

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles  
GNSO Review Update to the Council  
Saturday 11 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

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Okay, so let's stop the recording on that session and prepare for the next one which is dealing the GNSO review. Good to go with the recording? Thank you.

All right so the next session scheduled for 11:30; it's not 11:50, is to look at the work going on in the GNSO review. And we've got Jeff Wolfe here as a Counselor. We've also got (Larissa Gurnig) from staff, and our colleagues from Westlake who are working with us on the review.

So Jenn, would you like to say a few words to introduce the topic?

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. Thanks Jonathan. Yes, just to introduce the Westlake team who will be presenting the current status of the, I just wanted to provide for clarification, since I know there was some discussion earlier about the working party and the scope of the work that we're doing.

The 360 assessment that's being conducted right now is being formulated and implemented by Westlake as the independent examiner. And that was prescribed in an RFP created by staff.

The GNSO Review Working Party is a group of GNSO members who are coordinating that effort and will be providing feedback. We have provided feedback on the design and the questions for the 360 assessment.

But the 360 assessment itself is being conducted by the Westlake team as the independent examiner. So I just wanted to make sure that was clear.

The Westlake governance will be using the feedback provided by the GNSO Working Party and other community members to formulate the assessment, ensuring that the tool collects adequate information from a broad group of people to meet the needs of data gathering for their review work. So I just wanted to clarify that.

In parallel to this the GNSO Working Party can elect to conduct a self-review once we see the results of the assessment from Westlake. So, that's something that will still be on the table as we move this process forward.

So I'm going to turn it over to Richard Westlake from Westlake to provide an update on the status of the review. And after he presents I'd like to come back and just reinforce the importance of everyone at this table and in this room completing the survey.

I know you're going to give us some statistics about how many counselors have completed the survey to date, as well as other leadership also. I'll turn it over to you.

Richard Westlake: Jonathan, Jenn thank you very much indeed. My name is Richard Westlake and I'd like to also introduce my colleague Colin Jackson who's here with me.

Now some of you will be aware that we have done some previous work with ICANN, so we're not totally babes in the wood, but we're very keen to find out as much as we can about what you think, particularly here on the GNSO Review.

We've been working on this now with the team -- Jenn Wolfe and her team, and (Larissa) and (Matt) since the London meeting. And the 360 is the main vehicle for people to express your views on how you believe the GNSO is functioning, has functioned, and how fit it is to continue functioning into the future.

So can I please firstly just stress our invitation to everybody, if you haven't yet been into the assessments to have a look at it, please make your voice heard.

The link to the announcement is up here on the screen. We are very happy to pass that on to you, and you will see it repeated two or three times through the course of these short slides.

We're also very keen to talk to some people. Not everybody because time simply doesn't allow. But we are keen to talk to people about penetrate - driving a bit deeper - diving a bit deeper into the issues that are being identified. And people who particularly have views that you simply can't get into enough - can't explain enough within the survey.

For those who haven't yet done the survey you've got a number of options. You can come in and you can do it quite rapidly if time is very pressing for you.

You have the option - we have both some quantitative where you tick the box. We have some boxes for you to comment further, add comments, and we also have some free form text boxes towards the end where you can add

anything that we haven't asked about that you feel that we should have asked you about, or that you want to tell us about.

And in the middle, for those who wish to comment specifically in detail on any of the particular constituencies or stakeholder groups or the Council itself, there is an option - there are optional sets of questions in there as well.

As I say, they are optional. If you have ten minutes please go and give us the ten minutes. If you have an hour and a quarter to really tell us what you think, we would absolutely appreciate those as well.

Jonathan Robinson: So Richard if I may, just to make a comment. This is available to every counselor, everyone in this room; anyone who has an interest in the GNSO and its business.

I know that we have a GAC colleague here. You know it's open to any group or individual to put their comments or opinions in. So just to make it clear, this is wide open and available to anyone to participate in.

Richard Westlake: Thank you Jonathan, really useful to make - to add that comment. Thank you.

Yes, it is open. We are very keen to get a very broad cross-section of perspectives and views. And as Colin will show you in just a moment, there are some areas - there are some perspectives which we think are unquestionably of value and importance where there has been a significant lack of input to date.

So I could encourage you either to complete these yourselves or alternatively and even better, go and twist the arms of your colleagues who you know do have views that will be worth hearing.

In addition to both the 360 and the one to one interviews, we have been doing a very extensive desktop review of documentation as well. So we're really trying to get full triangulation on the processes; our own perspectives through the record - written record, the one to one interviews, and also the results of the survey.

I'll hand over if I could now to my colleague Colin to give you some of the statistics where we are so far.

Colin Jackson: Thank you. I wonder if we could have that slide moved on to - and again. That might be a good one to start with; thank you.

This shows the numbers that were done as of this morning I think it was. These are - so 119 completed responses. Now as Richard said, this is - or in fact as Jonathan said, this is available to everybody in the GNSO. It's available to everybody in ICANN. It's in fact available to the entire Internet.

But I think expecting six billion responses might be a bit too much, but we would appreciate a few more than we have.

In particular I split it out here by the particular parts of ICANN that people claim as an affiliation when they fill in the responses. As you will see we have got a reasonable percentage from the GNSO which you would expect, and that's fine, although there is still room for plenty more, please.

We could really do with some more from the GAC, really because the GNSO and the GAC, clearly their objectives come up against each other sometimes. That is a source of comment that is coming out through the work we've done so far is the relationship between the GNSO and the GAC and the policy that is created here and how it is seen as acceptable or unacceptable in government forums.

So we would really appreciate some - and if there is a GAC person here who can take that back, we would really appreciate that; a few more views from GAC members.

I might say these are something Richard didn't say but is completely true, is anything you fill into the survey tool is - does not have to be attributable to you. You are not speaking for anybody or you do not have to have your name attached to the feedback if you wish.

If you wish, we ask that you give your name. But if you check the box that says please maintain this as confidential, we will protect that confidentiality. So we will not identify your comment to you or to your company or to your government or any such arrangement.

So we would really like to understand what people who are involved think, whether or not there are concerned about upsetting their employer.

We'll also note on here that there's very little feedback from the SSAC which again is a bit of a shame. And we will be doing our best to beat up SSAC people. But if you know any, please do that for us.

Again because of the obvious relationship here, you make policy for the DNS and they do their best to stop people (unintelligible) the DNS, to put it crudely. So there is an overlap, and one might even say a conflict of interest in areas that we would like to explore in the course of this review.

Now some figures we haven't got put up on the slide I don't think, are the number of people who are related to this - to the actual review who have completed the survey instrument.

As of this morning I think seven counselors had filled in the survey, which is better than it was a couple of weeks ago. But I'm looking around this room.

There's a reasonable number more than seven. And it would be really good if we could have some more please. It is important. Thank you very much.

So - but I think really anybody who's involved with the GNSO should do this. This is not - it is not a greatly onerous use of your time and it's essential for us to be able to provide you with a quality review. Can we move on to the next slide please?

This is the time - Richard, do you want to pick this back up again?

Richard Westlake: I'm happy to do that. The survey is currently open, but it does have to close at the end of this ICANN meeting. So it has been extended twice and this is the final chance for people to complete it.

It will be closing on Friday this coming week - Friday the 17th at the close of business on Friday. So please, if anybody does wish to complete it or has started it and wants to come and finish it, or wants to encourage someone else to do so, you have until Friday the 17th of October to do that.

From there we are continuing also to do some interviews remotely, and continuing our desktop review. We then provide our draft report; our initial report in the middle of December to the GNSO Review Team - the GNSO Council Review Team.

And then will then feedback after which we will complete our draft final version, send it to public comment, and then we'll have a final report as you see, in April.

So our timeline over the next two months is quite tight, quite compressed. So if you want to have your say -- and we please encourage you to have your say -- please do so now. Thank you very much.

We know that during the ICANN week you are all absolutely occupied, from experience. We also know that there is the occasional five minutes you take out to come clear your emails. Please use three of those five minutes to log into the survey.

Colin Jackson: I'll just add one thing if I may. As I would just back up what Richard said, there is oftentimes sitting in meeting as I've observed, to clear things or to fill in surveys, but ultimately this is GNSO's review. We can't do it unless you tell us what you think and that you provide us with the input.

Jonathan Robinson: And could we please have the final slide. Those are the links. The top link there is the link to the announcement and also to the translated versions.

For those for whom English is not your first language, the survey is available in all the United Nations languages, and we're happy to send those out to you for completion.

As of this morning the non-English versions of the survey, we have a grand total in non-English surveys of zero. Not one person has requested the survey other than in English.

So we would very much appreciate those. The announcements have gone out in the UN languages, so people should be aware of it. We certainly are aware that some of the people who have completed it in English -- English is not their mother tongue -- but please, if it is much - if it is easier for you to speak in any of the other languages or you know colleagues who might be put off by an English language survey, encourage them please.

The link is there and you can find that through the first link on the screen now. And the link to the 360 assessment; there's a shorter one - a (unintelligible) dot GL link.

For those who can't read it but have a pen handy, [gu.gl/KQDOIhe](http://gu.gl/KQDOIhe). You can find that. You can ask (Larissa). You can ask any one of us. We're very happy to forward the link.

And in your grab bag when you registered, you will find a postcard with the link there as well. Thank you Chairman.

Jonathan Robinson: We've got a question from Stephane.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Jonathan. Stephane Van Gelder speaking. I'm part of Jenn's group working on this.

Two questions to you. You've repeatedly mentioned that you can't do this without sufficient feedback. What is your measure of what is sufficient feedback - i.e., how many surveys do you need - how many surveys filled in do you need to feel confident that you've got a good view of what the community wants.

And if you don't reach that level, what is your takeaway on what should be done next? And is it a reflection of the way the survey is structured? Thanks.

Colin Jackson: Well I'll comment on what I - how many I think we should get, and I'll leave Richard to pick up what we do if we don't.

In my view, looking at a Council like this, I would expect a very large majority to have done it. It's not that hard and you are the Council of the organization.

And I'm sure we could reach a reasonable level of validity if we got to 70 or 80% of Council. But I question why we wouldn't get 100% frankly.

Of the broader GNSO community, I think we have currently - the different constituencies and stakeholder groups, the numbers we have -- and I'm

working from memory here -- range between about 19 and eight per statistic and per stakeholder group or constituency. Eight is really a bit thin.

We would like to see, of the active people in that, half of each I think would be at least a good start. And we would like to get as many community members as possible. We're particularly interested as I stressed in my parts of the presentation earlier, in some of the other SOs and ACs in ICANN; some of the other parts of the ICANN community that have policy relationships or objectives that may overlap or conflict with GNSOs, we're particularly interested in getting some from them as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Colin.

Richard Westlake: Stephane could I perhaps just...

Man: (Unintelligible) Richard.

Richard Westlake: Could I just add to that three comments. In particular one, in terms of getting enough statistically valid or valid information from the survey, if we had been seeing a really broad, diversity of perspectives coming through, I would be very, very concerned with the numbers we have today.

As it stands, we do already have a relative consistency as to what the issues are in a large number of areas - or not a large number but a significant enough number of areas, quite often with 180 degree opposing views on those particular points. So we do have sufficient information there to help us focus our thoughts.

If we don't get the participation, then I think itself is valid input if you like, by absence, in terms of how the GNSO is functioning and would be functional.

In terms of your question about would it be a reflection of the survey structure, I think I can say quite reasonably confidently the answer is no,

because people don't know the structure until they log in, and we know the number of people who log in to complete it.

And we do see the majority of those who log in to complete it - who log in, do complete it. And many of the names that don't complete it are names that are completely unknown and relatively obscure.

And I suspect in many cases simply (unintelligible) who are curious; have a look at this and say no, this isn't me.

Finally, what is Plan B? Well Plan B is that we have extended already twice. We do have significant amount of desktop review. We do have significant answers already. I just don't want them to dominate if we can avoid it.

And finally, we are doing some one to one interviews which is in many cases, validating and in other cases, giving greater depth. Thank you. Could we possibly move to the next slide so that people can contact us if you need to?

Jonathan Robinson: And we've got a few more in the queue to ask questions or make comments. I've got Marilyn, Maria, and Volker at this stage. Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I - if you haven't taken the survey, I would urge you to do so. And certainly in our constituency and SG meetings and the ALAC meetings, you know perhaps we can encourage that, and all will.

But I'm going to make a couple of observations as someone who has taken the survey. It is to me actually not a survey about the GNSO at all. It is a survey about the policy practices of the GNSO's Policy Council and community.

And I say that because a survey - a study on the GNSO would actually have to go into much more detail about the functioning of the SGs and constituencies, and the support provided by ICANN to support the high quality functioning of such organs.

That is not addressed at all and has been an ongoing area of concern by many of us, in terms of the demands that are placed upon the GNSO as one of the three supporting organizations, and the barriers to success that exist in terms of lack of ICANN focused support.

Now some of that support has been forthcoming recently, but my point is just the survey is not in any way addressing the feedback about how the support that ICANN is providing to a supporting organization and distributed across the supporting organization is helping to strengthen the effectiveness of said groups.

I mention that because when we get into talking about participation in working groups, or we get into dissecting what might make the policy development process more effectively more informed, more efficient, etcetera, remember that the critters that need to populate those working groups come from within the constituencies; the supporting - the SGs and of course the ALAC and elsewhere.

So I think to me we're missing that in terms of the survey we are doing. The second thing that I found quite strange was that I was allowed to comment on other SGs and constituencies that I may or may not actually know anything about. I might have an opinion about them. It might be a good opinion; it might be a bad opinion. But there was no safeguard to me on whether or not I was really qualified to make a comment about the registrar SG or the registry SG or any other entity, which I thought was a bit strange.

And I don't really see how you can safeguard against that now because a disgruntled member of a group could say negative things as someone who is

positive about a group, whether they know anything about it or not, could also say positive things.

Then I would just say that I think it's very difficult for many members of SGs and constituencies -- I won't comment about the ALAC; perhaps they could comment themselves -- to fill out some of the questions.

If they skipped the multiple choice and went directly to writing in the box, perhaps they could then provide relevant information. But many members of constituencies participate through elected officers or through counselors or through designated representatives on working groups.

They are behind the process. They are helping to devise the policy statement. They are doing the analysis. But they themselves may not have the direct experience that would make them feel comfortable in filling out some of the questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marilyn. Would either Richard or Colin, would either of you like to respond to any of that?

Richard Westlake: Address all those points. I think perhaps Marilyn, thank you for those comments. Thank you for those views.

Two points - one is that the survey has been designed very much with our terms of reference in mind, and we do believe that we will have inputs that will allow us to respond to the points in our terms of reference.

Remember this is only one of three data gathering meetings. One also being the one to one interviews we're conducting. And the other one, which is the most extensive time wise and the least visible is the desktop review of the documentation.

So we're seeing matters of meeting, meeting process, speed of process, how processes are functioning, where there appear to be concerns expressed regarding lack of support and so on.

And I think that's really where we're going to be coming from. This I would say really, that this is just one of the three data gathering mechanisms Marilyn.

The other one, we were very keen to ensure and to encourage as great participation as possible. So starting putting up walls even within the survey saying you can't comment on this area is - was something we resisted.

What we have got is a bit of a cross-check. We have asked people to identify the major area within the GNSO in which they participate or within ICANN in which they participate. And most people have responded in those areas.

So clearly that will help us just to see, in many cases, the perspective from which they're coming. But of course this is exactly the sort of area or reason why a greater number of responses should help us to see overall views rather than just simply one or two outlier voices.

Colin Jackson: Yes, I'll just comment on that and say and if there are loud voices, we need to hear them actually. Because as Richard says, we (unintelligible) those people fill in the survey, are at least reasonably honestly. We can tell what their affiliation is; what their interests are, how much they've participated, and in what - and if they have something to say them we would rather have that. And we will place our interpretation on how much weight to put on it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks both. I've got a queue; just to let you know who's in it, I've got Maria, Volker, Avri, and then we'll go to the mic.

Maria Farrell: Thanks, Maria Farrell speaking. I'm also one of the small majority who has filled in a survey. I'm happy to announce that I encourage anyone else to do so.

And possibly one reason, apart from general, you know, inertia for the low response rate is that the review is not really what many in the GNSO Council had envisaged or desired in that it is an awful low narrower in scope and methodology in terms of its input and in terms of its expected outputs.

Many of us do this review unfortunately as a lot opportunity. A lost opportunity to look at the structural difficulties of the GNSO that we have inherited from the last review. The structure that makes it difficult to come to agreement and consensus on substantive issues.

So, you know, despite the best chairing foreseeable and the most, you know, in good faith and very, very vigorous participation by many, many people, the GNSO is not functioning as a policy-making organization as well as it could and should.

And I think the reasons for that are pretty clear. The structure we inherited the last review imposed by the Board, people - many people said that it inhaled categorically against substantive discussion against the ability to build and create consensus across the houses.

It's just mathematically not possible to get agreement because of, you know, very, very foreseeable structural features of the current model.

And so you know when we look at the very de minimis approach that's been taken to this review, I'm not going to shoot the messenger. I think Jenn Wolfe is doing a superb job. I think you guys will do a great job. But it is a very de minimis review. It's the appearance of a review. It's very much Board directed to the as minimal as possible; to be as quantitative as possible, to allow in as few qualitative viewpoints as possible.

We only have interviews because many of us, you know, shouted very loudly in Singapore and then in London that there needed to be qualitative input to this review.

So you know - so I think that may be party to a reason for the low uptake in participation in that survey.

People often talk about ICANN as being a model that's being - it's like an airplane that's flying and you're fixing the airplane as you're flying, in terms - you know, it's an analogy (unintelligible) used.

I would say that this review is a little bit like you're going on an airplane trying to get somewhere and after the plane - after the journey is concluded you get this response - this review that says, well was the coffee good? Was the check-in okay? Were the air hostess - the cabin crew nice? Yes.

Unfortunately the plane crashed. So it's as if we're going through the motions of asking about these - all of these kind of managerial, technocratic, superficial aspects of the precise function, you know, we're here for. And we're not looking at hang on, are we able to make policy? Is the policy good?

So - and you know I think one of the methods you're looking at; the desk review, very important. But it only looks at what the GNSO is doing. It doesn't, by nature that information does not look at what the GNSO is not doing and cannot do.

So, you know, that's possibly why some of the people aren't putting in as much input as they could. I don't want to shoot the messenger. I don't think it's your fault. I think it is the fault of the Board and I think we have to keep saying that.

Just briefly, Philip Sheppard at our meeting in London pointed out that we are really having to hold the feet to the flame of how this review is being done, even if it wasn't living up to Board public statements in terms of the scope and the methods.

So, you know good work. Please keep doing it but please - that's I think some important political context that may help you to understand why take up is not perhaps what it might have been.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Maria. Good set of points and well made. I'm just going to defer to the floor mic because it's uncomfortable standing there. And we around the table are seated and I'll come back to Volker and Avri who are next in the queue.

(Stephanie Perrin): Hi, my name is (Stephanie Perrin) and after what Maria just said, this will seem even more banal and trivial than I thought it would sound.

But I would give you fair warning, I'm going to bring up this issue again and again. And I'm an incoming counselor so, get ready.

The yellow type is illegible, and I can barely read it from here. And on ICANN diagram we're very fond of white type on pale, and it's illegible. So if we could switch the color of that type, oh good. Thank you. But this is just a generic statement that I will make again and again. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Stephanie). We've got Volker next and then Avri.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you. Volker Greimann speaking. I'm taking the questionnaire right now. Very helpful. The links and the Adobes, so you don't even have to type it, just go to the Adobe chat and click on the links. So there's no reason not to do it.

One question that I have is regarding the possibility of anonymous comments. I assume that you guys know who commented.

Colin Jackson: In most cases. Yes, this is true. Broadly this is true. At a greater level of detail what happens is that people are asked to fill their correct name in, in line with the appropriate ICANN procedures.

But provided they tick the box that says, please keep this confidential, then we will not attribute those, but we will still know who they are.

Richard Westlake: Unless they put Mickey Mouse.

Colin Jackson: Yes. I mean there were one or two were marked from obviously factious names. But mostly that is not the case. And we would strongly urge people to use their real names please.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I think this is helpful and this is also very good to ensure the quality of the results.

Another question here to the same aspect is, do you see any - yes, I'll use another word -- maybe astro turfing, i.e. identical responses to the questions from multiple respondents? Or is this really a good mix of individual responses that are individually thought out?

Colin Jackson: I would have to say that too many responses has not been a problem for us so far.

And to answer your question slightly more directly, no we have seen no evidence of that there is a good range of views. That said, there are some of the same issues come in different ways in people's own words again and again.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Very reassuring. Keep up the work.

Jonathan Robinson: Right, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I want to first of all, pretty much back up everything that Maria said. Fortunately there are the boxes that one can fill in with our particular positions and with their rants.

And I really want to encourage everyone to go back and take it because you don't want to leave the rants just to people like me.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. I've got - any comments on the floor mic? Go ahead. There's a response first from the guys at Westlake and then we'll come to...

Richard Westlake: Could I respond briefly to Avri that for those who've had the persistence to complete the survey, there is a box at the very end, say is there anything else you want to tell us about.

And I have to say the one person so far has used that extensively, and I expect sat up all night. We have a page and a half of tightly focused comments closely spaced.

We're very happy to receive those Avri from you or from anyone else who feels that the questions have not been adequately (unintelligible) you want to address. Thank you.

Colin Jackson: That also avoids the concern that some have raised that it is purely a quantitative survey. There is ample space for you to type material for us to read. And we will read it and we will take it into account.

Jonathan Robinson: A quick response from Avri and then we'll...

Avri Doria: I think the issue is not with the survey, it's with having heard that categorically the Board doesn't want to see any structural change.

Jonathan Robinson: Over to the floor mic.

(Kavorta Rusti): Good afternoon, my name is (Kavorta Rusti); member of GAC. I am not speaking on behalf of GAC, but I am speaking on behalf of one of the GAC members.

I have always appreciated your work (unintelligible) you are in the GAC meeting I always express sincere appreciation for your devotion with the precision of work you do.

I have some general comment with respect to this review process or review of GNSO.

Something that I have been involved for many years, that whenever we have a question of survey it becomes very, very critical and difficult. First what you ask, if it is clear you will not get a clear answer.

Second, what you receive, if it is not the clear answer and it is multidimensional, you will have difficulty how to interpret that. And if you receive contradictory responses you have to find out the way between those and put them together, and it might have impact on your review.

And the most important part would be how you analyze and how you come up with the result, and then to be the way to implement that. But this is not the purpose of the question - my question.

My question is that, how frequently you review? Do you have time to implement the results of that review, or you are in the continuous review process? One review after another review and you take - or it takes considerable amount of your expertise in order to go through the process; in order to ask the questions, reply the questions and analyze that.

And then there will be little time to implement (unintelligible) and leave the system to (unintelligible) for some time. I don't have any time to propose, but you start another so you may not have sufficient time to do that. And that might have impact on the entire process that the community expects from you.

So I would request you can do that. Have you - have any let us say, clear strategy of the review? How frequently you review and how much time you need for the review. And after that, when you implement that, how much time you leave or you continue with what you have reviewed, and now you implement that to see, to have a real reflection of what you have reviewed. Or you go through the continuous review.

I'm sorry, this is a very general question. You may not have very clear answers, but that is question and I thank you very much.

Richard Westlake: Thank you very much for the question. I could make a stab at answering, but I'm going to look at anyone else would like to comment. I mean it's a Board initiated review. They're part of a sequential and structural, sort of backed into the structure if you like.

There are periodic reviews of the organizations. Anyone else like to comment? Maria?

Maria Farrell: Yes, just very briefly to answer that, the reviews as by law, mandated. Their frequency, you know how often they happen, I think it's supposed to be every five years. It's set out in the bylaws, so that's where it comes from. It's pretty clearly -- excuse me -- mandated.

Richard Westlake: The other question was - the other part of the question was clearly, are we in a state of sort of continuous wheel-spinning if you like? You know, do we get to implement the outcomes of those reviews?

(Larissa), did you have something you wanted to respond on that?

(Larissa): No I just wanted - Maria already covered that. And the other element to it is from a review process, it takes generally about six months to prepare for the review; anywhere from nine to 12 months to conduct the review.

And after the review process has been concluded then the implementation phase, depending on the kinds of recommendations that are being addressed, the implementation phase could take any number of months. And then if you do the math, that's what's left until the next cycle begins.

Jonathan Robinson: So I'll make one brief other stab and then I think we should go - continue with the various questions that are in the queue. But I don't personally feel like we're in a state of continuous response to review inputs, although there are - we do have as you heard, the standing committee on Improvements that's running continuously to look at tweaks to our processes and continuous improvements, and seek to continuously improve of our own accord anyway, notwithstanding any input from reviews.

I'm very conscious there's a queue been building. I think Volker you've been in line for some time. Sorry, I didn't tick you off. Avri, did we cover you? Yes, okay so let's go to the floor mic there.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: This is Anne Aikman-Scalese with Lewis Roca Rothgerber, and I'm a member of the IPC. IPC - a delegate to the standing Committee on Improvements, and I'm also on the Policy and Implementation working group.

And my question really relates to the coordination issue that (Jay Scott) raised, or what my mother used to call dovetailing, when you're making a meal and you've got your green beans over here and your roast beef over there where you need to make it all come together at the same time.

And on SCI, as well as when we're looking at the issue of consensus levels in the working groups, and in Policy and Implementation when we're looking at when a new issues arises and what methods we have to address for example, a conflict between GAC advice and GNSO advice, the question becomes how we incorporate results of GNSO review into the work of those working groups and SCI and of how that comes together.

When you look at timing for example, right now Policy and Implementation is looking at trying to bring together a preliminary report eventually, in time for AmeriCash.

And when I look at the timing of this review process with respect to the surveys, I can see for example that in December there will be "initial findings".

So it's really a bit of an open-ended question about - it relates to the same comment that (Jay Scott) made about how the work that's currently being done can be affected by the results from the review, and whether there can be any kind of use of the findings prior to the final report. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Anyone wish to comment or respond to Ann's input? Marika?

Marika Konings: It is Marika. As I at least understand them and as I think I saw in the timeline as well, you know there is an opportunity I think, for the GNSO to provide comments on the initial findings.

So I would for example, foresee you know, if one of the findings is you really need to do better on the implementation side, you know, the GNSO Council can then comment.

Well actually there is work underway. You know, please take that into account as you finalize your report or something like that.

And I think similarly as well, I guess when we get to the stage of actually implementing some of the recommendations, similarly the Council may want to look at what efforts are already ongoing that actually are addressing some of the recommendations to indeed make sure that it all ties together.

So I think at least as I understand the process, I think it foresees those opportunities to at least point out, these are areas we're actively working on. So please make note of that in your final report. And as well, when we get to implantation we can make sure as well that all those ends tie together.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. Philip, over to you.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you, Philip Sheppard from Brand Registry Group. As Maria was kind enough to mention my name earlier, I just thought its worth, perhaps given the context of what she was referring to what I said at the last meeting. And this goes back also to a statement about, you know, what is the Board saying; what is the Board thinking; and how we've been given too narrow direction.

And I'm going to quote the resolution of the Board the 28th of September, 2013, and that was when the Board was discussing the timing of this review. A couple of lines.

"An expansion of the TLD space has increased the number and variety of stakeholders [participating in GNSO policymaking, and a review needs to take place on schedule to examine whether the current model meets the needs of a new generation of stakeholders."

"GNSO's structure is unlikely to accommodate and anticipate a new stream of stakeholders resulting from the expansion of the TLD space. The GNSO review will be an important vehicle for considering and addressing the issue. The imbalance that is already taking place needs to be addressed by the GNSO review."

So then we need to remember that that was the direction, when the Board talked about this, of what they were thinking about. So when we look at what we're covering in the survey, I hope we're all aware that that is a part of the job in front of us, but by no means all of it. Thanks so much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Philip. Any comments or responses from Westlake?

Richard Westlake: Perhaps a very brief one. Thank you Philip for that comment. Yes, and we're very conscious of exactly that view. And as you say, our review is specifically not to recommend new structures for GNSO, but within that we are most certainly considering the issues that the GNSO needs to deal with; need to develop policy for in the future as well as currently and in the past.

So, we're absolutely focused on that area and we encourage other people to do the same. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer with an implementation comment and then a more general comment.

The implementation comment is would you please put the GNSO Review at Westlake, [governance.com](http://governance.com), email address on the page where the surveys themselves are listed if you want to encourage people to send follow-up emails. Because after having completed the survey and found that it seemed to ask lots of detailed questions but did not give me the chance to answer the questions that I thought needed to be answered, I had to open a different browser to get back to the spot where that email address was visible.

And so my more direct concern about the scope of the review echoes some of those concerns that you have heard, that it seems we are being surveyed on very specific details of the way the structures have worked, but not asked

about overall, how this serves the communities that are coming together in GNSO. And how this serve the multi-stakeholder model, and whether restructurings of GNSO processes could better serve that.

And as folks who have spent a lot of time engaged in this process, I think we could offer more useful input to those questions than ticking a bunch of boxes - agree, strongly agree, or disagree.

Colin Jackson: May I comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, go ahead Colin.

Colin Jackson: Thank you Wendy. I think you may just have booked yourself an interview by the way. But seriously, yes we've tried to balance that in the design of the survey. We tried to balance it so that those who wish to go through and tick yes, no, yes, no, agree, disagree or even no opinion, no opinion, no opinion can do that. And we tried to leave space for comment. My apologies if that wasn't clear from the outset of the survey. It was tested a few times.

The email address -- I wasn't aware it wasn't on the master Web page, but I'm sure we can get that corrected.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. Just a follow-up. While O saw the option to tick every circle, no comment, it still requires an awful lot of manual labor to get through the survey if one really wants just to answer a few pointed questions.

Colin Jackson: That was - what that one was tested a few times. There was a reason for that choice actually which was that we really need to be able to determine how far somebody goes through it before they're ready to quit the whole thing.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Method to the madness.

Colin Jackson: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: That's probably, a pretty thorough airing to the issues in and around both the 360 Review and the work of Westlake. Jenn, did you want to close with any remarks?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, thank you for the discussion. It's all very helpful to us as we continue our work as the Review working party.

For those of you who are part of our working party, we are meeting tomorrow at 5:30. I know there are a lot of other meetings going on, but it really will be important to have your participation as we discuss how we'll be moving forward and receiving the initial report and providing feedback. So that is our next big initiative as we move forward.

I also just wanted to mention, it didn't come up, but there is going to be a follow-on survey about working groups that will be sent out to the community at large, as well all of those who have taken the survey. When is that supposed to be released? Do we have a date?

Richard Westlake: It will be shortly after the close of the main survey, and the date is to be decided where the people are suffering ICANNN exhaustion in the week immediately following, whether to launch it that week or the week after.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. So look out for that additional survey about specifically working groups. And again, I encourage all of you to take the time to complete the survey.

And we understand of course, maybe not every question has addressed your concern. That is why we have the catchall question at the end and really encourage you to take the time and tell us what you think because it will be incorporated into the review and the report.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jenn. I have a last word from Ron.

Ron: Thanks Jonathan; very much appreciate it. Richard, Colin nice to see you. With Jenn and others I'm part of this group and I just - I got to this room a little bit late unfortunately, but I wanted just to ask, when the report, as the independent review is complete, to whom or to which institution and which part of this institution will you deliver it?

Will you be delivering it to the GNSO Council? Will you be delivering it to the Board? Who's actually going to get that document, and will this go through public comment before it goes to that particular body? Thank you.

Richard Westlake: Our process, if I can just answer that for you Ron, is point one is that our draft report goes to the Review - the GNSO Review body - panel.

Jonathan Robinson: Working.

Richard Westlake: Working party I should say; the GNSO Working Party in December for GNSO Review Working Party and GNSO comment and feedback.

Our subsequent report as a result of that will then be put out in the normal ICANN process for full public comment before it becomes a final report.

Ron: Great, thank you. I'm glad we got that on the table. Thank you.

Richard Westlake: Chairman could I add one final comment which is simply just before I close, I'd very much like to thank the 13 people in the room who have taken the survey this morning. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Would you like to name anyone who hasn't? No breaches of confidentiality yet. All right, so thanks. I think that was a very useful session. We let it run on a little, but it's clear that there was some strongly held and comprehensive views to be got out, so that's useful.

There are just two orients. So we'll draw line to that session, that review, the GNSO Review session closed. What we had planned prior to lunch now is a Q&A session with the Council Chair candidate which is myself.

In addition we had planned to have some time on sort of what's called open and substantial strategic discussion with a couple of items we could cover there.

Frankly after lunch we've got substantial opportunity to prepare for meetings with Board, GAC, and ccNSO tomorrow as well as with (unintelligible). So I think we can roll the strategic elements into the after lunch discussion. I feel confident that we can deal with that as well as the motions in the two to four slot.

We've got a decent lunch break prepared for an hour which is great. I believe we can maybe even access the terrace outside. So we'll talk about that in a moment.

So my suggestion to you is given this - just coming up a quarter to one now, we take the opportunity to hand the Chair of the meeting over to Volker and give you an opportunity to ask any questions or make any comments in general that you might feel about the Chairing and the role of the Chair and my role in it to date - activity to date, and perspective activity in the year ahead.

I'm very open, in my mind and together with the Vice Chair as you constructed this agenda. I don't have a fixed format or view of how we take this. I'm happy to make a couple of opening remarks and then do a Q&A.

So that's probably the way we'll do it. And if it takes five minutes it's fine. If it takes 20 minutes it's fine.

END