Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: All right, we're good to go so welcome to the next session which is to look at the work that's going on within the GNSO on the GNSO Review.

And in order to lead us through that we've got our NomComm appointed councilor, Jennifer Wolfe, and Larisa Gurnick from staff so I won't make a complicated introduction, I will leave it over to you guys to introduce it. Thanks very much.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great, thank you. Could we have the slide deck? Who's got the slide? Okay thank you. Great. Thank you. This is - I'm Jennifer Wolfe, it's a pleasure to be here to speak with you about the work we're doing as the GNSO Working Party to coordinate the review process and specifically the 360 review.

If you want to go ahead and move to the agenda slide I'll just give a brief overview of what Larisa and I will be presenting to you today. Larisa is going to start from staff by giving an overview of the review as a whole.

It's an important distinction to recognize that the work we're doing is specific to the 360 assessment and our own self review but there is a larger review process going on concurrently. So Larisa is going to give a brief overview of the review it self, the timeline and then I'll move into a specific update on the work of our working party.

Larisa Gurnick: Good morning. This is Larisa Gurnick. It's a pleasure to be here. As Jen said, the review - the GNSO review has kicked off because ICANN bylaws require that a review of each structure be conducted no less frequently than every

five years. And this is the first in the review cycle - this is the first structure to be undertaking the second cycle of the review.

So the purpose of the review is to evaluate organizational effectiveness of the GNSO and the - its various structures. It's to acknowledge areas that are working well, identify areas that need additional improvement and to affect necessary change. So what you see here on the slide, as an overview, are the different key components of conducting this review.

The GNSO Review Working Party has been assembled to be a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiners and the Structural Improvements Committee.

The independent examiner is selected as part of the RFP process. There were seven of proposals submitted, two finalists were elected and the Structural Improvements Committee acted on the confirmation of an independent examiner and that information will be publicly available once contractual matters are addressed.

It's based on a tightly scoped contract and the work methods will include the 360 assessment, the examination of areas documents and information as well as the integration of the work that was done by the ATRT 2 on the PDP. Also involved in this process will be limited interviews to supplement the information needed to collect data.

And as far as the criteria are concerned they will be objective and quantifiable. This is the work that the GNSO Review Working Party is providing great feedback into. And the criteria will be applied across the Board to the 360 assessment as well as the other components of the work that will be undertaken by the independent examiner.

Next slide please. So the review process, in a nutshell, three phases, the review, the reporting and the implementation. The examination is expected to kick off on July 1. The 360 assessment will be the first element of the

process. And as I mentioned already, review of the ATRT 2 assessment will be incorporated as well as the interview.

The reporting phase as typical for this process there will be a draft report, an opportunity for the working party as well as the rest of the community to provide clarifications and feedback. Second report will be provided for public comment. And then final report will be issued at which point the Board would accept the report and that would move into the implementation phase.

Preparation and coordination of the implementation plan will also be done with the assistance of the working party. That plan would then be presented for Board approval at which time implementation work would actually begin.

Next slide please. A little bit about roles and responsibilities of the different entities that are involved in this process, the Structural Improvements Committee provides oversight over the review. As I mentioned they've confirmed the independent examiner. They will accept the report and prepare recommendations for Board action as well as approve the implementation plans.

On the staff side it's the RFP process and the preparatory work for the examiner selection as well as working on the details of the criteria and the 360 assessment and actually implementing the 360 which is an online tool and Jen will talk about that.

Staff also monitors and supports the review process and manages report preparation, application for public comment and all those standard procedures as well as will be involved in the preparation of the implementation plan.

The independent examiner will conduct the examination, will use the 360 assessment as a data input into the process and will combine that information with a variety of other data collection mechanisms including interviews. And will prepare a report.

The Review Working Party provides feedback on the criteria and the 360 questions and methodologies, will help coordinate interviews, will provide clarification and rebuttal to the preliminary findings and reports and will be involved in preparing the implementation plan.

Next slide please. So the timeline, very high level, but the pre-review activities have been underway since March. The planning - the preparation of the 360 assessment and the examiner selection. We're about to move into the review phase to kick off on July 1. And we expect that phase to go through January or early February of 2015.

And the implementation phase will follow, expected for, depending on the nature of the recommendations and the implementation plans, for about a year. And then several years to actually implement and operationalize the recommendations before the next review cycle kicks in.

Next slide please. I will turn it over to Jen at this point.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Larisa. So now we'd like to give an update on specifically the work of our working party. We do have 20 members as part of our working party to coordinate the 360 assessment representing 7 different groups. As many of you may recall in a recent Council meeting we determined we wanted the composition of the working party to mirror that of Council and so that's what we've tried to do and we've kept it at a good number in terms of managing the scope of our work.

We've had weekly calls since the middle of May and we'll be meeting tomorrow evening to discuss our timeframe to match up with the overall review and the work that's needed to continue to move us forward.

Up to this point our work has been focused on providing feedback on the scope and nature of questions, the language of questions. And we are actually right on time with where we need to be in providing that feedback.

Our next step is going to be to discuss and develop a plan for community outreach and really ensuring that we engage and get people involved to respond to the survey.

As all of you I'm sure understand if we don't get good participation we don't have good data. And we really want to have statistically valid data on which we can base our analysis and recommendations.

Within the 360 assessment process there will be an online survey tool. Some of you may have seen an Excel spreadsheet floating around. I just want to be clear that that's not the form of the survey, that's just how we're capturing the questions for right now.

But there will actually be an online survey tool. Our working party will be testing that before it's launched to make sure it's easy to use. Part of what we're looking at is bifurcating the survey so that there is a shorter version and a longer version that the survey-taker can self select; do I want to take one that's going to take 10 minutes or do I want to take a longer survey that's more in depth but you might select I'm going to do it in different phases.

So we'll be testing that out to ensure it's easy to use so that we can encourage as much participation as possible. And our target is to have that testing happening in July and being able to launch the 360 assessment.

The participants in that are of course the GNSO community, the SOs and ACs, but also other members of the community are invited to participate along with Board and staff so it really is intended to be a 360 complete review process.

There will be analysis of that by the independent examiner so all of the data collected will be reviewed by the independent examiner. But we will also have the opportunity as part of the working party and as part of the GNSO to conduct our own self review. And so our goal is to ensure, again, that we're gathering data that we can use to then complete our own analysis.

Next slide please. Just one comment on scope clarification; this issue arose in our weekly meetings where there was a question of is this including structural changes to the GNSO or not? And so we actually sought out to the SIC we asked for a formal response on that.

And what we did receive from them is that the review - the overall review, I should say, will include this assessment of the effectiveness of structural changes that resulted from the last review so that will be included as well as assessment of how all these recommendations have been implemented.

If structural changes are needed it should be considered when we move to the analysis phase so our goal in scoping the questions is to ensure that we're, again, asking the right questions so that we can have good data on which to make those types of assessments. But that is essentially something that we can consider as we move into the analysis phase.

Next slide please. So community outreach and engagement is obviously an important piece. You were all handed a copy of a brochure. These are being handed out during this meeting. But we're really going to be looking to all of you to help us to engage your stakeholder groups and to engage the community to participate.

If we have limited participation in the survey then we don't have statistically valid data which limits the ability to utilize the review process. So in June we'll be looking at conducting briefings, the brochure is out, there's a wiki and we'll provide that link. In July we'll be looking at blog posts, video pod casts.

And again we're meeting tomorrow afternoon so if anybody has ideas or suggestions on outreach please let me know so we can include that in our discussion tomorrow. In September there would be a community webinar. In October there'll be a public session at the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. And then in November there are other video and pod casts scheduled.

The next slide please. So just to be clear on the opportunity for participation and feedback, both the SOs and the ACs as well as any individual or member of the community has the opportunity to participate within the working party.

Again, we did determine that the scope or the role of the committee should include just the SOs and the ACs at this point in time to mirror that of Council. But anyone else can participate, the Brand Registry Group has been participating by sending emails and asking that those be forwarded so anyone can provide comments or ask to be - have the opportunity to participate.

During the 360 assessment obviously the more participation the better from the community at large. The independent examiner will be providing feedback to us as we begin to launch the 360 assessment. There will be a public comment period from November to December so, again, more opportunity to participate. The SIC will be sending comments as well as staff throughout the process.

The next slide is the last slide, this just has some important links and email addresses. And that concludes my update. Happy to answer questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much, Larisa and Jen. Comments, question. John Berard.

John Berard: I notice that you're very forceful in the slides with regard to the interviews. I'm also historically sensitive to things that the examiner might be told might have greater influence than the things that the examiner might be compelled to read through.

I note in the brochure that it says the interviews are, "if needed." So the first question I have is will there be interviews or not? And the second question is who gets to pick who gets interviewed?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Thank you for the question. Absolutely there will be interviews. It will be up to the independent examiner to determine to what extend they

need to collect additional information once they see the data that's been collected from the 360.

And then in terms of who to interview that's where the input from the working party will be very useful depending on the nature of topics and the kind of information that the independent examiner is seeking. So that is definitely one of the functions of the review party.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Philip and then Gabriella.

Phil Sheppard: Thank you, Jonathan. Philip Sheppard from the Brand Registry Group. And, Jen, thank you for recognition of our participation so far. We all in this aware of the happy coincidence of a scheduled review of the GNSO at the time of this huge C-change in ICANN in terms of its new registries coming on board.

And the concern that we have in the Brand Registry Group is that the standard template, if you like, that we're looking at this for this review, is a somewhat back-looking process in terms of how has it worked, how have things worked in the past? Did the structure from the last review, which I was deeply involved in, did that work? Is it fulfilling its functions and expectations now?

The question that we're not asking ourselves, which I think is the question that is most important, is not is the current GNSO effective? But how do we accommodate new stakeholders and the new ICANN, within the new ICANN, how do we accommodate its new stakeholders in effective policymaking which is the GNSO's job?

And unless we have that mindset going forward this review is not going to fulfill its higher level objective which is making ICANN effective by having an effective policymaking body that incorporates all of its stakeholders.

And I just wanted to make that point very clearly because that is what we feel very strongly about in the BRG in particular that that is not being thought

about as much as it should and we're a little bit blinded by the - what would, in other circumstances, without such a TLD program, be a normal program scheduled review. So I hope I made that point clear. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Philip. Would anyone like to respond? Just let me know if you want to pick it up particularly if you're happy just continue with the queue. I've got Gabriella.

Gabriella Szlak: This is Gabriella Szlak from the Business Constituency. I just wanted to ask if the survey is going to be available in different languages. And this is also related to the discussions that we had before about the challenges of overload at ICANN. And this brings all the challenges for people that are not English speakers. And it's hard to complete a survey if you have to do it in another language. So just that question, thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you for the question. First of all it reminds me to share with the group that the information, the printouts, the brochures, that you all have, this information has already been translated and it's available on the wiki so we're very sensitive to the needs of the translations. Once the format of the survey will be determined and the work of the independent examiner begins we're definitely looking at ways that we can make the information accessible to people of different languages so that's definitely part of the plan.

To what extent the format of the survey can be interpreted into five languages is not exactly clear at this point. But in terms of at least, at a minimum, being able to translate the questions so that people can read the questions in their languages is some of the options that are being considered.

I'm sorry, I think there was a second part to your question that I haven't addressed.

Gabriella Szlak: No, no, it's okay. But I wanted to know if the people are going to be able to answer actually in the language which is the most important part of the challenge. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Yeah, I don't have an answer to that at this point because that obviously brings a lot of analytical complexity.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Marilyn, we go to you next.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. And my name is Marilyn Cade. Thank you for sharing this preliminary approach to communicating with the community about the review. I'm going to make an immediate comment about the graphic on the back and note that apparently we're a little confused with our graphic artist about the role of users of the Internet versus DNS name industry.

And most of us, who are here, are trying to balance the idea of being a supply - ICANN being responsible for governance in the supplier community which there's very broad support from the Business Constituency for that, but also understanding that the larger role of governance of ICANN and governance of ICANN's activities really has to incorporate a much more distributed base of those who are users of the Internet and may or may not be registrants.

So just thinking in how this gets translated into human language not just language translation but also translated into human language maybe that's something that could be thought about a little more. I'm sure the At Large would have thoughts on that as well.

My second comment was just going to be about the translation of the word "examiner" into language that will be understood and incorporated particularly if we are truly trying to reach into the business user communities around the world.

I don't see - I know Gabby is here - I don't see one of our other officers from - here from Africa. But we certainly will be reaching out to encourage participation but the use of the term "examiner" is not necessarily a user-friendly word. It may imply a criticism as opposed to a critique. Just

something to think about in terms of explaining what the purpose of that function is. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marilyn. I've got Tony and then Volker next.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Jonathan. Tony Holmes for the ISPs. I just wanted to pick up on the point that was made earlier this morning when Ron Andruff presented for the Standing Committee on Improvements. And Ron made the point that the SCI were proposing that there was a review that the operating procedures in their entirety.

But I'm left still not - unsure in my own mind whether that now falls into this GNSO review or whether it will be done by that committee. And I think Ron posed that question to us. But I'm unclear as Council how we're going to address that whether that's going to be referred to the working group or not. And when that decision is going to be made.

Jonathan Robinson: Who are you putting that question to, Tony?

Tony Holmes: Well I think it falls between stores and that's part of the problem I have with it; it's really a discussion maybe for Council. But there is certainly a hook back to the work of the GNSO review so it's how we handle that. And I didn't want that to get lost.

Jonathan Robinson: So I have two quick thoughts. One is that we should capture that and make sure we did capture that. That would be nice to have confirmation from Lars that we have captured that? Good. Thank you.

The second is that my sense is that if this review works as it could or should it should capture that and it should be an outcome of that review rather than - that's my sense of the review that the review should highlight where there are issues.

And we've been told that from the SCI so in conducting interviews, doing 360 assessments and so on that should come out as a key point of a limitation to how we function, work or operate currently. That's my initial thought. Tony, by all means respond and then we should move on.

Tony Holmes: Yeah, just a quick point on that. I think if it's going to be done that way then there needs to be some input certainly from that committee somehow or the other. That shouldn't just be left with the working group to take forward without having that linkage.

Jonathan Robinson: Any comments from you, Larisa or Jen?

Jennifer Wolfe: I'll just say I think that's a great point and I appreciate you bringing that to our attention so we could capture that. Certainly operating procedure is part of the scope of the questions but I think to the extent we determine do we need to have a more detailed look at operating procedure we could take that on as part of our self review as well.

But Ron is part of our working group too so I'm sure he can liaise with the SIC as well - or the SCI, excuse me, as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I've got - I had Tony - I've got Volker, Maria and then Stéphane.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Jonathan. Volker Greimann speaking. Maybe I'm a bit confused about the comment from the gentlemen from the Brand Registry Group but clearly they are already represented both by the Registrar Stakeholder Group and possibly even by the IPC.

So when doing the review and looking at so-called new interests that are entering the community it may be worthwhile looking at if those interests are not already served in one or the other constituency or stakeholder group. And instead of creating new groups and new groups all the time integrating those groups into the existing structures may be much more worthwhile then trying to find a new slot to insert these into.

Jonathan Robinson: Maria.

Maria Farrell: Hi, it's Maria Farrell here. I'm going to apologize in advance because I - because I'm - I guess I have some quite profound concerns about the entire approach that we're taking to the review.

I am worried that this is an overly quantitative-focused review that has - doesn't seem to be taking account of the many rich sources of qualitative information available to us including interviews. I

'm concerned that, you know, (unintelligible) kind of research methodology in that knows that surveys can be - they can be skewed, they can be minimalist but the - I think in the hunger to create - what's called objective and quantifiable outcomes we are losing sight of what we're actually trying to look at here. We're trying to measure things instead of trying to appreciate what's actually happening.

So let me give you a couple of examples. I mean, I think some of the main questions that the GNSO is facing at the moment are not on the table here because we're so worried about having things that we can put into a pie chart, things like is the GNSO relevant to policy debates in ICANN? Is it something that gets routed around?

Are the people in the GNSO happy to continue with the GNSO as it currently is? Do we have a structure that is almost architecturally engineered to create disincentives to cooperation?

You know, there are a lot of really big almost existential questions that I think have been satisfied in the hunger to really strictly constrain a review that is very focused on numbers and outputs rather than actual lived experience.

You know, and I say this as someone who's trained as a social scientist, there are ways to do qualitative research and I'm just not seeing them here.

So I'm concerned that we're losing - in the methodologies we use - that are proposed to be used here we are cutting out entire swathes of research methodologies that are actually very effective.

And also I'm concerned that in the constraints that are being put around the review at the beginning, i.e., you know, the very clear message that this should not really deal with structural reviews that we are not taking into account that, you know, the domain name industry is massively changing, that the world of the Internet is changing in terms of participation and how we need to be relevant to and include more people but also the - I guess the power politics of the GNSO within ICANN as an organization.

So I think those are really fundamental questions. And I absolutely take my hat off to Jennifer, you know, for the work that's being done here. But I'm concerned that the narrowness of the approach that I believe has been set by the Board is something that is putting blinkers on us and is really not going to allow us to look at the fullness of the issues that the GNSO really is fundamentally facing and also to draw on the depth of experience and opinion of many of the people who are involved and also not involved in the GNSO. So those are my concerns.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Maria. So I've got a queue forming. Mindful of time as well. I've got Stéphane, Kristina, John and now Thomas.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jonathan. Stéphane Van Gelder speaking. I'm a member of the working party representing the BC along with Ron Andruff; we are the two BC representatives. I think the conversation we've just had is extremely symptomatic of the conversations we're having within the working party where we're constantly butting up against what I've called the narrow mandate that's been given to us by that SIC.

And the larger desire of people, within the working party there are, if I'm not mistaken, three past GNSO chairs; Chuck, Avri, I believe, and myself.

There's a lot of GNSO experience within that group. And there's a lot of people in that group who feel very passionately about the GNSO in general.

So I think the approach is extremely positive. But we are constantly being drawn into a kind of narrow focus where we don't feel comfortable because we'd like to go beyond that focus and look at the kind of stuff that Maria has just been talking about and that we - well, that some of us, depending on our background, some of us feel is extremely necessary.

And I think clearly we need - we the GNSO community need to be sending a message back to the Board saying that we feel constrained and perhaps we need to look at this review in a slightly wider way or at least change some of the parameters so that some of the questions that the community's consistently been asking, certainly ever since I've been involved in the GNSO, and get an answer.

I mean, one of the points - Volker made a point about that constituency and stakeholder group model and the way it is now should allow groups like the - Philip's group, I forget your name now, the Brand Registry Group, to be represented and yet you're seeing these groups also create themselves to get representation.

So obviously there are people that are dissatisfied with the current structure, the way that they can get representation, we're seeing that in other parts of the GNSO as well. Those are crucial questions that we've had for years and that we really should be looking at.

So I think we are constrained. I think it is a problem. And I think it's, you know, incumbent on us to make that message very clear back to the Board. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So I've got a queue forming, and I suppose the question is, is this about expanding the scope of this group and this work and if so how so? Or is it

something for a different area? And that seems to be something that - seems to be the question that's being asked.

I've got Kristina, John, Thomas, Ron and then Philip and then perhaps we can try and cut the discussion at that point and move into our next session. So, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Hi. Kristina Rosette, President of the IPC, which I note only because it's partially relevant to one of the observations I'm going to make your you and I realize although it may sound internally inconsistent, on the one hand I completely agree with the point that Maria has raised in terms of what is in fact the scope of this.

But at the same token I would note that we have had some challenges really getting a good handle as to what the scope is so that we can make sure that we are collecting the information that we need to be having, that we are doing our own internal checks to make sure that we're where we may want to be, where we may be expected to be. So we're hopeful that we've invited Matt and Larisa to come speak to our constituency meeting.

And I'm hopeful that by the end of that we'll have kind of a very precise snapshot of the scope - the current scoping information because as of right now it is difficult to get a good handle on it even for those of us who have been on the GNSO Council, who've been active in the GNSO.

And I think that is really a challenge that needs to be addressed so that there's really no confusion or uncertainty at the outset as to - it's one thing to say we're going to change the scope but it's helpful, and I think important for everyone to understand that at this point in time given our scope this is what we're looking at. And I think there really is a lot of uncertainty there.

Second, just to kind of put on my IPC hat, I understand the point that Volker was making about it may be that there is a view that the BRG can have its

interests represented in the IPC or in the Registry Stakeholder Group or the like.

But I would just note that I would have some concerns about creating a path in which reviews are conducted in such a way so that groups that are new or that - new interests that emerge are told perhaps to their abjection and the objection of the group that they are told to merge with, you have to be here.

That to me seems extremely counterproductive and certainly not part of the - not consistent with some of the outreach efforts for example, that we have undertaken. Not to mention that I would note that it's probably, you know, to a great extent it can be potentially structurally inconsistent under the bylaws and charters of the stakeholder groups and the constituencies.

And finally I would just really urge that, taking Marilyn's point into consideration of what we call the independent examiner, let's make sure they really are independent. Let's avoid conflicts of interest. Let's not hire somebody or some firm that's got previous connections with ICANN within the GNSO. I think we really need to make sure that we make - that whoever it is that it hired and retained to conduct this interview truly is independent.

I obviously - there is some value to having an organization or entity that's got background but I think we really, really, really need to make sure that we're avoiding conflicts. It's just an issue within ICANN generally and I'd hate to see the output of the review team by, you know, later allegations of conflicts or considerations as to whether there was an improper influence.

Jonathan Robinson: So we've got - I've got a queue that is - yeah, sorry, let me make sure you're able to...

Jennifer Wolfe: No, sure. I just wanted to make one comment. We're going to make sure - Larisa and I were just conferring to ensure that the questions that are being considered right now will be posted on the wiki.

So as you all go into your stakeholder group meetings on Tuesday that's available and we still have the opportunity to provide feedback and scope. So as you may - if you want to discuss that issue and get that back to our working party we will make sure that feedback goes to the SIC and to the Board to know if there are scope questions that you think should be expanded, if you don't like the language of certain questions that certainly still this stage that we're in is providing that feedback.

So I absolutely encourage everyone who has any concerns about the scope of questions. And also just to Maria's point, there will be some opportunity for open ended questions as well as close ended questions so we are trying to capture as much qualitative data and quantitative data as we can.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jen. I've got John, Thomas, Ron and Philip and then we'll close the queue there.

John Berard: This is John Berard with the Business Constituency. I would...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I would like to - as much as I share Maria's point of view that in order - sometimes progress only gets made when you bang the drum about what's wrong. There have been some instances where the GNSO and the GNSO Council specifically have had positive affect on the review process already.

When it was first presented to us, it was presented as almost an entirely statistical analysis and that was changed. Then there was the suggestion that it be delayed, and that was changed. And then there was the question as to whether there would be a look - taking a look at structural improvements, and that was changed.

So while I believe that there are miles to go I also want to make sure that we don't forget that we have come miles in exerting, if I may use such a robust verb, exerting a little influence over the process.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yeah, this is Thomas Rickert. Just a little remark, we've heard a lot of reasonable requests to add to the review other areas of concern. And I'm not sure whether that's the right way to go because I think that we should only expand to the review to the extent required.

And for other matters I think we should seek opportunities to resolve issues in the given structure. I think that some of the remarks are quite vague in that regard so I think it might be helpful to get a list of the things that need addressing and then see where we best place them because I think that some of the things can be resolved elsewhere.

Jonathan Robinson: Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Jonathan. Ron Andruff, Business Constituencies for the record. Thomas, to address what you've just spoken about, that's what the working party is doing right now is we're trying to look at all of these elements and we're bringing in the things that are structural components that are not functioning as they were anticipated back when we tried to create this new structure.

And, you know, this is the great part about the review is - was that we actually have written into our bylaws the fact that we have to go back and check and see if in fact the things - the great ideas we thought we had are they still great ideas or do we need to evolve?

And that's what this organic creature of ICANN is. So it's a very healthy thing we're doing. But speaking personally, one of the things I have some difficulty with is that we always talk about our bottom-up consensus driven nature. The last review we did, as an institution, that GNSO did it itself. And we came up with this house structure and so forth and this is the house - the structure we're living in today.

But what's happening here is that we have the GNSO review and we're told by the Structural Improvements Committee there's going to be an independent examiner and that here's a job for you to go off and do. And so we're busy off doing this job in the working party and it's been very constructive.

But I think we have to have also input, we as the GNSO Council or we as the GNSO in total into who is this independent examiner? I agree very much with what Kristina stated, you know, absolutely independent. But when you start talking absolutely independent we have individuals, as we've all experienced, that come to ICANN and they don't know what this animal is and they start applying rules to this process that come from a structure that has nothing to do with our structure.

We've seen economists come in and talk to us about economic things in other businesses. But this is not a business; this is such a unique animal. So what I wanted to say is very simply I think it's very important, while we've got a very nice brochure telling us all very clearly what we're supposed to do and who's going to do what I think it's very important that the Council at the very least has an opportunity to weigh in on who is this independent examiner and make sure that we all agree that this examiner is qualified to do the job as opposed to the Structural Improvements Committee at the Board level telling us that should be the case. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Philip.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you. Philip Sheppard from Brand Registry Group. Just a response to the question about representation, please be very clear, the Brand Registry Group is not considered that any existing group within the GNSO is representing our common interests.

One of the reasons we self formed in the first place was precisely because of that feeling. Now we all, in the Brand Registry Group, are a set of companies

who are very experienced working globally in multiple different trade fora. And many of these companies have different hats in those fora. And that is part of where we are within the GNSO at the moment. And that's part of the issue that I was trying to explain earlier.

IPC, for an example, is about brands. Now there's a lot of difference between brands and brand protection and a branded company who may want to become a register. I'm not going into the detail. So just an initial point there.

Secondly of course, as a dotBrand we will be a contracted party and having the IPC and the non-contracted parties house representing our interests has a certain interesting concept and is entirely inconsistent with the current structure of the GNSO.

We have also been in discussion any working group that I was helping to chair over the last few months, in fact since Durban, with the Registry Stakeholder Group to see how best the BRG as an association and indeed other groups such as the dotGeos may participate as the association rather than merely having individual members who could also join. And those discussions have so far not produced any satisfactory results.

So please be aware in terms of the representation issue there was a huge gap and that is one that we are seeking to fill. We are here. We feel ourselves to be part of the GNSO community. We are merely not currently a member of a structure within the GNSO. We are here to add our voice, our help, our resources and our thoughts going forward to make policymaking with ICANN better.

And we hope that this GNSO review is one element in that improvement in GNSO policymaking. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Larisa; thanks, Jen. Pretty comprehensive presentation and set of responses. It feels to me like you've got quite a lot of feedback on scope but also I think we've collectively got some feedback on - to the extent that it

isn't in scope, I mean, there is nothing ever to stop us doing - initiating and undertaking work of our own initiative.

So for me it's a question of how much does or does not the existing review work change to accommodate the comments and input and what if anything is left over for us in other areas to pick up and work with. So thanks everyone. It seems to be pretty comprehensive input that is strongly felt.

So let's call that session to a close and stop the recording there.