

**Transcription ICANN London
GNSO Review
Sunday 22 June 2014**

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

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, welcome everyone. Thanks for all of you being for being here. I know we're a small group today. Maybe we can just all introduce ourselves before we get started and we've got just a couple of items on our agenda, but it'll probably take some time to talk it through and I know it's late in the day. I'm (Jennifer Wolfe). I think I know most of you. I'm chairing this GNSO review working party. I am the non-com appointee to the GNSO council, and for a living, I consult with brands on their new GTLDs.

So it's a pleasure to be here. Just a little bit in terms of my background with regards to reviews. I have a black belt in Six Sigma do a lot of process related work with clients as well. So that brings me some contacts to the work that we're doing here. Do you all want to take a moment and introduce yourself?

Phillip Sheppard: Hello, I'm (Philip Sheppard) with the Brand Worthington Group.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes with the Registries.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh. Representing Intellectual Property constituency.

Theresa Gernick: Theresa Gernick. Staff.

(Bob Hoffman): Bob Hoffman (unintelligible).

David Maher: David Maher, Registry Stakeholder Group.

Woman: We've got a ton of staff in the room too, so.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Well, great. Well I know we all have everybody represented, so we'll have to keep that in mind as we work through some of these issues. At this point, for those of you who, I know Mike, you're new and I don't - Steve I'm not sure if you're been on the calls or not,. So you've been on the calls, okay. So where we are right now is we're finishing up the process of giving feedback to the SIC with regard to scope in the nature of the questions. So we'll walk through this document here in a minute which is the mockup of what the survey might look like.

In terms of our timetable, we are finishing up that process. We will have the opportunity to actually test the software of the survey which I think will be really important so we all feel like it's easy enough to use that we can engage the community in taking the survey. So we also need to really focus on outreach. How we're going to get people to get involved to take the survey. So that's part of what we want to discuss today.

And then finally we need to talk about our work plan. How frequently we should be having calls so that we can get more engagement in the process particularly as we move into the implementation and in the analysis stage. We're going to want to have more participation from all the stakeholder groups.

So anything, any other comments anybody has before we get started? Anything else you want to add to the agenda? Okay. So I'll start (Larissa), do you want to just walk through this document. Give us an overview and we can comment on this and talk about the questions and scope.

(Larissa): Yes, sure.

Man: Should we give comments as she goes through it, rather than waiting until the end?

Jennifer Wolfe: I think that's okay. Is that all right with you?

(Larissa): Yes. Perfect. What you're looking at right now is the - I'm calling it a mockup so that you know that there will be an interrogative version of this several steps down from where we are today. This reflects all the feedback that we've collected so far from this group or hopeful most of the feedback anyhow. And it includes introductory language that we talked about to make it easier for people to understand why this is important and why they should take the time to conduct the survey.

It also explains a little bit about the process and it sets the stage for the fact that we will ultimately take the questions that are included in here. There some close to 60 questions and things that are listed in the various categories. And we will sort them out into two groups essentially. One that will be survey for people to self-select if they feel that their knowledge of the GNSO is general in introductory.

So there will be a shorter, simpler version of the survey. And then the second version of the survey will be for those people that have and would like to participate in the more in depth survey based on their knowledge of the GNSO works in particular. Any questions on this so far?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I have one (Larissa). This is Chuck Gomes. In the first meeting I participated in, which I think was the first meeting you had a pretty good turnout, right? We talked about dividing the survey into segments. I don't think I'm talking about the short version, but the long version. Is the intent still to take that long version and divide it up into smaller segments? Keeping in mind there are quite a few people at that meeting that said, you know, ten

minutes. You get too much longer than that, people aren't going to complete it. What's the intent there?

(Larissa): To a certain extent, we propose that once we depend on an examiner, gets pointed and confirmed that that's something that they provide some insight as to the best way to construct that. But one of the thoughts was that since we're dividing it based on level on knowledge and expertise. Really the more in-depth survey that will probably end up with about my guess is 50 questions or so, will essentially be self-review.

Chuck Gomes: I'm following what you're saying.

Woman: Can I ask a quick question. The software, I think we talked about that already you and I talked about it. That you can start taking the survey and say I want to come back to it and save it and come back to it, because we had said that on the phone that the more in-depth survey as long as you could have the (unintelligible) to take it apart. So that will be available, right.

(Larissa): Oh, yes. Absolutely. So the survey; whatever the method of delivery of the survey will be. People will absolutely have the opportunity to save wherever they are in the process and come back to it later. I think Chuck you're referencing some very early conversations where we thought it could be broken down perhaps in sections and say today, this week we're launching, you know, the first section of the survey will address, you know, certain areas and then a week later, launch another one.

So the concern - that's still an option. We can certainly discuss that. I think the concern would be, you know, the benefits of stretching it out over a longer period of time and perhaps whom we're getting responses from people to the initial survey. And then thinking that maybe since they've already provided their response, they're done and not continuing with the process.

So I would want to think about that and talk to some survey experts as to whether that would be the way to go. Or allow them to come back and complete it and follow up with emails for those that we can see in the system that have started but haven't completed. That's also a tool that we have.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. And that may be okay allowing them to come in and out freely. But that doesn't - that sounds better than just, but we better be up front. The longer portion we need to let them know it's going to take quite a bit of time. So we've designed it so that you can tackle it in pieces and come back and continue it. And it may take several times to do that if they don't have a significant block of time.

It's really helpful to know how much time is estimated to take and like several people said, that (Mikala) is one that sticks out in my mind. You know. Re-emphasizing this point that if it's too long, you won't get very many people to do it. It's an improvement to allow them to come in and out and do it in segments.

So as long as we're upfront about that and say that, I know - again I can't speak for (Mikala) and others that express the same concern, but that's better. I mean right now it just - of course it's an early version. It's just all one big block with no indication how long it takes. And 50 questions - especially if people do any free entry is going to probably take them quite a while.

Jennifer Wolfe: And that's part of what she has up on screen here. Is that respond in a way that's suitable to you and we can certainly talk about the language because I might try to frame it maybe a little differently than it is right now. So that the user really understands what the benefit of talking the longer survey is. Meaning if you take the longer survey, you're giving more in-depth input to the process of people who really care about what's happening.

I would think wouldn't mind saying I'm going to dedicate an hour of my time to do this even if I do it in 15 minute segments. But I definitely understand we

want to get broad outreach so we've got have a shorter version, and I think you're right. We need to say this version is 10 minutes and this one is an hour. Mike did you have something.

Michael: Yes, I mean it's obvious that people are self-selecting whether they have a fundamental understanding or an in-depth understanding simply by taking the longer survey, right? And maybe I'm jumping the gun. We're going to talk about this later in the meeting and you may well talked about it earlier before I got involved, but I'm just curious to understand the context. What is the content behind collecting this?

And obviously we want people's opinions, but then who's evaluating that? Is it independent evaluator? Is it this group? Is there another group to counsel?

Jennifer Wolfe: I can jump on that. So it's really both or all of the above, I guess it say. So that's our intention from the GNSO standpoint is that we want to make sure we got our data points that we can use to then do our own analysis. But the independent examiner will be conducting the - in terms of the overall review being facilitated by the FIC. They're going to look at the independent examiner's interpretation of those results, but that's where what at least - I really want to make sure we do is we're gathering data - the actual data points that we can use to then have our own analysis.

Mike: I guess I'm not understanding interplay between this group; the counsel and SIC.

(Larissa): So the SIC is responsible for the oversight of all the organizational reviews. So that's the role that they play. And actually I'll make sure to forward you some slides that spell out the roles and responsibilities that might be helpful. The purpose of this group is to provide feedback on the 360 assessment on the questions on the way that the review will be conducted helping the independent examiner identify people that would be good to supplement for the interview process.

And when draft recommendations come out early findings to work with an independent examiner to clarify provide additional information and do all that. And ultimately when their final report is issued, to work on the implementation plan. So that's the role of this group. As far as the - so once the 360 assessment is launched, the data is all collected on the backend. And that data will be provided to the independent examiner as well as to this group so that you can conduct your own analysis and summaries.

But the independent examiner will use this as one of the data points for conducting the review. The other data points will be review of documents and materials that are - that have been generated over the course of however many years for the last five years. As well as conducting interviews. So they will be looking at all those elements as data points for formulated their conclusions and making recommendations.

Jennifer Wolfe: Did that help?

Michael: Yes, thanks. I don't want to waste time on covering - getting me up to speed. I don't want to waste all this time on that, but thanks for that.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, no it's okay and I absolutely want to make sure everybody understands the scope of what we're trying to do. Phillip?

Phillip Sheppard: Thanks. Just to clarify a question. What's the most questions you've got here? I knows there's a lot of them about how effectively is something done. In the draft we're seeing, is the ultimate form of the questions going to be a mix of free text and multiple choice.

(Larissa): Yes, it's actually covered a little bit further in those documents, but every question will have a free form text so that everybody can provide a free form comment on any question in addition to having another item on the list. It asks, you know anything else you would like to provide, please do it here. But

each question will also have a quantitative methodology behind it. It'll either be yes, no, I don't know. Or it'll be on a scale of one to - so that's the way the questions will be formulated to make sure that there's a basis for quantifying feedback that we're getting.

Man: I guess this is - since we're talking about it, it'll come up later when we see the questions, but how do you envision the format because - well let me back up. The spreadsheet obviously showed different groups. Are we going to ask each person that fills out the survey to respond for each of the groups? To the extent that they have knowledge about those groups? Or are we expecting people to fill out the survey for the group that they'll most familiar with?

(Larissa): The thought was that we would give them a choice, and ask them which groups they want to respond not on behalf of which of the groups they want to assess. And they can do as many as they would like.

Man: Okay.

(Larissa): And I'm not quite sure yet because once we see what the questions are it'll be a little clearer, but it also appears that the short version of the survey will perhaps - it will no longer be a short version if, but it...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Larissa): Exactly. And it just seems from a logical perspective and I would certainly, you know love the feedback from this group that if someone said they only have a general knowledge then perhaps they'll either opt to respond on behalf of GNSO as a whole or perhaps they'll do it based on whatever their knowledge base is. But they'll certainly have the option to do it as many times as they would like for whatever entities they would like to evaluate. Y

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, Mike.

Michael: I guess along those lines what is the thinking about allowing people to answer this confidentially?

(Larissa): So once they log into the online survey tool, we're asking them to provide certain information that you probably saw if you scroll down. But there will also be an option to say I don't want this information shared publicly. So very much similar if you think about when independent examiner would do an interview on the phone, let's say. The independent examiner knows who they're talking to usually so, the identity is available, but they tell people that the information will be held confidential, so that comments and feedback is not going to be shared publicly.

So this will be essentially the same thing. People will be identified so that in the analysis phase, the independent examiner will know where the information - where the independent examiner will - that's something that we can certainly discuss to what extent anybody besides the independent examiner should know that information.

Jennifer Wolfe: And I think what we're trying to do is safeguard so that you're only filling out a survey once, right? You don't get to fill it out five times under different names. You have to identify who you are so that we try to safeguard against that type of behavior. But at the same time give people the ability to really, you know, if you're within a constituency group, and you're unhappy with things, you might want to be able to really respond candidly without everyone in your group knowing that you did that.

So we want to give people the opportunity to respond honestly and without fear of repercussions because they speak their minds. I mean unless you all, I mean do you all agree, disagree or thoughts?

Chuck Gomes: I agree with that it's just for example for us if we're tasked with analyzing and summarizing the comments, and we don't know who made them, that makes

the task impossible as to those comments. Maybe, maybe not. If they're really factual based I suppose they can still be useful, but it generally helps to know who the speaker is.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well we can also look for consistency too, right? I mean anytime you're looking at qualitative data, you're looking for where you find consistent responses or results. And we're going to have some out layers. I mean you can actually turn qualitative data when we get to the analysis phase. So I definitely understand, right like you know, you might give one person's opinion more weight or credibility than another, but I think at least we have that ability for people to put in qualitative responses. Yes, Chuck you're...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I'm concerned if we - I think it makes it way too subjective if we start evaluating oh this is from Mike so I'm going to discount it. It's from Phillip I'm going to count it more. And that also becomes very hard to evaluate. Sorry about that Mike. So I think actually for us, it's better not to know who did it. I like the idea though that they have to identify themselves so we avoid the problem that you mentioned in terms of people doing duplicates and different things.

Phillip Sheppard: As a follow on to that, I presume anybody anywhere can choose to answer the survey, and at some point they'll be asked maybe to say, yes I am a member of the business constituency whatever, so there's some context looked to maybe their opinion about that. But then they also have an opinion about more general issues. I'm thinking a little bit of my own experience.

I mean I as one of the architects of the current structure (unintelligible) would have, you know a lot of comments in terms of how it's structurally working and into relationships between constituencies and SGs. As a former counselor, I would have lots of information on thoughts about how business constituency and etc., worked.

And then with my new hat on in terms of a new stakeholders of the registry group, we would have so much more higher level issues than maybe 10% of the questions that served could be relevant. But the survey is so structured to accommodate all those flavors?

Jennifer Wolfe: I'll jump in. I mean if you go to the questions, I mean I think we have. If you think we haven't then we want to hear that. And know what other questions we should be adding. You know I think we - there is a catch all at the end which is tell us anything else that you want to tell us. So there is a catch all I think so that if for some reason haven't captured some scope of something someone wants to address, there's a place to enter that information. But I mean that's why I said in our working session, you know yesterday to everybody, you know please read the questions.

You know, read them and tell us if you think we haven't addressed something. So Phillip, certainly if you think that we haven't addressed a way, you know for feedback to be given about structure, then we want to make sure we include that. (Larissa) do you have the thing up.

(Larissa): Yes on the screen right now you can see once again the mockup of the sections that the responder would come to from the get go asking for their name, email, affiliation and several other data points without making it excessively burdensome. And you know, this is certainly please provide us some feedback.

Information that helps shape where they're coming from. I'm thinking that it might be a good idea to add here a text box. Tell us, you know, whatever else you want to tell us about your experience, and let people respond, you know provide context if they would like to, we can certainly do that. But this section is meant to collect that information and there will be one more question added for those that don't want their identities to be used publicly. That's not there now, but essentially it'll give them the opportunity to provide some context as to their experience and their basis for answering the questions.

Chuck Gomes: On the - this is Chuck again. On the affiliation question, seems to me that would be a good emulating planning this. It's a good place for a dropdown box with another. Because we really want the - certainly the groups that we've identified. I'm thinking of a spreadsheet that runs across, you know. Those should be in the dropdown box because that's where, and they should be able to check more than one so that it's quicker.

Because if we say what is your affiliation, we're going to get answers all over the sun in terms of what their affiliated with, and what we're really most interested in is what their affiliation is related to the organizations and the GNSO and the GNSO itself. Does that make sense?

Chuck Gomes. Yes, I was going to make exactly the same point, I mean you know, we don't want people telling us if they're gay or straight or you know. We need to put context around that question. And then just on confidentiality, I was just assuming and I want to verify, the default is that your name will be public unless you check the box and say, I want my comments to be confidential. Is that right?

(Larissa): Yes, that's how this was laid out.

Jennifer Wolfe: Do you think it should be the opposite? That the default is confidential unless you say you can make my name public? Is that going to be confusing for people?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think so no. I think it should be default public.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well and if you notice here too, it does ask questions about how many meetings you've attended so to the extend there are these opened ended questions, you know, perhaps you could weight it based upon have they gone to zero meetings where it says you've attend. Something along those lines, more amorously but based upon how much participation they've had.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and let's not say default is public because we don't really mean public. What we mean is the independent evaluator would have access to those names. Is that right? And they're the only ones?

Jennifer Wolfe: No we're talking about public. It's - you check the box if you don't want it to know it was you completing the survey.

Chuck Gomes: So why would we want to publish...

Jennifer Wolfe: It could do that for anybody. It's just a question, right?

Chuck Gomes: So why would we want to publish the names of people who completed the survey?

(Larissa): We may or we may not if...

Michael: I mean we would publish the name of people who make public comments when they give their name. Of course they can do that anonymously as well.

Chuck Gomes: I don't understand why there'd be any...

(Larissa): Public comment - the names have to be provided I'm pretty sure.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I don't know - I'm still - nobody answered my question. Why we would we want to make public the names of the people who completed the survey?

Jennifer Wolfe: I don't know why that would be needed for our purposes. I'm sorry Mike, please go ahead.

Michael: It just seems to me and again so you can better evaluate the opinions that are given by knowing who's giving them. And that just seems ordinarily to be

the default at ICANN is to be transparent. You know public comments and speaking at the mic and everything else.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. But I think we run the risk by eliminating people's responses. Because they're concerned about their constituency group will respond or if they want to provide feedback.

Michael: That's why we're giving them the option to keep it confidential.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right, right. But you're saying, why not make it public? And Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: Unless somebody says specifically not to, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And what I am getting at is one thing for a very small group to know the names to make sure that we're not getting Mickey Mouse and stuff like that. That's very different than saying we're going to make the names public.

Man: If I may Chuck, I'm with you 100%. I don't see why though you couldn't have a fenced off area where you could collect that kind of information so that if there needed to be a follow up, they would know where to go. But it could be entirely separate section that is always going to be confidential. And because what you're really concerned about is two things. One is getting a free response. The second thing is being able to in a certain sense evaluate the ability of the response in terms of who gave it. And of course the third thing is there's a requirement for a follow up. You know, you need that as well.

Now if someone wants to opt out of filling out that confidential piece, I would say go right ahead, but then again, if I was going to evaluate the data that's presented in conjunction with that anonymized piece, I would tend to put it aside and say not a really valid response because I can't validate it to a

certain extent, nor could I seek a verification so it could SKU what I'm saying in looking at it.

Chuck Gomes: So right. It's Chuck again. Just in response to that last thing you said there. Why even give them that option if we're going to discount it?

Man: Making it confidential?

Man: No.

Chuck Gomes: Why give them the option of not giving the identifier information that you're going to discount it anyway?

Man: I'm on the white board here Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: And what I'm saying if you listen carefully, I said you could. It was a very conditional word. And so, if the group would be, you know satisfied with saying okay, the specific demographic type of information we're collecting is confidential, and will not be published but will be used for purposes of administrating the survey. Fine, then you're good to go.

Man: You know, if someone objects to that then they might as well not bother to fill out the survey in the first place.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Man: And we did this Chuck without meeting in our normal meeting place.

((Crosstalk))

Phillip Sheppard: I think we're having a pool and discussion but we risk having a discussion in which we're confusing prevising confidentiality with effectiveness and interpretation for the survey. If I was the expert appointed to, in the survey results and draw some conclusions, it would be extraordinary helpful to me to know that 90% of the major leaders who are being preferred team meetings and so the ICANN meetings are all saying the same sort of thing about the organization.

As opposed to just the volume of comments about that. Some of the questions you're asking here require a detailed knowledge of persons in a way that (unintelligible), etc. of operating. So the certain in that information will be terribly helpful for the experting the way they're interpreting it. That's quite a supposition in terms of that is published.

Michael: Right. So all I'm saying is to get away from the publishing amount is take those pieces of information that you're talking about as being part of the things you need to have. Does this make that section always to be a confidential piece? That's what Chuck and I've been talking about. And then everything else it could be however you want to have it. But you do need to have that because as you said, you may be able to determine the validity of it. You need to make sure that your sample is good. And you also may have the need to do a follow up.

Chuck Gomes: It seems to me by allowing or encouraging or a default that every part of it - all the comments are not going to be tied to somebody's name. I mean why don't we do that with public comments then now? I just don't understand why we're considering that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well I just - I think this different than a public comment because we're really trying to do an assessment and a review and if you did this within inside any company; if you go and interview your boss and your subordinates and your colleagues, it's confidential. You don't know who said what specifically and

that's designed to ensure that you know, if you're doing a 360 on your boss, do you want your boss to know everything that you've said?

No, because you're concerned about repercussions so we want to give people the safety to provide information that they may want to provide. So I understand what you're saying, but typically everything is transparent in public. But I think if we're capturing certain data points here about, you know, how many meetings they've attended and we do actually have the ability to verify that information, right?

Because we have their name. We can verify have they've been registered for this many events. So if we can verify that data anonymously, now we have some way to substantiate the responses and then use that as a way to verify. Does that make sense?

Michael: Kind of. It just seems like we're putting an awful lot of trust in the independent evaluator that's going to be the only one who knows that information.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well is that - I mean couldn't staff go in and verify if someone says I've been to 30 meetings and verify they've been registered for 30 meetings? Isn't that possible without violating their anonymity since...

Michael: Again, they're going to have the option of being honest, right? But I just feel like we should be encouraging people to be public about it so that the public can evaluate all of the responses. And who made those responses. Not just the independent evaluator and staff.

Chuck Gomes: Mike, Chuck again. You and I probably wouldn't care the least about our identity being public, but I think they're a lot of people that would and especially people that may be are criticizing some of their colleagues or something like that. And I think it's a mistake to compare the public comment period to a survey where we're trying to get valid data. Public comments

aren't used that way. They're, you know, it's not expected to be a scientific study that produces results that are fairly reliable.

I think it's good. It's helpful. I'm not criticizing that but it's very different. A survey where you're trying to get data and compile that data then evaluating public comments.

Michael: But then again, we're giving them the option to stay anonymous so I just feel like that ought to be enough to address your concern that we get candid responses from those. I think relatively few people who will want to be anonymous.

Man: Well, I'm with Chuck, I mean the think is that the survey is not like a public comment. A public comment is basically the same thing as going up to the microphone in a public forum. And you're speaking in public, and you are required or asked to tell who you are who you are affiliated with. And this is not quite the same thing. So if someone says well I want to be anonymous you know, do you have the problem that of evaluating? If this guy says I went to 50 meetings, well how can I verify that?

I mean if I want to go back and look at records and reports and look at how many people have been to 50 meetings, and then I you know...

Man: I don't think that's what we're talking about. Because the evaluator is going to know who made the comment, right? Or he should have covered that before he walked through the room no matter what. So you're not going to be able to be truly anonymous unless you say you're Mickey Mouse or whatever. But that's fine. But we're talking about is all of the survey results at the end of the day presumably are going to be published so that the community can evaluate those.

And we're debating whether or not names by default would be attached to those opinions.

(Larissa): It's quite typical when results are published that they would be published in aggregated form with analysis comments and such. It's also usually you would see a listing of, if it wasn't a survey if it was a one-on-one interview process. It would also be common to see the names of people interviewed, but you just don't necessarily know which one of those individuals provided which level of feedback.

So as people are reviewing the results of the work, they understand who participated in providing feedback, but the specific comments are not tied back to the individuals. So there's many different ways that the information could be shared, and maybe to a certain extent it would be useful to see what kind of information is gathered and how the independent examiner would consider this information and include it in their analysis.

Man: And I get the position. And so I understand how you don't want people to name their entity. I understand the point never mind. I agree to understand where you're coming from, but how about just having at least staff affiliation to stay with the group? Not the name but just where they're coming from. Because I think it might be interesting to see for everybody that 20 people from the registry responded. Never mind - not link the response to them, but 20 people; five from the NCUC responded so on and so forth.

So that way you have at least some idea of who these people are, but you don't have to have their names on there.

Jennifer Wolf: No, I agree. I mean that people being able to quantify so many from each group or so many who didn't identify with any group will be helpful. And (Larissa) you made a point. I just wanted to come back to you when we first started that you can't announce formerly yet who the independent examiner is, but once you do, we could get that company's perspective, you know, assuming they've got expertise in doing this type of survey so we can, you know get some additional expertise once that's made public, correct?

(Larissa): That's absolutely correct. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So I think we should probably move on with the agenda for today for sure, but it seems something that the broader group needs to focus on come to our opinion about if we can come to a collective opinion on it.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, and I think, and I know Mike you weren't on the calls, but we did discuss this a couple of times in the calls, and I think the feeling was generally we want to count who they are so that you're not filling out ten different surveys, you know, under different names. But also provide that anonymity for the reasons, you know, we've discussed here so, but yes, if you want to come back after your meeting on Tuesday with IBC and tell us if there's a consensus. We certainly would want to know that.

Michael: Again, I just clarified. We're talking about whether the default is to be anonymous or not and whether an answer is going to be public, right?

Jennifer Wolfe: Right, right. Exactly. Exactly. And like we said too, you know, part of what we're doing right now is just framing this. It's gone from a spreadsheet to a Word document. We will actually be able to test the software so we can again see if it's confusing. Do we have understand? Because we want to make sure that it's as easy as possible. I guess if there's nothing else on that particular issue that we...

Man: Just a comment...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Man: I disagree with your - the way that you described that. The choices aren't just anonymous or public. It's - everybody's going to be asked to identify themselves. The question then is whether that information is just used for restricted purposes and what you're suggesting is making - why not make it

public? The only thing I'd ask you to do is tell me why. And we don't need to do that now.

Man: I think I did explain that a little bit, but I think it's important to give weight to the opinions and to let the public judge make their own opinions as well, not just put all that trust in one person. The independent evaluator. And/or ICANN staff.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, well I think we'll move on from that for right now. Again, knowing that you do have your stakeholders meetings on Tuesday and I know there's only a couple groups represented here but hopefully this is on your agenda for some time on Tuesday.

Man: It's on our agenda for tomorrow.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Tomorrow? Tomorrow is Monday, right?

Man: We're having an IBC meeting tomorrow as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, okay gotcha. Okay. So also just with on that note, those documents have been circulated to everybody now so you could use that now in your meeting as well to just confirm everybody likes the general structure and certainly if there's commentary on the language, we could all have an opportunity to look at that, right (Larissa)? We could provide suggested changes to language and then.

(Larissa): Yes. It would be very helpful to get the event from this group in terms of whether the spirit of the comments that you've submitted has been captured and also certainly keeping an eye on the length of the survey. If there's questions that ended up covering the same areas if there's some way we can scale down the questions if they're repetitive in nature. It's certainly - that would be good too.

Jennifer Wolfe: And if you scroll through the document. I think we down. If you go back up in that document that's up on the screen, we talked about responding in a way most suitable to you; so you're self-selecting a short version versus the long version. That's where I want to actually - yes, so we talked about that and everybody's good with having two versions right?

Short version. Long version. You select I want the ten minutes versus the one hour version. And so then if you scroll down to the next section there after that. So what happens here feedback? So we can look at the language of those things. But then we talked about this in our call to define the terms so that it's very clear and the survey taker embarks on the survey they understand what all of these terms meant.

So this may be something too. It looks like you just started it (Larissa) with a few terms here. This is probably something to take back to your groups to feel. Make sure everybody is comfortable. Have we - if you look through the language of the questions, is everything clearly defined? Is there anything that's confusing or ambiguous that we need to define so we can provide feedback on those points?

But I think that was an important comment made during our working group calls that we wanted to define the terms so everyone knows what we're talking about. Any comments from anybody on that? It's pretty straightforward I think.

Okay and so then moving on into the questions. We've got some general instructions and the purpose and then we move right into the questions. Did anybody have any further comments on the actual questions? Is this something you still need to talk with your groups about on Tuesday and come back?

Man: I think we should be giving everybody in the community time or everyone involved to have a little time to digest this and make comments, you know, at least another couple of weeks. Is that roughly the timeframe?

Jennifer Wolfe: I mean, these have been out for a few weeks to everybody, so I know you're new to it, so I know...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes, unfortunately our group didn't have a rep so that's, okay. That's our problem. We'll deal with it.

Jennifer Wolfe: But, (Larissa), how are we? What can we do in terms of time?

(Larissa): I think it's certainly very important to collect everybody's feedback because we want the questions to be clear in representative. This will also give a chance to be in front of an examiner. They haven't seen any of this yet, obviously so we need some time to explore that. So I think that, you know given that we're at ICANN meeting and the some people have holidays.

The goal is to get this launched in July as quickly as possible recognizing that August is the month that many people take off, so we want to keep the survey out and available to people for people to participate to make sure that we get broad participation but at the same, our timeline is such that we ask for draft findings to be summarized by the end of September. So our timeframe is quite rigorous. So we want to be mindful of that.

Jennifer Wolfe: What's the estimated date for announcing the independent examiner?

(Larissa): Within the next two or three days.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. So this week?

(Larissa): Yes.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay, so if that's announced this week, then I assume we could coordinate with the independent examiner a timeframe for them to review the scope; get feedback from the consultants in that give the community some time to - sounds like we would still need another week or two before they'd be ready to go.

(Larissa): Yes. And within that timeframe, we could certainly be populating the tests; the sample survey for this group to actually interact with online and test the feasibility so that's in the email that I circulated to the group earlier. I laid out that these would be the steps. Still collect the feedback; allow for the independent examiner to weigh in on a lot of these topics that have been discussed; finalize the questions. Actually create the surveys and get the usability tested before the actual surveys launch.

Jennifer Wolfe: What's the technology being used again? Did you tell us?

(Larissa): The stevent is the technology that we have available but the independent examiners may have another solution, so we will consider that too.

Jennifer Wolf: Does anybody have comments on that or experience with that, Chuck? Oh, go ahead. I'm sorry Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: I don't have comments on that but there's been some questions added on structure, okay. I don't know if everybody else has looked at those yet. I didn't see them until now. So we're going to need a little time to look at those. I'm just looking at two real quickly. When you ask is the role non-com appointees who - excuse me, how effective have non-com appointees been is question 52. I think that needs some rewording because what are we talking about the individuals?

I don't think so. Well you know, are non-coms an effective addition in you know, in current structure or something, but the way it's worded right now, it sounds like you're, you know how effective has Jenn been? You know as a non-com appointee. So anyway, there's some things that we probably - because we haven't looked at those before.

Jennifer Wolfe: That came from our list. If you remember that - I think that's where she pulled that from.

Chuck Gomes: What list?

Jennifer Wolfe: On our list. I think Avri made that point. She wanted something about non-com appointees. I think that's what she...

Chuck Gomes: No, no. I know that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: The question itself.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. The wording itself hasn't been paved. Correct, you're right. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And then how effective has the two-house structure been? Well, now the next question is really good because it relates the two-house structure to the policy process. That gives - but when you say how effective has the two house structure been, very different for the election of board members as we've talked a lot about on our list versus the policy process.

So again, we need a little bit of time to tweak those and make sure we're doing the best job we can to get data that will be helpful.

Jennifer Wolfe: I do just want to recognize though that (Larissa) did a great job I think of trying to capture everything everybody put on list and the calls and add those to the list of questions.

Man: I think that you're better served to do what Chuck is saying here which is not ask the general question about how effective in a two-house structure, but to actually go at and ask questions inside context. Just like you gave two examples and ask those kind of contextual questions, and therefore you will get an answer that you can evaluate too as far as what if any strong points about the two-house structure.

What has been the weak points of the two-house structure? That's really where you want to get to.

Jennifer Wolfe: What does everyone think is a reasonable timeframe to take this back and get - review the questions they give us sort of the final - these are the comments that we have. And I know we are missing a lot of group, so I'm going to just rely on just what you guys have to say to try to move it forward.

Man: My suggestion of two weeks I think is probably okay if everybody is so busy this week that this week is pretty well shot. And then they're traveling next week, so two weeks is a minimum I think.

Jennifer Wolfe: So maybe like mid July? We're talking that timeframe

Man: Yes, Jenn, July 15th I think. Right around there.

Jennifer Wolfe: Does that sound reasonable?

Man: We got the 4th of July and the state's...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, I know. I'm well aware. True I think a lot of people are traveling next week too, next week would not be a productive week I'm sure. (Larissa) does that seem reasonable? Plus we'll have the independent examiner so we can concurrently be getting feedback from the examiner and from the community and then bring in all together.

(Larissa): Yes. So I - what I would propose to do is that we use the current version as a mockup once again recognizing that changing the wording and making things clear adding terminology. All those are you know, fairly easy to do but it seems like we have agreement that there will be two types of short and a long version and then people would be given the opportunity to choose which group as we defined it.

They would respond to some of those are pretty fundamental kinds of decisions that would be hard to undo if we went down this path I suspect.

Chuck Gomes: To deal with - this is Chuck again. To deal with, I think it was you (Larissa) that raised this. A short version all of a sudden will become long if they do it for a lot of groups. Should we consider making the short version just a GNSO related rather than specific groups? Because if they haven't had very much experience, they're probably not going to be able to get too specific. But I'm throwing that out for discussion. I'm not strongly advocating.

(Larissa): That makes sense to me. Just thinking through it, but certainly if people want to weigh in on the different structures it seems that they would have to take the time and do the longer version. Now it's also important to point out that they don't have to answer questions.

You know how some surveys force you to answer? That wasn't the idea here, so if someone doesn't want to answer a given question, they can just pass right by. So everybody's okay with that; that would be our recommendation.

Phillip Sheppard: Just circling back to the structure questions. I mean in almost all of those cases, there is an existing rationale which was embedded in the discussions

of those forms previously as to why, you know the non-com appointees exists as to what the goal of the housing structure was exception.

So you can find that relatively easily just in the history of previous reforms. So either each question would be, you know, the objective of the non-com appointee for this house. For the two votes more sense and then you can ask a question about how effective is that? Because then everybody has the same thing to judge it against.

And I think it is worth doing that because I suspect that even card members of counsel and probably current holders of the office, may not be familiar with those objections. So it will be useful to have that and that would also make greater consistency in your arts.

(Larissa): Just to make sure I understood your statement. What you're suggesting is that we provide some context in front of each question?

Woman: Not - it wouldn't be applicable to all the questions but the structural questions? Got, it.

(Larissa): Yes. Thank you.

Man: I have a suggestion for another kind of general information question at the beginning and that is I don't think it's there but maybe I forgot. How many working groups have you actively participated in? That would be very nice information. Because what I've seen in the community is people are very critical of the working group process and how long it takes.

But it's more often those who haven't participated in one that really don't understand the dynamics and the fact that you're really trying to give everybody an opportunity. And if you don't understand it, it looks terrible.

- Man: I would echo that. And I'd even ask them to list them. Of course they don't have to if they don't want to, but....
- Chuck Gomes: If I had to list all the work groups that - I think that's too difficult.
- Man: I agree. Or just give a representative sample of most recent ones, you know, last five years that's all we really care about at this point anyway.
- Jennifer Wolfe: No and I think Chuck to your point there was a general question we could make it a little more specific about. If there's questions about your leadership and participation too, so we could stroll down on that a little bit further.
- Man: Also asking what they do professionally. I don't see that in here either in the general questions.
- Jennifer Wolfe: Those are objections to asking more demographic questions like that? Where they live? Does that matter?
- Chuck Gomes: Just a question for my knowing what they do professionally. How would we use that in evaluating data?
- Man: I don't know. I guess if you're getting, you know, a certain set of answers from engineers versus lawyers that that might, you might be able to develop patterns there...
- Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, because too many lawyers they are all discounted. Just kidding.
- Man: So I guess it just seems like it could be helpful and certainly not harmful to know that information.
- (Larissa): The point that I mentioned before is that I think there's a whole lot of information that could be useful and sometimes when you're at this stage, you don't even know whether it would be useful or not. But the tendency do

you want to collect it and that's great unless it makes people feel that this was just already too burdensome.

And they stop at that point. So it's always a careful balance how much we ask about them versus what we really want them to get down to the next section and complete the feedback.

Jennifer Wolfe: That's something too to maybe ask your groups if they have an opinion on that issue. But I mean I wouldn't be opposed to asking the question of you know, which box do you fit in and if you give then to general boxes. Just helpful from a data standpoint.

Any other comments on the questions. I know these new ones were just circulated, so we need time. I think we just discussed giving you to mid-July to get feedback, but if you could take that back and I think we'll need to make sure (Larissa) we email because we've got a lot of groups not represented. Get an email out by tomorrow letting them know that we want them to give us feedback on the questions within the next two weeks, so they talk about it on Tuesday.

Anything else on the questions? Or process or getting questions done? Okay. Then let's talk a little bit about outreach. How we're going to get people to actually take this survey. Any general thoughts? (Larissa) started. We've got a brochure which I know is not going to do it all, but we do have a really nice brochure created. What are thoughts that engage within the groups and then to engage in a broadly within the community so that we get the participation over, you know the month or so that this is available?

Chuck Gomes: I'll pick it up. This is Chuck again. I think first of all each of us need to assume the responsibility to try and sell it as much as possible to get participation because it's in the interest of our stakeholder - individual stakeholders to do that so with regard to inside GNSO participation, I think each of us needs to

promote it and do everything we can. Now it's a totally different task than to get people outside to do it, so.

Jennifer Wolfe: And (Larissa) I guess I'll look to you there too. What are the plans in terms of engaging? It is intended to be a 360, so if we take on the challenge of, we'll make sure we have the participation from the GNSO. How are we getting the participation externally from it?

Man: The simple answer to your question is to go to (Dick Peso) or AC. And ask them to get 10, 15, 20 or whatever and that way as opposed to trying to reach out to individuals. You can characterize maybe the types of people that you would like to have respond to the survey. But, let them carry the burden if you will, and it's going to be important probably for me as the Board member or (Larissa), the staff to convey them that, hey by the way the same thing's going to happen when it becomes your turn.

So I think that the outreach needs to be in that direction. How exactly we do that is something else. I know we've had similar discussions about other things if the Board wants to work on as far as how to do that outreach. And when you can get people involved, and they get a little bit of buy-in from them and so forth.

So when it becomes a task for the leadership to get done, it's a little bit more effective than trying to go out and collar people. And so if you want to get a response from for example the people that are in their leadership roles and their policy structures, you know, you should ask for that. If you want to get things from the general population, you can ask for that. I think that you'd be better served instead of trying to identify who those individuals are is to characterize the kinds of people you want to participate and then go to the leadership of that particular SO or AC and ask them.

Now it's going to be problematic to a certain extent when you start talking about the excess AC because it's small. But certainly the at large; the ASO and CCS so you can take that tact. That's me on the white board.

Man: So, so a general question. This is really an honest question for people to respond to. How valuable is it going to be to get completions of the survey for people who don't have any experience with the GNSO? And of course a corollary question is how much outreach do we want to do beyond the GNSO? And again, I'm throwing that out for honest responses.

Jennifer Wolfe: So I'll just initially respond. I mean I think to me that's part of the point of a 360 is that you're asking everybody around you to respond. So to the extent that they haven't knowledge, they can respond. They can say I don't know. And we can know what group they're from. So that will I think be helpful data for us if we find, gee this particular group knows nothing.

Maybe we need to do more outreach. Or maybe there's something else we need to do. So I could that could be valuable data.

Man: I think you're going to have great difficulty getting a large reply group to the quest for stevetell questionnaire. I think it's going to be self-limiting. Only those people who really have been involved with the GNSO are going to answer the survey in the first place. That's just - I...

Jennifer Wolfe: And I that's what I say. What kind of accountability mechanisms do we have in terms of do we request do you have a certain percentage or a certain number of respondents from each group?

Man: That's something you're going to have to decide. The real issue is 360. And if you're not well-known, it's important to know that. I mean kind of goes hand-in-hand with your attempt to organize cross community constituency working groups. So, if you want to get people that are going to participate in those

things, they have to become knowledgeable of everything else that is going on.

So you can do this in solving the same problem. Because a larger, larger feeling of forming more cross community working groups. So what you hope from that is not only that you're getting other people's perspectives and opinions, but there's also a cross fertilization of ideas and thoughts. So that ICANN gets out of it siloed load of operation.

And if that's a side benefit from asking questions, its fine, yes you're right. You're not going to get a large number of respondents, however if you make it a reasonable number and ask them to provide you their back, you'll get that. You know, for example if you went to the ASO and said, here we want ten. I guarantee you ten members of the address council would probably be the ones that fill it out.

If you would like it to come from the regional registries, you probably would be surprise at the number of people in the regional registries that are familiar with what goes on in the GSO. So, it has to be a reasonable number that you're going to ask from the outside. And so it downs to what is the statistical sample that you want from outside of the GSO with regard with what their opinions are. So that's the decision that you are going to have to make.

Lyman:

I think to your question Chuck you may be thinking of the fact that a classic 360 is conducted within an organization and its typically, you know if it's a 360 of the manager or managerial position, it's all the people that work for that manager. By definition, everybody involved in the 350 knows something. In many cases, a lot about the subject of the 360. And they way that we are applying it here is a little bit different. And so I think that you may have to back stop that with the way in which you apply the analysis methodology to the data that the survey provides.

It won't be classic textbook. You know, you won't be able to open the, you know, the 360 assessment textbook and figure out exactly what you have to do. You're probably going to have to be a little more sophisticated in how analyze the data. But it is a good point because it's using a tool slightly outside - certainly outside the domain for which it was originally developed, and somewhat outside the domain in which it's been extended by practice over the years. So there will be a little tricky aspect to it that way.

Man: If I may, one other thing. One of the big comments from all the previous structural reviews; Bylaws reviews is then that you're evaluating the organization in isolation. You're not evaluating in the context of ICANN. So anyway you can evaluate the contexts of ICANN is ask the rest of ICANN. And so, yes this is as you said, Lyman, in attempt to do that use a tool. Modify the tool slightly to do it as opposed to getting a new tool.

Lyman: Yes, I very much was talking about the survey as a tool not the assessment as an activity. And I think we should be very careful that the survey's going to be a valuable tool to use in the survey. But let's hope it's not the only analytical tool that's being used or we'll miss a lot of the things that you just referred to.

Jennifer Wolfe: I know its 6:15 at the end of a long day, so are there any other comments on the 360; the scope; the questions. I think we've got our timeframe. I guess it's just the one other question that I would pose and we can continue to talk about outreach as we move forward. What sort of timeframe do you all want to have for our meetings? Is every other week after this? Because I felt like maybe every week was too much and that's why we weren't getting as much participation. Is it easier if we do every other week and then it's more of a priority versus every week? It's easy to not call in. Because we haven't had great participation. So, any...

Man: I vote for every other week certainly.

Jennifer Wolfe: Chuck you have thoughts on that? It doesn't matter to you.

Man: Actually every other week should be fine, but probably is doing to depend more on the timing related to our 15th deadline than it is when we do it. And we probably need something before then and then a follow up afterwards so then I think it's more critical than, you know, if we just schedule every other week just to schedule every other week, if it doesn't correspond to our deadline...

Jennifer Wolfe: So maybe just short term we actually, hey let's talk on this date. Why don't we look at the calendar (Larissa) and we can set up a (unintelligible) with a few suggested dates to get feedback from everyone. And then after that we can get to a more regular schedule on outreach and moving things forward. And actually while it's being conducted we might need to have a pause for a few weeks until the results come in and then we can start looking at it. So maybe that's a better way of doing at it.

Let's make it functional to the work versus - does that make sense? Okay. So we'll look at the calendar and maybe give everybody next week a break and then look at that following week to schedule a call. Does that work?

(Larissa): Jenn, just looking at the calendar, if we want to stick to the Thursday schedule which that's the day of the week that we've been doing it. It would probably be the 10th of July. That would be a good target date.

Jennifer Wolfe: Would that work for everybody if we just kept that on the calendar? What time was it? I think it was 10:00, Eastern Time? What's the? Was it 11:00? I can't remember now. It was 10:00 or 11:00 Eastern Time on Thursdays. So...

Man: I'll be traveling but I'll just hand it off to David.

Larissa: I'll get an email out quickly with a lot of things that we talked about making sure that people know about the time line; the next meeting; things suggested for the 10th and the time so that everybody's in the loop.

Jennifer Wolfe? And then I'd just ask everybody here to let's reach out to our colleagues on council and within the GNSO to make sure they know that we need their feedback and if they don't give their feedback, makes it a little harder. Phillip I know, you've got something else.

Phillip Sheppard: Thanks, I'd just like to say that on behalf of the Burn Literature Group, there's a new stakeholder and not yet a member of the GNSO. I appreciate the opportunity being invited to this meeting. And I look forward to being a member of this working group. So, I would ask you still please to reflect on the decision to exclude us, because I believe we have a contribution to make.

Man: Why wouldn't we do that?

Jennifer Wolfe: It came up in a council meeting. This questions was raised and the decision was that this working party should reflect council. So, I invited Phillip to come today because I knew we weren't going to have a lot of people, and I think his feedback is important as a stakeholder in the larger scope.

Man: I see no reason why we shouldn't include him.

Jennifer Wolfe: I agree. I mean...

Phillip Sheppard: I could pretend to be represented by somebody else.

((Crosstalk))

Phillip Sheppard: To all members of the BBC and I could say, I'm, you know...

Jennifer Wolfe: If this room were completely packed and we were standing room only, and seating was at a premium, I might understand that, but we've had such limited participation as it is, I think we want as much feedback as we can get. I appreciate you being here personally, but does anybody have an objection?

Man: I think he's valuable.

Jennifer Wolfe: Valuable, right, okay. So, I think there was initially some thought Phillip that every seat was really valued and clearly it's not, so. I appreciate you being here. So I don't think that's really an issue. So I can bring that up in our GNSO rap up session on Thursday just to confirm. Make sure I don't step on anybody's toes, but, I don't -- Chuck do you see -- okay.

Chuck Gomes: I can't imagine why the council even made that decision. Because you want the more input we get from a broader audience, the better the survey's going to be.

Jennifer Wolfe: I agree, agree. Okay. Well thank you to everybody in the audience. I know it's the end of the day and appreciate all your feedback. And that will bring this meeting to a close.

END