. And Westlake does make a point later on that they - that we're not getting everyone today or as many people as we like.

So I just suggest rewording of that so that it doesn't lead off with an impression that working groups aren't open because as we know they are. I'll leave it at that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. Philip I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks. It follows on from your reference to the chat and the points that Avri and I were making.



I mean, if we accept that Westlake has made up their mind and actually not going to make any structural recommendations as to whether or not we can hope or some have said they might, it may nevertheless be helpful to ask them more specifically why they felt that or perhaps to lay out the areas that they have chosen not to touch just as a to lay the right foundation for the working party to do some of the work.

To me that's an extraordinary mission they have made a positive decision to do. It does seem to tie-in with that the board has asked them to do. It doesn't seem to tie in what many people responding to the survey are asking to do.

And frankly, it ignores the reality of where we are today in the world with new TLDs. So it's just - it's quite bizarre to me and I think we need our strongest point.

And if we're not going to get Westlake to change their mind at least they can tell us that's why.

Jennifer Wolfe: So that's a great point. Thank you Philip for raising that.

And Chuck please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Well I want to comment on something on Page 7 but since the structural issue keeps coming up let me say that I agree with Westlake's recommendation on structure, because I don't think that the structural issues relate to the GNSO's most important task which is developing policy.

It hasn't negatively impacted the policy development process or the functioning of working groups in my opinion.

There doesn't mean that there aren't structural issues that need to be dealt with. But I don't think they impact the most important mission that the GNSO

so has. And I'll just leave it there for now. We can talk about that more as a working group later.

But what I wanted to comment on on Page 7 in particular Recommendation 8 there, you know, they made several recommendations with regard - and I have other comments in this regard.

They made several recommendations with regard to privatization and connecting to the ICANN strategic plan.

And frankly I am really having trouble seeing how these - what this really means.

If you look at ICANN's strategic plan it's at a very high level and many of the strategic objectives are very good and appropriate.

But tying the GNSO work to the strategic plan I'm not sure what that means because as I begin to look at this it seems to me that the GNSO so work is much more tactical and strategic.

And we can spend a lot of time trying to connect to the strategic plan and probably find out that maybe one or at most two of the strategic objectives really led to GNSO work fairly directly.

So I think recommendations like Recommendation Number 8 really, I'm not sure they make sense. And I don't know if it's just me.

But and we tried prioritizing in 2010 as Westlake notes in the report policy development efforts and so forth. And what we found is that every group had their own priorities. And it was very difficult if not impossible to agree on priorities.

So these things sound good. But again, I don't understand how you tie in the strategic plan.

And several of my comments actually relate to that as we go through like Recommendation Number 21 that says the GNSO Council be tasked with creating and maintaining a plan for policy creation that aligns what ICANN's strategic plan. We spent a lot of time doing that. I'm not sure it really gains that much because of the high level of the strategic plan and the fact that it covers lots of things that are much broader than we're dealing with in the GNSO. And I'll stop there.

Jennifer Wolfe: So thank you Chuck. I think that's a great comment and maybe staff if you could note that as something to specifically ask Westlake to comment on when we hopefully have them on the phone next Tuesday. I think that would be helpful to hear their response on that.

Any other comments from the group on the overview section, the summary where all of the recommendations, all 41 of the recommendations are made?

Anything else that you think is not clear or anything that you think is inaccurate as we think about this being publicly posted, and again, that this section is probably the one that will be read by most people, you know, other comments that we want Westlake to answer and review and changing this before it's posted? Chuck is that a new hand?

Chuck Gomes: That's a new hand.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay go right ahead.

Chuck Gomes: And I think the observation is correct that the summary is a key element that most people will focus on. And so I did insert a lot of comments there. Let me get my draft in front of me that I can read much easier.

So on Comment 29 relates to statements of interest. And again I had several comments that I'll lump together in my comments here. I got the impression that Westlake is recommending that an SOI be required of every participant in a stakeholder group or a constituency.

And I don't know if that's true or not, but that's the impression I got. And I don't see the value of that. And maybe that's something we can get other people's opinions on on this call here.

The - obviously, all of us have possible conflicts even within our own SGs and interest groups.

But I think we know those. I don't think the statement of interests are necessarily needed for every member, every participant or delegate or whatever they're called in a giving constituency or stakeholder group is needed.

They are - and they are required in a GNSO for participation in the group and for leaders and people in the leadership position or non-leadership position.

I think that's already required. And I think that it should be required. And that if people don't provide them they're not allowed to participate.

So but it - I don't get the impression that Westlake understands that for working group and leadership position unless they're just trying to imply that or suggest that it should happen within the SGs and see constituencies themselves.

So I don't know if people disagree with me on that or not. I'd love to hear some comments on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. I don't know, Avri I see your hand is up. Did you want to comment on that point or do you have any (other) point?

Avri Doria: I - I'll comment on that one. I wasn't - when I put my hand up I had my own issues, starting with 22. But I'll comment on that one. I actually thought that was a great idea. I think when we had an immense amount of problem getting all of the SGs and constituencies to even list all of their members.

And I think all of the ones that have a vote perhaps not all of the ones that participate as advisors or as extra participants but the ones that are there representing an organization or perhaps voting on decisions I actually think it would be an excellent idea for everyone to have a statement of interest.

It's not that they're conflicts of interest as Westlake was putting it. And I'm assuming they know about all the working groups and leaderships having to do them. I can't imagine that they would have missed that point.

So I took them at their written word of suggesting that everyone that is making decisions or participating in making decisions within the stakeholder groups and constituencies should also have one. I thought that was a superb idea and very much appreciated it. Thanks.

I'll leave my hand up so when we can go to other issues I can raise my other issues.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. Does anybody else have comments on Chuck's point and Avri's response to it? Okay. Seeing none Avri why don't you go ahead to next one?

Avri Doria: My next one had to do with or my first one had to do with Recommendation 22. And I discuss it both from the body but I think it's important. They - their notion of the GNSO Council's role in it making it absolutely administrative the trend is correct.

But they seem to neglect that there is a content part of that job. And that's that in addition to making sure that all the processes were carried out correctly, and there was sufficient diversity and all of that very important, you know, multi-stakeholder outreach inclusion of openness, et cetera, that making sure that all of these issues have been dealt with and have been dealt with adequately and have responded to the various points of view, whether positively or negatively needs to be done.

The GNSO Council will be aware perhaps of other currents. And if they know of issues that for example some other organization has been making an issue about but don't see them address then before sending something to the board what the board is going to have to do with that issue it's the GNSO Council that has to look at the report and decide there's some content that hasn't been adequately dealt with for the following reasons and send things back.

That whole notion of making sure that the content is complete and covers everything seems to be left out of their notion of the roles and responsibilities of the council.

I agree they shouldn't be making, you know, decisions to change the issues. But if there's a council member or a stakeholder group that looks at it and says our main issue wasn't dealt with here and that's not a reason to vote the thing down. That's a reason to send this thing back to committee, back to the working group and say, hey, you know, you have these issues that you have not dealt with adequately.

So I think that's an important gap in their recommendation. Thanks. I have another one on 26 but I'll just put that one on the table for now.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. No, there's our great points to give to Westlake. And obviously we'll look forward to their responses next week. And I know Avri has another

comment. But does anyone else have something prior to letting Avri continue?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I'd let Avri go because my next one is on 37 so I would let her go.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: It might be helpful if we kind of went in order by recommendations just so we don't jump around so much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Of course.

And we were on 22. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay my next one was 26, unless somebody has one before that. And that was on their whole issue on the new constituencies being created.

Now I'm one of those and this is a position I do not hold in common with many of my mates in CSG. I'm in NCSG outlier on this I'll admit.

I'm the one that believes in multitudes of constituencies. I like to see them all over the place and I'd like to see them lighter weight, blinking in, blinking out as the case may be but beyond that, just wanted to give a context in my comment.

So I'm not disagreeing with the need for a constituency process that works. I wanted to point out that the constituency process that we have is really only a constituency process for the non-contracted parties house that if my reading of those guidelines are correct that they only apply to half of the GNSO and not the other. And I've always felt that that was a fault in the process.

But beyond that there seems to be confusion between did they follow the rules and the rules had been changed or there's seems to almost be a new simulation of rules having been broken.

And so I guess I'll have two issues with that with one recommendation is one to be clear that, you know, what are you complaining about, the way it was done or the rules?

And I would argue that the rules may be at fault but I believe they were followed to the tee. And do these rules apply to the whole GNSO or just the half of it? Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Avri. So moving through the summary of the recommendation that was on Number 26 of their comment on Recommendations 27 through 30 any comments there? Okay. Seeing none, how about 30 through 34?

Okay. How about 35 through 39?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: ...have some in the group.

Jennifer Wolfe: Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jen), Chuck speaking. So on Recommendation 37 -- and this is not a criticism of the report but actually an idea I threw out -- I tossed it out in a couple forums before. It never really got any traction and it probably really is more of a somewhat of a structure (unintelligible) not a structured (unintelligible).



And that is Recognition 37 if you can't - don't have it on the screen there gets (unintelligible), gender and cultural diversity issue related to ICANN core value for.

We do a lot of talk about that and implementing it is tough even though I think there's openness within the GNSO for it. You have to get - you have to do outreach and Westlake deals with that. And you have to try and get people trained. And all that is good in the recommendations.

But I have thought that one way we could specifically try to facilitate that is to use our three NonCom appointees differently than what we do right now.

If...

Jennifer Wolfe: Hey Chuck can I just say, real quickly, somebody's got their phone off mute and we can hear all this background noise. If everybody could try to be on mute if you're not speaking that would be helpful. Thanks. Go ahead, Chuck, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and that's okay. I understand and I appreciate the interjection. It sounds like they're still not muted.

But the - so I've often thought that one of the things we could do is ask the - and some work would need to be done on this to make it effective. If we were to have the Noncoms appoint three reps to the GNSO Council one from each of the three most underrepresented regions and certainly have those reps fit into the GNSO Council structure that we have somehow in some way but identify reps who would be from those three regions and serve as liaisons to those three regions working within the overall ICANN structure for regional representation and so for to try and facilitate participation in the policy development efforts from those three regions.

So they would serve not only in their Council capacity two of them being associated with one of the houses and one of them being the what we call the nonvoting rep or whatever but really a primary role would be to serve as a liaison to their region to try and facilitate more participation and to communicate the needs of that region and so forth.

Seems to me that could be a step that would - could - it wouldn't be the answer to everything but it could maybe help us in this area going forward.

So I don't know if that - anybody else thinks that's a good idea or not. But (unintelligible) suggestions like that whether that's the right one or not would be much more helpful than just continuing to talk about getting more cooperation from the other regions. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. And Philip I see your hand is up. Is that to that point or do you have any point you'd like to make?

Philip Sheppard: It's a new point.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Let me just ask if there any other comments to Chuck's notation on the NonCom appointees? Okay seeing none for right now, Philip. Please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks. To stick with audio because I want to reiterate a point I made in my email that the preamble to Recommendation 36 on was - is inaccurate and the characterization of the constructive GNSO being in place only about three years.

And I think that does need changing as my guess is they're talking about the fine implementation of where we are work in working groups rather than the actual structure with the change to the two houses. I think we need that terabyte.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Philip. And yes, just to remind everybody as well if you see anything like that where it's putting a recommendation in a certain context and you think it is an accurate please do raise that.

And as we move into the report that's where we'll be particularly looking for anything that you think was inaccurately represented.

So moving on through the recommendation anything on the last few all the way to Number 41? Any other comments on the recommendations that were made?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, this is Chuck. I've got one on 41 if nobody has a sooner one.

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So 41, says the ICANN board be satisfied that the membership of the Working Group are - reflects the geographical, cultural, gender diversity of the Internet as a whole when approving GNSO policy.

The question I ask and my comment what if it doesn't? Should the efforts of volunteers over probably many months and maybe years be rejected if it was not possible to get participants that meet diversity goals?

That recommendation to me it comes up lacking because it's a big broad recommendation but it doesn't really deal with the practicality of what if it happens. What, should the board rejected?

It's totally incomplete in my opinion. And I think it would be very demoralizing if a working group who even after trying to get diversity didn't succeed if all their work was in vain because of that.

So to me Recommendation 41 comes up way short in terms of completeness.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. And Philip I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: I agree with Chuck on that. It's a bit of an empty recommendation and it'll help you go forward if things don't turn out there with what you want. I think it's better to demonstrate efforts to have diversity rather than have the actual results of that being conditional.

More generally, though there seems to be some loose language in all these reports as to what is meant by diversity. And sometimes I see geographic, gender, age group and cultural.

Sometimes it's demographic culture and gender. I'm not convince that in each case they are - Westlake is being intentionally different in recommendations there in the way of finding diversity.

And so I think it might help if perhaps they do that up front and then refer to that going forward. And also explains how that perhaps the element of diversity does not vary the diversity in different types of industries that exist today such as .grams. And I think we'd like to see that as part of the diversity parts as well. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Philip. Chuck. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Can I if I can go back - thanks (Jen). Can I go back to Recommendation 38...

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...which I skipped over a comment? They - Westlake seems to be suggesting that we rotate starting times of meetings even if there are no - to different regions even if there are no participants in a working group from those particular time zones.

I'm - I have always strongly supported rotations of meetings. When I was on the Council I did it and I - every three weeks I had a meeting that was at a ridiculous time for me. And I fully supported that.

So the general idea I think is a must. But they seem to be suggesting that you have meetings at strange times even if you don't have anybody in those strange times.

And in other words less inconvenience to people who are volunteering and are working even if there's no one in that time zone. I think that's going too far. And I think that would work against the goal of trying to get more volunteers and so forth like that. So I think this one needs some tweaking.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. That's an excellent point and I think we probably on this call have been up at some strange hour tonight on an ICANN. But I think that's a point well taken and perhaps we can clarify that issue. Are there any other comments on the recommendations as we wrap up this first section? Chuck was that a new hand? I see Avri popped up her hand.

Chuck Gomes: No, I'll take it down.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Avri please go ahead.

Avri are you there?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) me.

Jennifer Wolfe: There we go. Now we can hear you.

Avri Doria: Yes I was - I muted myself but the operator muted me as well I guess. I had a comment on 13 I believe it was. Oh yes, this notion that complexity deters newcomers. And it's a bullet without any explanation.

And I couldn't understand from the context anywhere in the report even perhaps are they saying we therefore should not have complex problems or are they saying that we have an obligation to somehow explain it is a - and whatever?

But I think is a naked bullet point of complexity deters newcomers it leaves too much to the imagination. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Avri. Any other remaining comments on the opening section and recommendations? Okay, moving on we'll move on to Section 2. And this provides the context for the review.

I think this would be helpful for them to know if anyone's done anything that they thought to be inaccurate or that mischaracterizes the review since this I think from a documentation standpoint is what puts this in context.

And of course the next section will be methodology which I want to make sure we spend some time on. But any comment on the context? Avri I see your hand is up. Please go ahead. Oh Avri put her hand down. Chuck. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks and sorry for commenting so much. But and let me ask a general procedural question first of all.

I made several comments throughout the whole document where I thought there were some inaccuracies or it wasn't well worded.

Do you really - do you want to go through those on this call, or should we just assume that people will look at those and that they think I got it wrong speak up? Let me ask that general procedure question first before making the specific comment here.

Jennifer Wolfe: So I'll certainly open up to the group. But I would think that unless you think it warrants discussion we could just leave your comments at is. They will be provided to Westlake. They will provide a response to your comment. So we certainly would have some accountability to every comment that you've made.

Does anyone else think we need to go through each and every comment unless Chuck would like to raise and discuss it? So Chuck, I would leave it to your discretion then. If you feel like it warrants conversation...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jennifer Wolfe: And if not, then just know that it has been documented and will be responded to.

Chuck Gomes: So I don't know, I'm going to start off right at the beginning of Section 2. This is Chuck again on top of Page 16.

They say ICANN is an internationally organized, nonprofit corporation responsible for allocation of certain naming and addressing resources on the Internet and for management of the root servers necessary to deliver some of those resources.

I think that's, you know, a very inadequate statement. And, you know, I think they ought to back to the four elements of ICANN's mission statement and talk about that. The listing management of the root servers the first thing and I think gives a misleading statement of ICANN's mission.

So I'll leave it at that. I think it can be - their mission is first thing is a root server management. That's - they certainly have a role there, especially with regard to some of the IANA functions and so forth. But I just - I'll leave it at that. I don't know that we need to necessarily need to discuss that further.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay thank you Chuck. Any other comments on Section 2, the context of the review? And I know, Philip had a notation on just been missing from the history of previous reviews.

Any other inaccuracies or concerns that anyone had on the context? Okay. Seeing none, let's go ahead and move on to Section 3 which is the review methodology.

And this is a really important section. I know we've had a lot of conversations in our past meetings where people were concerned about how the list of who was interviewed, was selected, you know how we - how this has been structured from a methodological standpoint.

So I want to ensure that if you feel like what they have outlined here is not accurate or did not capture concerns that we address those.

I would just make one opening comment for the Westlake team. So I think it may be helpful for them to define when we talk about the 360 review that that very clearly includes staff.

I know there've been a lot of concerns expressed that there were number of staff interviewed and I think that would be helpful. But other than that, I will open up for others to make comments. Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Hi, yes I have two comments. One of them is that NCSG comments made a whole lot of methodological comments and reviews.

It really, you know, the review hasn't changed before those comments so I expect those are comments that we will have to make again when the review goes out just to basically discuss our view of the methodology.

I think them describing the methodology that they use is probably a fairly good description of what they did.



So I'm not going to - now I'm not going to be at the next meeting and maybe the NCSG people that will attend that one will be more interested in, you know, getting again into what we believe was the methodological failures of this review.

But that doesn't seem to be an issue for the working party in terms of their review. Perhaps in response to the comments it will be.

The other issue I wanted to make is even within the context of what they're doing they make a lot of their conclusions on data that was collected for the ATRT2.

There has been expansion and outreach and change since then and I see either the absence of having kept up with that or better yet, something that would reassess the numbers from ATRT2 in terms of using them for new recommendations.

I think it's quite possible that if they had looked they would see changes in geographical diversity and such over the last couple of years. And it would've been nice if they had been actually able to gauge the improvements coming out of ATRT2 up to this review before just repeating those same stats.

Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Avri. Are there other comments about the methodology? And thank you for clarifying that Avri. I think that's a good point that you may have concerns about the overall methodology that was used. And you've certainly raise those now. But also if you think there's anything inaccurate about how they defined their methodology that would be helpful.

Okay. Seeing no comments on Section 3 the methodology from this point the report starts to move on into the details of how they arrived at some of the recommendations. So we'll go through the section by section.

Section 4 which was adopting the working group model, do we have comments, anything that you think was inaccurate how it was referenced or how the recommendations were arrived at? Chuck. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jen). I have a couple of comments on Page 32 of Section 4. If someone has a comment before that, that's fine, just speak up and raise your hand. Otherwise I'll just go ahead on those.

And they're both related to the same section right at the top of Page 30 I think it's top of Page 32.

So that bullet at the top there it says the working group model is fantastic. But when you look at who is involved in working groups it's too few technical minds. And I'll stop there maybe before going on to the second point.

I don't know that that's helpful conclusion there because what I have found is that working groups if they need more technical expertise, they go out and the working group model actually encourages this and to reach out and get the technical expertise that is needed. And they're invited to participate or their input is sought and then brought into the working group.

So I'm not in agreement that there are too few technical minds in working groups. Also I think that it's hard to get some of the technical people to be involved in a working group in its totality but if it deals with their expertise there they're glad to provide the input.

No I know, even within VeriSign what I have actually recruited people on the technical side to participate in some working groups where I thought their technical expertise was broadly needed and have had some success at that.

But just as a general rule, I don't think that the conclusion that there are too few technical minds in a working group is terribly useful because I think we

definitely satisfy that need, not necessarily by in every case, getting them involved in the working group as a whole, but rather providing the specific expertise that we need from them.

Now and I'll pause there before I go to the second part of that sentence which I also expressed a concern on.

Let me skip over to that (unintelligible) room.

Jennifer Wolfe: And I would just ask you staff if there's any way I think we're on 4.4.2 in the document if there's any way to pull that up just to help as a reference in case somebody doesn't have the document in front of them. Why don't you go ahead Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. So the second that same sentence goes on to say - and I'm not a lawyer. So please if for anybody who doesn't know that it says it's too dominated by lawyers who can bill hours to large corporations.

No I - there are some lawyers on this call, so correct me if I'm wrong but I think that's misleading. I doubt -- and I can't speak for the lawyers -- but I doubt that most the lawyers who participate in working groups are billing those hours in a lot of cases.

My impression is that they're volunteering that part of their time to help in the working group. And I think it's probably an unfair criticism or statement here in that regard.

Now again I'm not one of those so maybe I'm wrong but I didn't find that statement very helpful.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Chuck. Any other comments to Chuck's points or in the Section 4? So the next big section is 4.4.3 relatively small group of volunteers does the majority of the work. There's their observations and analysis. And then the

next Section 4.4.4 work sections are dominated by English speakers. Any comments to how that was characterized or their observations?

Philip please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Yes I think just in response to what Chuck was saying I think there's a slight issue. I think if we read this section in particular its where Westlake's verbatim said back to whereas comments had got during the survey process that's where we see the comments in italics.

Now maybe they should make it clearer that those are indeed comments made by others as opposed to conclusions made by Westlake.

But I feel that right or wrong, I'm a little comfortable in us as a working party like having editorial judgment over the comments that Westlake have chosen to incorporate. I refer particularly to the one that Chuck mentioned.

But I think it is fair and helpful and useful just a few comments and to understand the perceptions that people have. And you see that as by the quotation of (abating) comments.

So I don't think we should as a working party be exercising editorial in that way.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. Thank you, Philip.

Any other comments on the last part of Section 4 is 4.4.5 working group involved in a policy implementation limited? Any comments there on their observations?

Okay. Seeing none, let's go ahead and move on to Section 5. And just to check in on time we're in at about quarter past our second hour of the calls. We have about 45 minutes remaining.

So if unless anyone has an objection we'll continue to go through the documents up until the end of our time today and then we'll be picking this backup next Tuesday. Hopefully Westlake will be able to participate and respond to some of the really critical questions that we've had for them, as well as provide some additional feedback to us.

So I'll go ahead and keep us moving forward in Section 5 which is to revise the policy development process.

We start in 5.1 with the BTC recommendation, 5.2 the accomplishments and milestones and then a summary of Westlake Review's - or their team's assessment of the implementation effectiveness.

Any questions or concerns about accuracy or just concerns in general to raise on this section? Okay. Seeing none in Section 5.4 they move on into their basis for assessment, any comments on their observations, analysis? They have a Section experienced skilled working group leadership, any comments there?

Okay moving on to 5.4.2 is the technology for meeting support. Any comments on their observations, analysis or an alternative policy development process?

And I know this is where we have some overlap with work that other groups are doing. So again, I think that's where it will be helpful to be able to spot those easily.

Avri I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. I have a comment on Page 60 which I guess I didn't get my hand up the time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh, sorry.

Avri Doria: Oh, no that's okay. It's my fault. When they're discussing the (likes) of PDPs and I found it amusing that the whole discussion is the number of days that something takes. And then they give the average length of a PDP of between two and three years.

And, you know, I'm sure that that's accurate. But it seemed to me in the context when the whole paragraph is about the number of days that it takes the number of days that takes and then to list the average in terms of years and not days seems a mismatch.

And so I was wondering if they could fix that and actually put in what the average was according to days? Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you.

Avri Doria: It's sticky point I realize.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, compare apples to apples. I understand.

Any further comments in Section 4 or, excuse me, Section 5?

So 5.4.4 the recommendations, the link to ICANN's strategic plan? Any other remaining issues in Section 5?

Okay moving on to Section 6. And if I miss seeing you please jump in so we make sure we get your comments.

So Section 6 was the restructure of the GNSO Council. This Section began with the BGC recommendation, Westlake's review of the assessment of those implementation effectiveness.

And then it moved on to their recommendation, their observation, analysis, prioritization of GNSO projects, any comments on their basis for assessment or their recommendations? Philip, please go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks. Just to have things in order, just to raise a point I also made in the email earlier that there was a mismatch between the typing that has to do with GNSO structure and the recommendations that we see from Westlake all of which had to do with potential diversity within the working groups which I'll now say a structural change in the same way.

So I think it would help if they clarified they're choosing not make structural recommendations and instead of making the recommendations about the makeup of working groups.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Philip. And Avri I see your note is coming up here within the Section on 71, 72. Do you want to ahead?

Avri Doria: Sure I'll (unintelligible) and so it could be long (unintelligible) because of the (unintelligible) so sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: Was this the Section is titled the GNSO Council?

Avri Doria: Let me - yes, let me get my note in front of me.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I don't have that information. If it's someone else - oh no, there's no one else waiting. It's just me. Okay.

Yes, I guess okay 71 is the ones that I already mentioned. I just wanted to bring it up in this context, in terms of the activity of the council and so wanted to point out that that is the section where they talk about what's appropriate for the council to do that I mentioned earlier with the recommendation.

On 72 is there's the discussion and I wonder how they - you know, whether they need to take it into account. But they're making this sort of firm assertion I believe that the board is the peak governing body and that it would be inappropriate to limit its authority and just reading that in the midst of the CCWG accountability that is indeed working to do that I'm just - it struck me as a discordant note and I flagged it.

And, you know, they may not want - they may want to avoid making such a strong statement or they may want to indicate in a footnote perhaps that they understand that this is an issue that's under discussion elsewhere. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. And I agree. I felt that way too. That being able to understand where things overlap with other discussions or work being done will be very helpful.

Are there other comments from the group in Section 6? Please continue on with Westlake's Recommendation 22, 23, 24 providing their observations, analysis? It continues through Recommendation 25.

Any other comments?

Okay. We'll go ahead and move on to Section 7. And I'll just remind everyone again, you know, please do feel free to take the time between now and our call next Tuesday to mark up any other comments and get those circulated so we make sure Westlake has all those aggregated and can respond to them.

So moving on to Section 7 which is about enhancing constituencies, we follow their pattern of course listing the BGC recommendations, major accomplishments and milestones and then their assessments of the implementation effectiveness.



Any comments on accuracy or concerns about what was provided there?  
Okay. And I moving onto their, Westlake's assessment. Oh yes, Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I definitely had comments in - okay looking for my file again. I definitely had comments in that section dealing with the - there it is, dealing with the whole - and again had mentioned it up front, but dealing with the whole constituency issues.

I think their description is far improved of over what it had been. I believe that in their discussion of the cyber café - and unfortunately I did all my notes on by page, not by number. So I find - but I'm on Page 83, you know, basically that they need to reflect the history properly.

They do something of sort of saying yes it kind of looks like they follow the rules. But there was this one statement that we disagree with disagree with and they go on.

Again one of the things that I think is unfortunate is that they aren't able to look at some of the constituency problem issues in terms of forming new constituencies in terms of the structural issue.

Because if you dive down into any of these constituency issues you find there was very - an issue of - there's no place they quite fit in because of the way we're structured.

And so therefore there was a shoehorning effect that didn't work in most cases, so some of that is very much the structure.

Then there was the Page 85, you know, I guess we've already, you know, that people would do things. And they weren't specific. They point a finger any specific group however.

But they do sort of point a global finger at all these people that are doing everything they can to keep newcomers out so that they can keep on the totem pole.

And I believe that was not them quoted something but them saying something or- and that thought that that was an unfortunate way to put things. And even if that was a quote, you know, again, being careful about how incendiary quotes you have that something that vilifies people even if they are unnamed, is problematic.

You know, and then I had a - we have into - in the NCSG, you know, that we're still sort of being used as see these people can't get along whereas as the only stakeholder group that has a new constituency where although the siblings do fight as sibling sometimes do they do work together, they do put out statements together. They are learning to live with each other.

And so there's this funny dichotomy where, you know, only one new constituency was allowed but the constituencies in NCSG fight too much.

And that kind of inconsistency and just in terms of facts, in terms of looking at new people versus old people I was just sort of - and I went back and checked our pages that if you look at the leadership in the NCSG and such it's far - it's at least half new people.

And so grouping these statements about no new people get in anywhere is again doesn't quite hold true. So I would just wish for them to check their facts on all of that. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Avri. Any other comments on the enhancing constituencies?  
Chuck yes. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Chuck speaking. And I just wanted to reinforce what Avri just said, and especially watching the GNSO Council and the makeups from the NCSG

over the last several years. There's been good turnover and I, in fact I've been very pleased to see the new people getting involved to not only on the council but in working groups and so forth. So I just want to reinforce what Avri said there.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. So continuing on and I'll make sure I reference by page number too, I think this section goes to Page 96. So anything else those recommendations can just continue Recommendation 26 through 28 and then 29 through 32 and 33 and 34. Those all continue on through this section.

Any other comments on those recommendations or the basis for them?  
Chuck is that a new hand or is that...

Chuck Gomes: That is a new hand.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, go right ahead.

Chuck Gomes: I know it's hard to keep track of. But on the top of Page 92 the paragraph there it says where they - the first - well let me just read the first sentence. The issues that this creates were highlighted in the discussion at ICANN 51 between CSG constituency chairs and the ICANN board. That's fine.

Where they expressed concerns that the board's requirement to have a single set of views expressed through the single stakeholder group. I'd like to know where that's coming from.

I'm not aware of any - the board ever having any requirement that a single stakeholder group has to have a single view. In fact to the contrary, we have certainly had examples from multiple stakeholder groups where there has been divergence, diverging points of view.

So I think that's - I'd like to know where that's coming from. And if there is some sort of requirement like that please point to it because I'm not aware of it.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you Chuck, excellent point for Westlake to address. Other comments as we wrap up this Section? And then we move on to Section 8 which is improving communication and coordination with ICANN structures.

Again they follow the similar pattern. They provide the BGC recommendations, accomplishments and milestones to date, their assessment of the implementation. And then they move on to their observations, analysis and recommendation.

So any concerns about accuracy or just inclusions that we reach in this section? And this goes through Recommendation 35 and 2, Page 102. Okay seeing no comments then we'll...

Chuck Gomes: I think I...

Jennifer Wolfe: Go ahead, Chuck. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: One second. I'm trying to...

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...because it's easier look at my own document and so keep up. Let's see, on Page 98 the - and I put my comment in the title there, BGC Recommendation 18 improve communication and coordination with other ICANN structures.

I just - and this is just a constructive suggestion. And I know that this work isn't going on long before the - a lot of the stuff's happening in the Cross Community Working Groups that are happening right now.

But I think it's a mistake in this report, not to mention the very, very significant cross community coordination that's going on in the IANA transition and ICANN accountability CCWG. So I just throw that out because I think it's been very impressive and very broad.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. That's an excellent observation. And Avri's got a check mark next to her name on it as well. So thank you for raising that point. Anything else on Section 8 which was improving communication and coordination across the ICANN structure?

Okay well seeing none we'll move on to the last Section. And if you may recall from our prior conversations with Westlake they intended for the Section 9 to be sort of a summary or wrap up of anything that didn't neatly fit into the other structure parts of their report.

So a lot of what they have here is an introductions such as new ideas or things that they saw. And this is where they introduced some recommendations or commentary on structure. So I'm sure there may be some comments in this section.

Why don't we go ahead and just go through this section, you know, section by section so we make sure that if you have comments we capture those?

And again, please do feel free. I know this was just circulated let last week. If you haven't had a chance to read all this, you know, take your time, read it and circulate comments because we want to ensure everyone has ample time to provide that.

Anything in the introduction that was just an overview?

Chuck Gomes: What pages are we talking about (Jen)?

Jennifer Wolfe: So we are starting here on Page 102. And so this is all Section 9. And in that runs, let me see what does it runs through? That runs through 117, 118, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: So I have a comment on Page 108.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for clarifying that for me. This is Chuck speaking.

On Page 108 Item 3 there at the top, you know, and I certainly believe that some interview he said that voting on every item before a committee is very much a US style approach.

And I'm not questioning what interview he said that or not. That's fine and that should be reported.

But that just saying that it seemed to me is somewhat misleading because in my experiences since the reforms were implemented in the last GNSO review that that is very uncharacteristic of the way the GNSO operates now.

In working groups, you know, very few votes are taken. And sometimes the poll of opinions are sometimes to get a sense of the room that will be taken. But and in fact that was a recommendation that came out of the last review that was implemented.

So I think maybe some qualification of that impression even if some people have it would be helpful in this instance.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you Chuck. I know, I see Avri I see you have a note on 113 and 116, anything prior to that? Any comments on how they characterize the demographic structure of the Internet, how they defined geographic and cultural diversity?

Anything on the internationalized domain names which is Page 110?

Chuck Gomes: Bear with me. This is Chuck. Bear with me a second. I'm looking for a quick and...

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure I know. I know it's a massive document.

Chuck Gomes: Some of my comments and IDNs don't need comments here.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I did on the top of Page 114 - well, and I'm sorry. That's the same comment I just made so I don't need to repeat that on my comment on IDNs. I think they used a word incorrectly, but I don't think I need to cover that. So I'll skip.  
Okay?

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. And that anything on the new gTLD Section, which is let me quote my page numbers, Page 110? Okay. Then moving on to GNSO structure and I think Avri we're getting close to where you are, which is Page 113. Why don't you go ahead?

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. This is Avri speaking.

Yes I question where we discussed (unintelligible) and such all of the ALAC is and how separate all of GNSO is. I believe they're making a category in that they're comparing GNSO to ALAC as opposed to comparing GNSO to at large and the GNSO council to ALAC.

And if you look at, you know, the (silozation) there's not as many people from At-Large actually participating as participate in GNSO.

I think there's a lot less of the strict siloing that Westlake predicts. I mean there's quite a few groupings and certainly there's socialization between all of these groupings. We have may have one day when we all meet separately which they seem to key off of.

But it's just the comparison that they're making about the GNSO, you know, living in complete silos and not interacting with each other is really not the case.

And I think the comparison is a category or when they compare to the full GNSO not ALAC not realizing that ALAC is the same as GNSO Council in the organizational matrix. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Any other comments on this Section where it's discussing the GNSO structure, the silo focus structure, stakeholder groups, linkages with the ccNSO? Yes Avri, please go ahead again.

Avri Doria: And I do have and I think my comment was probably a little sharp. But I really had difficulty with something that ends on the note of quoting Winston Churchill in regard to this being the best possible, you know, this GNSO being better than any other model that was tried. When I read that I truly gasped.

It seemed to be a trivialization of the quote and it seemed to rest upon us having tried many, you know, previous GNSOs and different fixes and to say that this structure is the best of all possible structures in as Philip indicated a completely changing environment where we haven't even thought about stuff just seemed I don't know, it puzzled me to put it mildly. Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: No thank you. And for anybody if you've got the original it's on Page 116. What we have on screen includes Chuck's comments so that's sometimes throws the page numbering off just a little bit.



But it's on Page 116 if you want to take a look at that. But that's just a great point and probably one that they will take into consideration. Anything else here then we move into their 9.8, which is their conclusion on the GNSO structure, any other comments to provide? Philip did you want to chime in on anything? I see you've got a couple of points in the chat room.

Philip Sheppard: No, that's okay. I think - it's the same points I made already on the emailed. And I'm just...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: ...popping in the stuff in the text because it may be easier for them to follow. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Okay then moving on Section 10 are the appendices. I don't know if there a lot of comments or questions if we need to go through these one by one.

I think they don't have the quantitative summary results. And that would actually to me be helpful just to see how they plan to present that. So I don't know if we can make a note maybe that could be circulated before our next call. Larisa do you want to address that?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, thanks (Jen). This is Larisa. Westlake Team sent a note that that section currently stands the same way as this was when it was distributed several weeks ago as part of the draft - or excuse me, working text. So I will add this to the list discuss with Westlake what my understanding was that they had already planned to present it...

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: ...(unintelligible) that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. And it seems like there were a few pieces in the appendix that they just didn't include. But I think just to be comprehensive if they could put everything in but so we can see it complete in its complete prior to our final call that would certainly be helpful.

Does anyone have any other comments? I mean, most of these we're just attaching, you know, prior documents or other comments. Did anybody find anything to be inaccurate or have a concern about it?

Any other questions or comments there?

Okay. Well, seeing none, we've got about 20 minutes remaining in our time. I want to certainly thank everybody. I know this is a very lengthy document, you know, very structured and it's not easy to review hundreds of pages in a phone call.

So I appreciate all the time that everyone has spent reading the document, providing comments. And again thank you to staff for keeping it organized and keeping track of all the comments.

That's very helpful to be able and go back and see how Westlake has responded. And certainly appreciate the Westlake Team taking time to go through each of the comments that have been made throughout this process and provide some response. That really helps from an accountability standpoint, in the overall management of this process.

Are there any other comments or concerns that anyone has before we wrap up this call?

Okay. Seeing none, you know, and I guess we can certainly extend our apologies to the Westlake Team for scheduling the call the middle of their night.

I think our call Larisa correct me if I'm wrong, I think it's a later timeframe that might be a little more reasonable for them next time when we meet next Tuesday? Is that right Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct. Yes that's correct. Next Tuesday is 19 UTC.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Larisa Gurnick: And, you know, I'd like to send my apologies on behalf of the Westlake (unintelligible) staff. It was everybody's intention for them to be part of this very important conversation. So I'm sure there's a fine explanation but and certainly we'll make sure that they get the transcript and the chat and all the comments as well as the responses from all of you that have submitted them in writing.

So that's by the time next Tuesday comes about they will be ready to respond to all the items that you flagged.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. So I'll just extend to the working party if you do have additional comments, please don't hesitate to circulate those. We will plan for next call to be our final wrap-up of comments to Westlake before the document is officially released as a draft. So I will ask you to try to complete your comments by that point in time.

We'll plan on our call next Tuesday to start with just opening comments from Westlake. And then if we can review all the comments made today and how Westlake has responded to those that should hopefully get us to a good concluding points during that two hour call.

So I think everybody Larisa did you have one more thing? I'm sorry I just saw your hand up.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes just one more thing in playing ahead to Buenos Aires staff's looking for a block of time to schedule a face to face opportunity for the GNSO Review Working Party to gather in Buenos Aires. So we'll feedback to you with some preliminary timing works.

I know everybody will be quite busy, but I think it will be a good opportunity to do the traditional face to face meeting if at all possible. And Westlake plans to attend so that may be helpful as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. And just picking up on what we mentioned earlier. During that in person meeting which is during the public comment period we can start to discuss the implementation, any additional recommendations that we want to provide. So we can plan to address those issues during our in-person time.

So if there's nothing further I want to thank everybody again for your time and diligence. I know there are a lot of other important policy issues taking place right now. So I thank you all and welcome additional feedback and look forward to talking with you next week.

Thank you. That brings our call to a close.

Woman: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Avri). You may now stop the recording. This concludes today's call.

Coordinator: Thanks.

END