

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles  
GNSO Review Party meeting  
Sunday 12 October 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/#oct>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jen Wolfe: Well welcome everyone. I know it's a small group. That's a little too close I think. Why don't you guys come up to the table because it's a small group? Please come up and join us. You don't want to. I can see.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jen Wolfe: Yes. You stay right there. Okay. You sit - but the rest, will you please come and join the table. We had a feeling it was going to be a small group tonight. But thank you for coming to the GNSO Review Working Party Session.

Why don't we before we get started on the agenda that's on screen just take a moment and everybody introduce themselves? I know a lot of us know each other but a few of you are new faces. So let's know who you are. I'll go ahead and start and then we can just work our way around the table. I'm Jen Wolfe. I'm the Chair of the Review Working Party. I'm also a NonCom appointee to the GNSO Council. And I'm glad you're all here, so. Why don't we - here.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

Mary Wong: Mary Wong, ICANN staff.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes, VeriSign.

(Julie Bowers): (Julie Bowers), Amazon.

Woman: (Unintelligible). I'm a newcomer from Thailand.

Man: (Unintelligible), ETDA Thailand, newcomer.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung, .asia.

Richard Westlake: Richard Westlake, Westlake Governance.

Colin Jackson: (Kioa) Colin Jackson, Westlake Governance.

Philip Sheppard: Philip Sheppard, Brand Registry Group.

Matt Ashtiani: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

Larisa Gurnick: Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff.

Lars Hoffman: Lars Hoffman, ICANN staff.

Jen Wolfe: We'll fix that (field) copy there. Well thank you and welcome to the - welcome to both of you. We're glad that you're here at ICANN and thanks for coming to our session. We're really glad that you're here.

We'll go ahead and get started with our agenda. We're going to have an update on the 360 assessment in terms of the outreach that we're doing this week. As you all know, we extended the timeframe to complete the survey.

So I think Matt's going to give us an update on some of the things that we're doing to try to encourage more participation this week. Then we'll get an update from the Westlake team. We look forward to having a more detailed update here today. We'll talk about the timeline.

And then in any other business I want to make sure we talk briefly about the discussion that we had at the GNSO session yesterday. Just talk through some of the comments that were made and see if there's anything we think we need to do to address those issues. So Matt, do you want to kick it off with the outreach update?

Matt Ashtiani: Sure. Hi everybody. This is Matt Ashtiani for the transcript record. Currently we have a lot of outreach updates that are in progress, which are not - there we are. We have nine sessions that were scheduled with various stakeholder groups here at ICANN 51. So far we've conducted two of those sessions with seven remaining, most of which will take place on Tuesday.

We've also uploaded a video as of this morning to YouTube. The new video with Jen detailing the review and asking people to participate and really encouraging them to make their voice heard and have a part in this process.

This morning we also put a blog on CircleID, which as of about 20 minutes ago had already 730 hits. So that's been out there and really getting a lot of attention for us.

Jonathan Robinson is also going to make some remarks at the welcome ceremony, which are going to include Jen's video. We've also been distributing postcards here at ICANN 51. Every bag that a registrant has picked up has included a postcard that details, you know, to take the survey when it ends and to really try to get the word out there.

So that in addition to our normal tweeting, Facebook posting, which again occurs in all UN languages. So we've really been pushing as hard as we can to get the word out. Next slide.

Chuck Gomes: So Matt, this is a little facetious so I'll warn you in advance. But might be good if Jonathan gave his spiel and the video was played before Fadi's talk so that people can do the survey during the talk. That was quite effective in the GNSO session on Saturday.

Matt Ashtiani: That was. I think afterwards Colin came up to use and we already had 15 new survey takers. So. See, even the microphones want to participate. So just so you guys are able to see Jen's video, it's actually pretty short. It's about a minute and a half. I'm just going to play it or not. Give me one second.

Well, it looks like they don't have the software installed on the display machine so I can't really show you. But what I will do is I'll put a link to the video on YouTube in the Adobe chat in a few seconds so everybody can actually take a look at it in advance of the...

Man: iTunes (unintelligible).

Matt Ashtiani: You think so? Let's see. Let's see if they opened - put it on here.

Woman: Did you read that?

Matt Ashtiani: Sure. I think there's enough lawyers in here that can help me out in case I get in trouble. And then if I could please ask any of you guys to turn on the...

Man: You have you microphone (unintelligible).

Matt Ashtiani: No, I don't. Jen, can you turn it on?

Jen Wolf: (Unintelligible).

Matt Ashtiani: It looks like while Lars knows quite a bit, he was wrong about iTunes. It's not going to play the video. So I'm going to stick with giving you all the link and trusting you all to watch it on your own or to wait until Fadi's remarks tomorrow. But you might want to watch it now since the blog does contain a link to the video I believe and it's gaining a lot of attention. So it might behoove everyone to see it in advance.

So just so everyone's also kind of aware of the messaging that's been going out there, these are the general points that we've been pushing, which is, you know, telling people about the announcement, the extension announcement, constantly pointing them to the survey.

We've really been trying to stick to one URL shortener just to kind of not confuse people. But in any case, if they come along - across another link, it'll still end up at the same page. But just for publication purposes and to make sure no one's confused, that's why we've been plugging this one link so much.

We're trying to show them what's in it for them and really reinforcing that this is their opportunity to make their voice heard and to provide the input on the things that they think work and things that do not work. And, you know, also to tell them that they actually - their contribution will have an impact. It will be heard by the independent examiner and it will be considered for the final report and to know that they really do have a place in this process.

So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Westlake Governance.

Richard Westlake: Thank you Matt. We have some numbers, which are slightly more detailed than yesterday's and of particular relevance to this group here today. And so Colin, I think probably since most of the people in the room were here

yesterday, Colin I'll hand straight over to you to get into the details of how we're going.

And I can then - we can then talk also about the backup of the other sources, the triangulation we're getting on information through those interviews and through the disk review.

Colin Jackson: Okay. Thank you Richard. This is Colin Jackson for the record. That table's pretty self-explanatory I think. The - it's obviously possible to start a survey and not complete it. We have a particular point through the progress of the survey that we regard as complete. So by our definition we have actually 27 completed survey instruments, which are useful. Many of them contain interesting comments and insights.

Similarly we have quite a number, which have been started and have not completed and many of those have a very low completion rate. It's many of them are of the form of somebody's going to the first page and then just quite out without doing anything more. That may be half the complete ones or that sort of thing. Maybe half the other complete ones have got some useful information in before they stopped.

We have been following those up. We've had a policy of emailing people once a week if they've started but not finished with a maximum of two emails per person. (We take a few) - there's two in mind, this doesn't do it, then there's not much point in keeping going. Don't want to be accused of spamming.

As you can see there, the working - the Council yesterday when - most of you were there when I met Council yesterday. And the rate of completion from Council then was a bit lower than it is now. And in response to a question about response rate, I said that I felt that 100% would be a very reasonable response rate from GNSO Council members.

Personally I think the same would probably be true for Working Party members and people in other leadership positions in the GNSO of the subgroups, the stakeholder groups and constituencies, which is something we will remark when we see most of those bodies on Tuesday.

We would also like to - I'll just - can we skip onto the next slide please?  
Thank you. Oh dear. I've got a little batch there - same chart. Here we - oh well, never mind.

Responses by affiliation. What that is about - and I might say (some of) these statistics were put together in something of a hurry about half an hour ago. So what the - what this shows is who are these people who are responding and I wish I could see what was under that second...

Man: None.

Colin Jackson: That's none. Okay. So the missing label there says none. These are the - this is the response to the affiliation question in the survey. It says what part of ICANN do you affiliate with. And none is a perfectly valid answer for the question.

Obviously a good number, roughly half of these respondents affiliate with GNSO and you'd expect that. But then we have been encouraging people from outside GNSO to contribute to this. Quite strongly encouraging that. And we will be pushing that harder.

The reason that GNSO line is so long compared to the others is not just for the surveys about the GNSO. It's because we've come here and sort of beaten the GNSO up a bit in the last few days; encouraged cooperation warmly and repeatedly.

We haven't had such access to the other components of ICANN although we are trying on that. And the drum was beaten in front of ALAC this morning I think. We will be talking to SSAC in a couple of days. Excuse me.

As for the other components, I do think it would be good if we could get some more feedback with SSAC, which you noted have really got very little there. And I think some more from the GAC would be good as well given that those two bodies - their objectives and interfaces with GNSO are quite important.

Beyond that, all we can really do is keep trying for people at this meeting. In general, Matt's mentioned a couple of ways in which it will be more widely publicized.

Finally, I will say that if anybody in this room has not yet completed a survey, please do it now.

Chuck Gomes: Colin, I got a question. Just looking at those numbers, it's looking to me without doing any statistical analysis at all but really the - it's going to be hard to get statistically significant results from - in any category except for the GNSO. Just as a category, not as overall. Am I wrong on that or...

Colin Jackson: I think you're right Chuck. We don't have a high enough number of - I mean broadly speaking for the statistical significance you need a significant, whatever that means, portion of a population. So if your population is say 12 might - members of some body or other and you've got eight or nine or ten of them, then maybe that statistic (will be) significant.

However, with a body the size of 12, I'd actually frankly want 100% because I'd want to know if there are any outliers in there. When you've got a large group, then you - the notion of statistical significance gets more important.



But I don't think we - discussing significance makes a lot of sense unless we have a great deal more responses than this. And well it depends what you consider your overall population to be, you know.

Chuck Gomes: I just didn't hear what number you (said so).

Colin Jackson: I didn't give you a number. What I said was that it depends what your overall population is. If you consider the ICANN community as represent a typical meeting, which is maybe 2000 people, then you're going to be looking for, I don't know, a lot more than 200. You're going to be looking for a good proportion of that.

If you consider the relevant people are everybody who has ever been to an ICANN meeting or can ever spell it, you know, you're going to want a lot more than that.

So right - I guess what I'm saying is the notion of statistical significance is hard to pin down unless you can bound the total population that you are trying to estimate the opinions of.

Richard Westlake: Could I just add to that? This is Richard Westlake again. In terms of statistical significance Chuck, that's one measure. But I think there is also the significance and the strengths of the views and in some cases the consistency of views or the inconsistency of views are equally valid in terms of being able to provide some analysis.

The other aspect of it is that just because you have a statistically significant number have said something and a statistically insignificant number have said something completely different but raised a point of - that is clearly strategically valid, then we don't propose to ignore those either.

We may comment on them and then ignore them. We may comment on them as outliers but say they need further review. Or we may say in fact these people have picked it.

Jen Wolfe: Let me just ask one quick question too. Are we concerned at all as the Working Party that if we don't get enough to what you deem statistically valid as the experts that this is going to be challenged - the conclusions reached will be challenged? And then at that point what do we do?

Richard Westlake: Jen, Richard Westlake again. I don't believe that is going - is a significant issue. For this thing I would say this is the first ICANN review in which the 360 has been played a part. So (if the) previous review has depended on interviews and desktop research so you have had essentially the qualitative and the written record only, we now have those two as well as the 360.

So the 360 has certainly helped us vector in on giving - getting more focused interviews. And I would say as a tool for that, overall I think the end result we won't be saying these numbers are statistically valid. We will be saying it's disappointing that we didn't - or maybe not use the word disappointing but noting the sparsity of response from some areas.

But that in itself may well be an issue for the GNSO. You know, if the SSAC isn't coming and commenting or the GAC isn't coming and commenting, how engaged in issues that are simply of critical shared importance are they seen to be?

Jen Wolfe: That's a really great point. That was another question I was going to ask. Are you going to be pointing that out in your report some of these areas where we've had such a lack of response as perhaps indicative of an issue?

Richard Westlake: Absolutely we are.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Richard Westlake: Because to me that is potentially one of the more significant issues for the GNSO's role, and excuse me if I'm slightly off mark here, but is essentially the single genuine policy setting body within ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. So, and this may be more of a staff issue rather than Westlake. I don't know what's appropriate there. But it seems like one of the things we need to do once we - after we get the final report is do a cost benefit analysis for the sake of maybe asking the question is the 360 review maybe not a very effective way to get date. Go ahead Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: You know, Chuck, you're absolutely right. So in conversations with the Structural Improvements Committee who oversees this effort, we've got slotted lessons learned from this entire experience as it works itself out, one of the elements being consideration for timing.

I think this group with your help we've learned a great deal about what might be better timing. And I'm not just referencing, you know, the August vacation situation but launch of 360 in conjunction with a meeting as opposed to not.

There's, you know, several topics that we've already flagged and we will absolutely have that lessons learned discussion and what does that tell is in terms of what to do with subsequent reviews.

Jen Wolfe: Please go ahead.

Colin Jackson: Yes. Thank you. There's one other point I wanted to make about the responses to the 360. We haven't yet touched on the translation. It's in two alternate languages. And I just think we should note for the record that the instrument has been translated into all the UN languages and to date no responses have been received in languages other than English.

Jen Wolfe: I know I was speaking with (Gabriella) yesterday about that and she did mention that there were some issues with the translations, that we were going to work on trying to correct I think Larisa, right.

Larisa Gurnick: To follow up on Jen's comment, this is Larisa. Apparently (Gabriella) pointed out that there were some inaccuracies with the translations but we're - at least the Spanish translation. So we'll follow up on that and find out what those inaccuracies are. But as far as I know, there's no issues with the fact that translations are available and no one has responded in any way to - besides (Gabriella) to flag challenges with translations. So they are out there.

Richard Westlake: Richard Westlake again. I don't want to labor this too much but I think the fact that (Gabriella) has pointed that out in regard to the Spanish one, the fact that we have not through the normal process going into the survey process even received one request I suspect is not hindered by the fact that there are concerns with translation in the survey itself because most people have not even gone to have a look at the survey.

Jen Wolfe: That's a great point. Thank you. And I know I think she mentioned too that she was going to be completing it in English but that she had noticed that, so thank you. Do you have - you have more I think - yes.

Richard Westlake: We have more.

((Crosstalk))

Matt Ashtiani: Can I just jump in for one second.

Richard Westlake: Yes.

Matt Ashtiani: This is Matt Ashtiani for the record. So one thing that I'm working on right now is I'm trying to get some stats on how many times each of the translator files have been downloaded. So just so we can see if people are actually even,

you know, maybe there's some - we can anticipate some surveys coming in or maybe it hasn't even been downloaded once. So that's what I'm working on.

Colin Jackson: Could we move to the next slide please? So that is a discussion of Richard's and my time here. Just the time we're spending in LA - the six days or so that we're spending here in LA. And as you can see, we - in fact, those numbers are now slightly under because we've arranged to cut more interviews since I compiled those about an hour ago.

So we are being pretty busy talking to people. If you don't spot us in the sessions, that's because we're almost certainly set at a table somewhere talking to somebody. We are finding this quite productive. There is in now a few very (unintelligible) substitute for us to be coming to a meeting like this and waylaying people and talking to them face-to-face.

Richard Westlake: And if I could - Richard Westlake here. If I could add to the numbers that are on the screen in front of you to say those are only the formal interview sessions we're having. We are making ourselves between interviews relatively prominent around the hotel. We're visible. Not prominent I should say. Visible and we are both being accosted and accosting and in many cases being subjected to 20 minutes of a particular perspective.

So I would have to say that the actual number of people we will have spoken to by the end of the week is probably at least double what's up there. And from each of them you typically take one or two snippets of useful information and particularly when it is people who come to us whom we don't know and probably wouldn't have approached through the lists we've got available to us. And there are some views coming through there.

Small numbers again. So not statistically valid Chuck but certainly as far as that's something that fits or doesn't fit with what we're already seeing. Useful comments to receive anyway.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Richard. Chuck again. And your - I take it you're capturing those snippets as - okay. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: So when you report that - when the report does come with the interviews, will we know - I know we weren't going to necessarily list all the names but what their affiliation was would be listed so we'd have some idea of where did all the ideas come from that were presented to you.

Richard Westlake: Jen, yes. Just to complete the formality on this, our process is when we are interviewing people formally, we are saying that unless you specifically give us permission, we will not quote you and describe your comments to you. However, we will be listing the people we have interviewed but unless you ask us not to.

So if people are coming to us, we tell them that we will be putting in the fact that we have spoken to them. But unless they ask us not to say so, that will be part of a list as well.

Now some of the pull asides you don't always have the luxury of capturing that and you just have to remember and note or something like that. But we will aim to put at least an estimate of the number of informal meetings and conversations.

On top of all this we have at least another half dozen ending here in Los Angeles and we have another list - a growing list of people who either aren't here - aren't available here or whom we have undertaken to get in touch with after the ICANN meeting is over. Yes. I think we're going to be using Skype fairly heavily in the next week or two.

Jen Wolfe: Do you have more to present? Anything else on that?

Colin Jackson: Yes. I'll just comment on what - on the - oh you - sorry. Can we just go back one? I'll just comment on the presentations. By presentations we're referring to the sort of thing we did at GNSO Council yesterday. That was only yesterday, wasn't it?

We've got a good few of those lined up for the various components of GNSO and for the SSAC. And ALAC was done this morning by Matt and Larisa. So yes, that's - in fact that one even that one I think light. I think I've under counted by one there. So we're - this is - we're certainly making good use of our time whilst we're up here. That's really the point. We are definitely getting in people's faces and asking them to contribute.

But I'll - we can move onto the timeline now if Richard wants to pick that one up.

Richard Westlake: Thank you Colin. Richard here. You will see that the 360 assessment does close and has to close at the end of this week of ICANN. So Friday, the 17th of October if you haven't completed it by then, you won't be able to. So there are another five days in which people can complete it.

For those who simply want to provide the top line answers to the introductory questions, it won't take more than 15 minutes. For those who are serious about making their thoughts heard - views heard and who want to discuss in depth certain aspects of the GNSO and they've got opportunities to do so in relation to a whole range of areas as well as to provide some free form if there's anything else you wish to add.

Comments. It can obviously take longer. But if it's that important, please use this investment to make those points. Having completed our interviews, our desktop reviews and the analysis of the 360, we have our draft report scheduled to be handed to ICANN on the 19th of December, which then gives - this is for the GNSO's feedback and commentary and the Working Party and the GNSO's for feedback or response to us by one month later, the

19th of January after which we have a relatively tight timeframe then to get to our draft final report, which will then be circulated and posted for public comment in the normal ICANN means.

And that is the middle of February with a view then to - at the end of the working - the end of the public comment period the final report being available 15th of April.

Chuck Gomes: Richard. I'm sorry. Richard, question. What does GNSO feedback mean?

Richard Westlake: That is the response from the GNSO Council and members and the Working Party itself to our draft report. So we will give you the draft and say are there any errors of fact, anything you feel we haven't covered that we should have covered? Have we misinterpreted something?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck again. So in other words - so on the 19th of December your initial findings will be given to the Working Party and the GNSO Council?

Richard Westlake: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: And will the - continuing. Will the GNSO Council then be allowed to give it to its groups?

Jen Wolfe: Yes. I was going to say there's - I mean that's right before Christmas. That's one month to try to have our Working Party, GNSO Council, out to all the groups and have - I don't think that's possible.

Larisa Gurnick: So the idea is that the GNSO Review Working Party is the liaison and provides feedback on behalf of the GNSO. So I guess this is really a good time to discuss the mechanism by which you feel you want to engage.

The main objective of this step is to make sure that before the report is even published for public comment that as Richard suggested that the structure



has the opportunity to say no, this is not accurate. You didn't understand or, you know, whatever the case might be. Provide clarity and opportunity to correct or challenge or add some color to whatever the findings are.

Now that isn't the only opportunity because as you can see there will be the more traditional formal public comment period that will run the full length, the, you know, 45 days or so if we got our timing straight there.

So the process by which you want to engage the rest of the structure, you know, would certainly - would be a good time to think through that now and how to deliver the report - that first initial findings report. But the plan here was just to present to this group and then have you...

Jen Wolfe: Ron, go ahead. I saw Ron you wanted to - go ahead.

Ron Andruff: First of all, I (unintelligible) late. Overlapping meetings.

Matt Ashtiani: Sorry to cut you off. Matt Ashtiani for the record. Can you please state your name for the transcript record?

Ron Andruff: I was about to Matt. Thank you for asking. Next thing was going to be Ron Andruff, Business Constituency. Thank you for that. And apologies for my delay - for being late. But I - when I first look at this timeline and actually asked Richard about it yesterday in one of our meetings.

I'm a little concerned also, you know, because of the Christmas period and all. Well there's two things actually. I don't have a problem per se with the December 19 delivery and to the 19th of January, which basically means those of us on this committee or at this Working Party would have 30 days and this isn't going to take five days to review. It's, you know, sitting down and focusing on it for a few hours.

So I have no problem with that initial findings coming back to the Working Party in that time period. And then sending it out to the GNSO for feedback on the 19th of January, is that how you have it? Is that how you understand it or - because I think that the two - the way I heard it is coming out to everybody at kind of that time.

And I think we need to digest it first to make sure all the rough edges are knocked off and make sure that we're comfortable with what's happening and then bring it out to the larger community. So am I understanding it right?

Larisa Gurnick: So let me clarify and maybe we can make sure that we're saying the same thing. So let's just clarify that on the 19th of December the report would be delivered to this group, the GNSO Review Working Party and that you would take the month to digest it and clarify. Okay.

Then that gives the Westlake team an opportunity to well first of all engage with you in, you know, similar fashion, not in person but through a series of calls and correct or adjust or respond or react, whatever would be appropriate in that time.

So then they would have less than a month to come up with draft Number 2, which then would be posted for public comment the way typically reports would be posted. So this would give the Council, the stakeholder groups and anybody in the community an opportunity to provide the public comments within the standard process.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Larisa for the clarification. And I think we're - just Chuck and I were both nodding. That works because we have - that gives us time to digest it. And we're all - it's over the Christmas holidays but we can do that. And that's no problem.

But I think when you say that would give the Westlake team less for the month. Why are we imposing - why don't - why isn't that date 19th of February? I don't understand why we don't - there's no rush to this.

And I think one of the problems that we're seeing with ICANN across the board is everything is just flying along. And, you know, there's times we can stop, step back, take a breath because this imposed rush that we're seeing on all fronts is a self-imposed thing.

And on this particular issue, which is so important, we've heard from - I've heard and probably other members of my fellow committee members have heard from others in the community that we're rushing along doing this thing and it's - what kind of review is this anyway because it's really not a proper review and so forth.

It is a proper review. We're doing surveys. We're doing personal interviews. We're doing all of these things. And then a independent report will come out and then we'll be able to determine whether or not this review was true or not to what we're trying to achieve for the community.

So I'm just saying that for my part I don't - we don't have to rush. That can just as well be February 19. Give them an extra week. Give the Westlake team time to do what they need to do. And then if it happens the 15th date slips to the 30th of April, I don't think there's a problem there. From my part there's not.

And I don't know how our Chair feels or others feel. But it just seems to me we're not in any hurry. We, you know, if it slides a week, two weeks, that's all right because we've got enough stuff to fill up the other days of our calendar. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you for that Ron. Appreciate the comment. And certainly you're right. I think to a certain extent, it is a self-imposed deadline just from - purely from a

project management perspective. Also having to be sensitive to the fact that when we engaged Westlake, it was based on an understanding of resources and timelines that we have to respect and consider as they go through their work.

And the lessons learned part certainly from staff's perspective is the reality of the cadence of the work and the timing of each step. When we set out to do this work I think in all, you know, good faith and good efforts we put a timeline that made sense on paper to everybody. And we're living a different reality.

We've had two extensions to the survey both for very good reason and all to arrive at productive results. We hope and we're confident. So at this point what I would say is we will continue to look carefully at the timeline and balance all these considerations so that the end product is something that everybody can agree is representative of the hard work of this group and the Westlake team and everybody else. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Philip's been waiting patiently so please go ahead Philip.

Philip Sheppard: No, just on the same subject. Richard you had comment really. I'm just wondering managing expectations in terms of what you want to get out of us once you provide your initial findings.

I mean my guess is what you're hoping for is that we will give you a feeling in terms of robustness of the exercise as opposed to the fact that we like your findings. And the like your findings be it comes after the draft report is published. I mean is that what you're expecting too?

Richard Westlake: Thank you for that question. I think it's a very useful one. Our view always has been that we are the reviewers in this case. That our opinions will be our opinions. What we want to have as much assurance as possible is that opinions are based on a valid digestion of the facts and of as many relevant facts as possible.

So where there may be errors of fact, errors of interpretation or even an alternative view of interpretation that we may not have been able to consider, that's the type of feedback we're looking for such as I think you've got it wrong about the sequence of events. I think you've got it wrong about why certain stakeholder group exists or doesn't exist and perhaps why a decision was made.

What we will say whether you say to us we really like your findings or whether you say to us we think your findings are absolutely right or alternatively your findings are going to land a hand grenade in the middle of an ICANN meeting, we will bear those in mind. And we may well reconsider. We will have a look at what we have found. But if those are our findings, those will be our findings.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Richard. And I think too as I am just thinking about how this plays out and how we handle our work to be able to provide that, while there are not many people from our Working Party here today, I am quite certain the call will be jam packed when we are reviewing the report and talking about the feedback.

So I think that in looking at that we should probably look at scheduling maybe a two or even three hour meeting for them to present and for us to discuss these issues. Maybe have one meeting for you to present the findings to the group and then schedule another for us to discuss and have some feedback organized.

With the short time window obviously we would need to, you know, avoid the Christmas week. But around there I think we could probably get everything scheduled. Does that sound right to everybody else as a way to approach this?

Ron Andruff: I think it's reasonable like five days after the New Year sort of thing. Once, you know, everybody's got back from holiday and they've sort of settled in. I think that makes a lot of sense. Absolutely. Thank you. Ron Andruff for the record.

Jen Wolfe: Do you think - I mean do you think having a two or three hour meeting would be appropriate so that we can really discuss and provide quality feedback to them as appropriate? Is that too much time, not enough?

Ron Andruff: I think - this is Ron. I think if people allow for the time and then as much as is used because one never knows. It may come back and we go you know what, this is spot on and it feels right and what I read looks good to me. So you never know what it's going to be.

But I think, you know, we've done that before in other working groups where we have allotted for a certain amount of time and then we worked through as much as we did. And if we finished early, all the better.

Larisa Gurnick: Just to clarify. So that means the written report will be delivered on the 19th. And then everybody would have an opportunity to read through on their own time and prepare however they - that they wish for a call somewhere during the first week in January. And that would be the two or three hour call. Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Richard and Colin, do you think it would make sense to have a shorter call for you to just present it in a way or give us a summary, provide some general information, give us some instruction as to here's what we did, here's how you might want to look at this? I feel like that might be helpful maybe somewhere around the 19th and then everybody has time to digest with their - with that presentation and then we can provide our feedback in January.

Richard Westlake: Jen, Richard here again. If that's workable, that would be fine. My - our experience is that the ambition of having a short meeting when people are

first exposed to someone like this are quite often unfulfilled. So I wouldn't under estimate the time that you find yourself taking regardless.

Chuck Gomes: Several kind of different comments. First of all, if we can find a three-hour block that most people can participate, that's great. That's really hard to do usually. So it might have to be broken up.

Secondly, I wouldn't think that the - I wouldn't anticipate me giving you feedback in terms of whether I agree or disagree with your findings. If I think your methodology is a problem, I'm going to tell you that although you're a lot more expert at that than I am. So it's probably unlikely.

The - and so if I think it's rubbish results just because I don't like them, I don't see myself doing that. I mean if I see a problem, I'm going to tell you that but not because I disagree with the findings. I think I like what you said Richard that, you know, if this is what we found, this is what we're going to report.

Richard Westlake: (Right).

Chuck Gomes: So that would kind of invalidate the work you did if you're making changes because I didn't like it.

Second or last totally different point and it's kind of related to a question. If this slide here is being used in any of your remaining presentations, I would change GNSO feedback to - what are we called?

Jen Wolfe: The Working Party. Absolutely. Absolutely on that.

Chuck Gomes: Working Party. Working Party feedback. Because that could set expectations that, which is kind of what you said first like it was going to the Council and so forth. And that's why I asked what that meant. So if this slide is being used again, please change that so that we don't set expectations differently than what we're doing.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you Chuck. That's actually a very good observation. And to reflect on you first point, the purpose of this step, because I'm quite sure it's a new step in this review that hasn't been there in prior reviews or at least not as specific as this, is to respond to some of the things that didn't work so well in prior reviews or the structure that was being reviewed never had the opportunity to intervene at that formative stage before the report was really formulated.

And this really gives an opportunity to clarify, correct and really express anything that anybody wishes to do so. And of course, you know, the independent examiners will take all that as appropriate. But that's the genesis of it. And, you know, we certainly think it's an important step.

Jen Wolfe: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So I generally agree with what Chuck is saying. However, I do, you know, come back to a comment that was made just now is if there are, you know, viewpoints that we think were not expressed in the report, then, you know, that would be something that could be brought up and also, you know, whether it was taking into account, whether you heard it and why, you know, that kind of thing.

So it's - not that you don't like it but that there - maybe there are issues that you can bring then.

Chuck Gomes: If I can respond. It's Chuck again. Thanks Edmon. And yes, I mean I don't have any problem with that. Now if they didn't receive those viewpoints from any of the data that they got - I mean I think a good question for us to ask did nobody say this or something. Yes.

So I don't have any problem I don't think with what you're saying. It was - what I was getting at was, you know, me providing feedback. Hey, I think your results stink because I don't like them. And I think we're in agreement on that.



Richard Westlake: And if I may what you may - a response you might get to a point like that is yes, we did hear people saying this but we heard people saying the other as well and in our judgment the other is actually the case. So that's just to construct an example.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here again. So on that note, as you have reported already, you know, the distribution of, you know, where the responses came back, what - I might have missed it earlier. But where - how are you selecting the interviewers - I mean the interviewees?

Richard Westlake: Richard Westlake here. If I could just add - respond to that comment. As far as the interviewees have gone, it has been very much a collective effort between us and the Review Working Party and particularly Larisa and Matt in identifying as broad a range of informed stakeholders as possible.

Beyond that we have said - we've pointed in direction where - which we think are important for our analysis. And somewhere we felt it's really important to get several perspectives from that particular group or particular dimension rather.

And yes, we've had to make a few judgment calls as to which are higher priorities than others. But - and we are still willing. As I said, this is still a moveable feast as to who we're seeing. And we have had people approach us and say I really wanted to talk to you so please contact me.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa also to add to Richard's comment. Some of the interviewees are being chosen from the comments that they made in the 360 so we're certainly using that to encourage people to express their point of view because that gives the Westlake team an opportunity to say well what did you mean by that. We'd like to delve further into it or, you know, really delve into the issue. So that's another very specific and concrete channel into the interview cycle.

Richard Westlake: Thank you. Richard Westlake here. There's one other point I should add because there did appear to be a little bit of confusion earlier today that both the 360 and the interviewee targets do go way beyond the GNSO itself.

We are trying to get as many diverse relevant perspectives from within the ICANN community as we can; the At Large, the SSAC, the GAC and others as well as also trying to get a segmentation by experience with ICANN.

In other words, the ability to get involved with people who don't necessarily speak English as their first language. Any obstacles they might find. Or people who are both new and don't speak English. Where do you start? So we're trying to cut and dice the interviewees into as many relevant segments as we can.

Jen Wolfe: Edmon, sure. Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here again. So with what you already have by now in terms of the roster, I guess the question is do you feel that the demographic is pretty good and diverse?

Richard Westlake: I think we've now got to the point where we can see where there are significant gaps and we're working actively over these next few days to fill them either here or in subsequent interviews later. Particularly in some - when you start to get into the component parts of the GNSO.

Jen Wolfe: Yes Colin. And then I have a question too.

Colin Jackson: Yes. Sure. This is Colin Jackson. I just want to add a supplementary to the questions about what do we do if - what do we the ICANN do if we think you haven't heard this whatever.

My point really is that it is much better to tell us these things now than to wait until we've written the report and then say oh well, nobody ever said that; yes, okay. And this is a bit of an obvious and facile thing to say but to me this underscores the point that we actually need to hear everything that people have to say on the topic this week preferably or at least have them say you need to talk to me and we'll arrange a contact in the next week or so.

Jen Wolfe: And that's actually a great segue to my question because yesterday in our Council meeting I would say some of the big themes or comments that were more critical of the process seemed to center around I don't think the questions were right or I don't think we're talking about the right - or we should be talking about structure and we're not and things along those lines were raised yesterday.

And so to the extent that people use that catch all question that we've created and raised new issues, will you be including that in the report so that they feel their voice has been heard and it's included?

Richard Westlake: Unquestionably. The catch all questions at the end - the three I would have to say have some of the most insightful perspectives because you get the sense that people have worked through the survey and then they thought well, what is the one or two key messages I want to leave because we have those what are the three and what are the three and is there anything else you want to tell us or that we should have asked you.

Jen Wolfe: (Right). Because I feel like that's really important to make sure that those voices have been heard, that they felt like the questions weren't tailored the right way. But if we have enough data, I think that will be really helpful and very important. So I want to make sure that we frame that. Yes. Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hi. Anne Aikman-Scalese from Lewis Roca Rothbgerber, IPC member. And I just wanted to follow on with respect to that there are in the survey sections after each question as well that contain comments. And I

assume that when those are reported they'll be reported out the same way even, you know, it's not the last three questions. Is that correct? We'll see all those comments?

Richard Westlake: Oh it certainly is. Now we won't necessarily quote all the comments verbatim. We're not proposing to give the survey results verbatim. But we are proposing to absolutely capture them and to give a very good comprehensive summary of what the perspectives were.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So are they available later as exhibits or something or are they - are, you know - for those who agreed to, you know, have their comments known. I mean can you attach the data?

Jen Wolfe: I think some people chose to be anonymous, right. So that...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...I mean you don't even have to attribute it. But I would think normally just in the same way that any ICANN, you know, public comment process that all of the comments are available. After staff summarizes them you can still go find them and that sort of thing that it would help the working group, you know, the party credibility to have all the comments available even if they're not attributed to anyone.

Richard Westlake: I don't know. Perhaps just make two quick comments on that. One is that we haven't considered doing that verbatim. Secondly, I'm not sure, and it's something we can discuss - I'm willing to discuss. But secondly, I'm not sure that more information is necessarily going to be better information.

If one has several hundred responses, some of them will be one word answer, some of them will be almost nonsense answers and trolling through to try and identify the key issues is - that's what you pay us for.

And the idea of you then wanting to have to go through the whole lot again and I would suggest that the return on the effort or working through in detail or working through every single comment on every single question is going to worth an effort that will probably be fruitless.

And secondly, if people get exhausted there's a greater likelihood in fact that you stop part way or people read only part of what it is and get the wrong interpretations after we've taken the trouble to go right through the whole lot.

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...it's that great question of just exhibits and people that's optional if they want to read all that backup. And I think if you don't do it, you'll have a transparency problem.

Ron Andruff: This is Ron Andruff for the record. Anne, I appreciate your comment because one of the things that we talk about always is transparency and making sure that everyone can actually see all this information and so forth.

But I liken this a little bit to the NonCom where the process is open but the data is private. Inasmuch as we tried now to really open up the NonCom activity so we can see what we're doing and understanding how we're doing, have open meetings here and so forth.

But the data itself is kept private for all the good reasons because it's private data and people have applied to the NonCom they should have that protection of privacy. And in many ways it's similar here because this is a survey that's being done. It's not a public comment that's being done.

So I can appreciate what Richard is saying is that when you start putting the raw data out there, it could be misconstrued or there could be all kinds of things that people might just grab and hold on to and then others are forced to go back and go through that raw data.

So I'm not so sure about that but I think that that's something we might want to consider at some point. But I don't think it's a critical element at this stage right now because it's a survey and that's the key here.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I think you might cause more problems by not having it available because people might speculate on the conclusions that were drawn and question whether the conclusions were accurate.

And so I agree with you that there's a balancing there to - that has to be achieved but, you know, there's a lot of speculation that occurs in the community about how decisions are made. And there's tremendous emphasis right now on transparency. And I guess I'd urge the Working Party to consider that very carefully.

And the only other question I had was a much more practical question, which is I felt badly that I hadn't filled out the survey before (it showed up) at ICANN. And so I went online and did it after your session with GNSO yesterday.

Except that my Internet connection was somehow randomly interrupted during the middle. I was 3/4 of the way through the survey and I couldn't figure out how to get back to it. It just all disappeared. And so there was no - there was no save and reopen this later.

It's not a three-minute survey especially if you really want to provide real information and you want to, you know, fill out the length and give real input. It's not a three-minute survey. And I don't know what happened to all my answers that I wrote because I had no option to try to save it. And then my Internet connection, which I happen to be in the GAC room at the time. Okay. I was multitasking. But I don't know where it is or how to get it back.

Richard Westlake: Can I perhaps - Anne, I can comment briefly without having gone and had a look at the exact results. At the end of each page of the survey there is a save this page button and we ask you to do that. And at the top of the following page we say remember to save your previous page. And as long as you have done that...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: In that case, I'm an idiot. Okay. Because I...

Richard Westlake: ...those pages...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm a total idiot and it's...

Richard Westlake: ...will have been saved.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...I'm sorry. I'm an idiot.

Richard Westlake: The other thing - if I could just talk about the other issue. Again, I'm not trying to make a judgment as to whether we should or should not publish the raw data. And I think, you know, it is clearly open for discussion - that one and a decision that isn't ours.

But I would just ask you to do the math. Let us say hypothetically we were to end up with at the end of this week 500 responses to the survey, which have been some aspirations of a few people. If we have 500 responses, there are 27 pages available potentially to each respondent. I just ask people to do the math about working through the data and how long that might take any individual.

Larisa Gurnick: Anne, first of all wanted to address your frustration. It's possible that if you use the same device and just go into the link, it should bring you back to where you were left off. And perhaps the reason you didn't recognize the option that was being described, I believe the actual terminology is next and not save.

So - and I don't recall off the top of my head but just to clarify that point but perhaps after this we could see if you - could help you get back to where you...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. I may be able actually to get back in. I don't know if this is - it's not - probably not helpful given that it closes on Friday but I'm quite often in (faction) with various surveys and particularly with performance evaluations and seeing that button that says, you know, save and come back to this later, that type of a button. But it's probably not relevant given it closes on Friday.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi. This is Matt Ashtiani for the record. So I just wanted to point out on the first page after accept cookies, perhaps you accept the privacy notice that it explicitly states that you must have cookies enabled in your browser if you're going to use this questionnaire and that you can return to the questionnaire as often as you wish provided that you use the same browser and computer.

So I just wanted to know did you use the same browser and computer and was cookies enabled?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I guess I'm not making my point because okay. My issue is user friendliness. I now know from what you guys say that I can, you know, potentially go back and recapture everything that I did. But okay, I'm not the most sophisticated technical person in the room obviously.

But I do a lot of surveys. I do a lot of performance evaluations. I do a lot of this kind of stuff. And express warnings on the first page about that I must enable cookies on my browser so that I can get back to it, great. But you guys want to really like broad, you know, you want a lot of people to fill this out. You want - I mean it's just to my mind was not one of the more user-friendly type surveys that I've ever taken.

Jen Wolfe: Edmon, you had your hand raised.



Edmon Chung: I'm just trying to add to it. I'm trying to (unintelligible) a few things on that. One, the - I understand the shortened URLs. It's simple. But next time probably easier to remember phrases like gnsoreview.icann.org would probably be better than that.

And I'm trying to actually do it now. Not hiding the fact. But I can't go through - get through the first page because it doesn't allow me to select two areas that I participate most in, which is the case. I participate as - I pretty much as much in the GNSO as in the ALAC. And none of the selections allow me to do that. Now there's a none, which is also not true, so. I'm trying to figure out how to get through this.

Man: (It does).

Jen Wolfe: I think it does. And you could actually go on and take it twice because it - what happens is once you select an affiliation; it leads you down another path of questions. So if you want to - right? Is that right Larisa? I think so.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jen Wolfe: Is that right Larisa, if you're two affiliations?

Edmon Chung: Anyway, what...

Larisa Gurnick: No. No. With the affiliation what I would - this is Larisa. What I would suggest is that perhaps you choose the one that's dominant and add a comment. You can always add a comment. There's multiple places where you can clarify that.

What Jen is referencing - as you get further into the survey - as you get further into the survey, if you're part of a stakeholder group or a constituency or you feel that you would like to provide feedback on a given stakeholder

group or a constituency, you have the ability to say yes, I'm - and I forget the exact wording.

But there's basically yes or no. Yes I am part of that and I'd like to comment on it. And if you say yes, a whole other series of questions opens up to you. But if you say no, then you have a choice to answer questions for the next stakeholder group. And you can answer for as many stakeholder group and constituencies that you feel qualified and interested to comment on.

And then finally I wanted to make one point or recommendation that's relative to the other issue that's been discussed about to what extent to include the raw data.

It might be a good idea to take this question and do a bit of analysis and provide this group with some history of how this topic was handled in the past because there is some track record with prior reviews both in terms of interviews and quantitative type assessment that I believe were taken up in some cases so that the decision to include or not include could be consistent with the way this was practiced in the prior reviews. So that would be just my suggestion.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi everybody. This is Matt Ashtiani for the record. So just a quick note that we have a hard stop in just a few minutes; literally about three minutes. So I think if Jen's okay with it, we should just hand it back to Westlake to do the close out.

Jen Wolfe: Sure. Philip, were you waiting to say something?

Philip Sheppard: Yes. One...

Jen Wolfe: Just want to make sure we...

Philip Sheppard: ...it was one quick observation on whether or not we should publish the raw data. And I was trying to think well what's the objective there. And to my mind the objective is either you're ambitiously going to go through it all and say they got it all right, which is fine. Or you're going to go through it all and say they got it all wrong, which is unlikely.

And most likely if you don't like the outcome, you're going to go through it piecemeal and find a few conclusions which fit your opinion and use that instead. So I make this as observations to be weighed against the concept of transparency.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Philip. And so just to close out and I want to let you all close out. But Larisa and I we'll coordinate - get a doodle poll out to look at scheduling something in January.

Maybe we'll schedule two two-hour meetings and see if we can at least get those on everybody's calendar and make sure an email goes out to the whole Working Party to let them know the importance so that we get it on everybody's calendar and we're good to go. Chuck, did you have one more thing?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. And just before they close, Ron wanted to suggest that at the welcome ceremony that we also mention that there will be a working group survey coming out. That's all.

Richard Westlake: Okay. Thank you very much. I just want to make one or two minor comments and then we're pretty much done. The first one is just a note on your data, which is even if somebody did troll through the entire dataset of the survey, they would not have our transcripts of the various interviews, et cetera, that we're taking, some of which will be quite fragmented in terms of transcripts.

We're not proposing to release those. And we are mostly giving people confidentiality assurances that we couldn't. So even if you were to read

27,000 pages or whatever it comes to and form a view, there might be valid reasons why we formed a different one. Just as a point.

The other one to Edmon who was asking how can he put in multiple affiliations, there is a question very soon after the what is your affiliation that says please describe your involvement with GNSO in a few words or a few lines. So you could easily put there while I spend a lot of time at GNSO, I also spend a lot of time in the ALAC. That might be the smart thing to do.

And the one other point that I - has not received any conversation here is the supplementary survey. I don't know whether we even want to discuss now but there is a view that that should be launched very soon.

Jen Wolfe: Yes. You're right. Any thoughts on should that be launched next week? Should we give a week off?

Man: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Week off after ICANN and then launch it. Absolutely.

Richard Westlake: So you would like to see that launched seven days after the closure of the current survey?

Jen Wolfe: Yes. I think that's (what)...

Chuck Gomes: Chuck speaking. And you just don't want to do it next week because people are going to be so wiped out and so forth.

Richard Westlake: That's fine. From that, thank you - thank the Working Party very much. And thank ICANN staff for the support we've had throughout so far.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. Well we'll look forward to a couple of long phone calls with you in January.

Richard Westlake: Oh, you can count on it.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks. I think that closes out the meeting.

END