GNSO Review Committee meeting
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 06 May 2014 at 1230 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review20140506-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

Attendees:

Osvaldo Novoa
Jennifer Wolfe
Avri Doria
Thomas Rickert

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Larisa Gurnick
Mary Wong
Rob Hoggarth
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Today's conference is being recorded, if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Please go ahead; all lines are open.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Louise). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. Welcome to the first meeting of the GNSO Review Committee on the 6th of May, 2014. On the call today we have Osvaldo Novoa, Jennifer Wolfe, Avri Doria and Thomas Rickert. We received no apology for today's call.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, (unintelligible), Rob Hogarth and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Well, hi. This is Jen. Good morning everybody. How are you doing?

Thomas Rickert: Hi, Jen. This is Thomas. Hello everybody.

Jennifer Wolfe: Hi. Well I think we have a small group. Hopefully a few others will join. And I know we've got a small group to begin with and that's one of the things we can talk about today. I think Marika circulated the agenda so if it's okay with everybody we could just jump right in to the agenda and take a look at the scope of work that's been created by Larisa for this group.

And I think we've been struggling with what to call ourselves whether it's a working party or a committee. I think we're trying to stay away from the word "working group" so it doesn't get confused with a typical PDP process because this is very different from that. So I think - I think did we decide on working party or working committee?

Thomas Rickert: Well I guess - this is Thomas speaking - I guess at least the title in square brackets for the mailing list suggests that it's a drafting team.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. I think the - the email address that we are currently using was actually one that was created quite a while back when I think we saw that we would have a little committee maybe on this project. I think that was even before the SIC announced that timeline was going to be pushed back and the group never really took off.

But, you know, for convenience sake we actually used that same email address to create this group. But I think indeed one of the conversations we'll need to have is that I think we call it for now a committee because I think initially the idea was that this would just be a small group consisting of Council members to look at aspects of the review that would touch upon the Council and possibly develop a (soft) review in parallel.

However, at the same time there now seems to be a desire from the SIC to have a GNSO review working party that would be a kind of sound board and work together with the SIC on the review and that is the document you see on the screen that was developed by Larisa who is supporting the review from a staff perspective.

So one of the conversations we may want to have is weather this group is transformed into that working party which as a result then would need to open up as currently we only have Council members as initially the idea was that this group would only focus on specific aspects related to the GNSO Council or, you know, whether there's a desire to have two separate groups or whether the working party could also have a sub team or subcommittee that eventually could look at Council aspects of the review. So I think that's one of the first items that may want to consider and discuss.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. And just following along with our agenda we can talk through the scope of work that's been outlined here. But that lends itself to then if this is the scope of work and we're also looking to potentially conduct a self-review in tandem can we create this as a primary working party or working committee to be the liaison between the GNSO as a whole and the SIC throughout the review process.

And then to the extent that we need to peel off maybe a smaller group of just Council members for the self-review we could do so. That's part of what we're looking for feedback on this call. Did - hopefully everybody had a chance to look at the document.

And you can see that the intended scope of work right now is really to serve as the liaison with the independent examiner who is assigned and with the SIC so that we can provide input on what the review criteria is, which I know is going to be a big issue, as well as how the 360 assessment works where the entire community is surveyed and then be able to provide inputs and have just got ability to liaise between the GNSO and the SIC sure that we think the review is being conducted in the way it should be.

And then again the point of doing a self-review, which we want to talk about in this call, is that once those criteria are established and there is an independent examiner and that review that we determine how do we want to conduct our own self review so that we have some good data points to compare if the independent examiner finds the same conclusions that we do or if they don't that gives us some good data points. And it would be most efficient to be able to do that at the same time using the same metrics.

So any comments or questions just on the general scope of the work that we are charged with doing? Nothing? Okay and then just in terms of timeframe to make sure everybody is comfortable, Larisa's put a nice timetable together that you can take a look at here to see come at you know, our goal is to identify, you know, what is the working party by May 14 so we should be very on track with that.

And then she's clearly mapped out over the course of the next year, you know, the number of hours that we would anticipate in terms of volunteer work on calls and then providing feedback. So want to make sure everybody is comfortable with the time commitment.

I'd like to just move on in our agenda for a moment to talk about the self-review. Does anybody have any comments or concerns about the idea of moving forward with the self-review? Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi yeah, thanks. I guess I'm wondering what we're talking about a self-review we're talking about the entire GNSO doing one correct?

Jennifer Wolfe: Well I think so, I mean, I think that's part of what we could determine is certainly we can lead that effort but I think that we would want to involve the entire GNSO in that process of a self-review. But what are your thoughts?

Avri Doria: That was my hope. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yeah absolutely. Well and I think that's part of what we will do as we move this forward is one of the metrics are determined for the independent review then at that point we determine how do we conduct it within the GNSO so that we again we're gathering same measurement criteria that within our own review process so we have good data points to compare. Marika

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just had a clarifying question I guess on the self-review because as I at least understood it that - and maybe I'm misunderstanding what are the question is, you know, GNSO Council versus GNSO community.

                   Are we basically talking about - as I understood the self-review would for example focused on, you know, GNSO operating procedures, how we're using certain aspects, are they working as intended, you know, timelines and things like that.

                   And indeed mean that involving the whole GNSO community meaning that they could all participate in that review or are you intending it to mean as well but we would also set up a self-review for the functioning of stakeholder groups and constituencies? Is that the question? And I said maybe I'm just misunderstanding and just like to get some clarification on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: I think it's a great question and I think that's part of what we can determine as part of our work. I mean, I think I would - my viewpoint would be once we determined the measurement criteria and how it's being measured then we

want to determine how broad do we want to make the self-review with the purpose of the self-review being to ensure that we're gathering data by people who are involved in the genus so.

I think that's always one of the criticisms is that these outside parties are brought in, they're essentially outside consultants who are hired to do this and they don't fully understand. And because they don't fully understand it skews their conclusions. That I think one of the criticisms.

And so if we are able to conduct our own self review using the same criteria then we should have some good data points to determine okay did we arrive at the same conclusions that the independent examiner did? And if we did then we've got good conclusions; if we didn't then we need to understand why that happened.

So I guess my thinking would be we need to determine how the 360 is going to work and what measurement criteria is used and then within this group determine okay how do we scope itself review? Does that make sense or does anybody have comments? Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa Gurnick. Hello everybody. I just wanted to clarify that as we are developing the 360s style assessment to connect that to the self-review that Jen is talking about it's the idea that that assessment would also include what I would consider a reflection of the GNSO organization on all the various criteria so the 360s style assessment would include responses from the GNSO, all the different components, as well as responses from other community members as well as the Board and staff which is what makes it a 360 style review.

So we expect to have quite a lot of connection and synergy perhaps between that aspect of the 360 assessment and the self-review that Jen is referring to.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Jen. I would like some more information on the relationship between the self-review and the 360 assessment. You know, please bear with me if you've already discussed and explained this.

But the question I'm asking myself is if we can fully design and conduct a self-review how would that play into the 360? And also a follow-up question to that would be do we know that the various groups in the GNSO will submit themselves to a self-review? Is there such commitment?

Because I understand that would be a voluntary exercise. And I think it would only make sense if everybody or if all the groups would actually subscribe to the design of the self-assessment and then actually commit to work on its basis. Because I think otherwise it would be a moot exercise if it doesn't provide a holistic view on the GNSO. Thanks, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: No I think that's a great point and perhaps that's something we should raise in the Council meeting so that as the various groups go into their own meetings, particularly in preparation for London, that issue could be discussed because it you're absolutely right, if there is an agreement to participate we're not going to have much of a self-review so I 100% agree.

So does that seem like an appropriate next step on the self-review is to raise - should we raise it with Council to then take back to their groups? Just raise the question of is there interest; does that seem like the appropriate next step on that point? Oh Thomas, I'm sorry.

Thomas Rickert: This was an old hand actually but since I hadn't taken it down...

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh okay.

Thomas Rickert: ...let me briefly take advantage of that. I guess it would make perfect sense - or at least I would support the idea of going back to Council and ask

councilors whether they could go to their respective groups and get confirmation that everybody has a fair chance to participate in the design of the self-assessment.

And either they take that chance or they miss that opportunity. But unless they object up front there is no way for them not to participate at a later stage, that the least my thinking.

Because what I think would be a waste of resources is if we work on this sort of in isolation to then find out that some groups inside the GNSO don't like the idea and are not willing to work on the basis of it.

Jennifer Wolfe: No that's a great point. Avri. Avri, I think you're muted.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I think two of us were unmuting me at the same time.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh.

Avri Doria: So I was getting re-muted. Sorry. Okay, I had two questions. One was in describing the 360 part of the 360 sounded like a self-review or maybe I'm misunderstanding. And so I'm wondering are we talking about to self-reviews or is the self-review we're talking about the third of the 360 review of us reviewing ourselves, our peers reviewing us and our superiors, you know, reviewing us. Which whether that's the language we use for 360 that seems to be kind of that style of review. So I don't really understand whether we have to self-reviews or just one.

In terms of going back to the constituencies and stakeholder groups or just the Council with the question I think we have to have done some framing of the question before we ask them - because I could just see us getting immediate feedback that sort of asks all the questions we're just starting to ask.

So I think we have to take a slight step down the what are we talking about before we actually start asking questions because we may also find, you know, that we've got a series of questions that we need input on. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Avri. That's a really great point. And, you know, to a certain extent I think you're right. As we see how the 360 take shape we may find that is functioning as a self-review and we just want the opportunity to have the raw data so that we could reach our own conclusions as opposed to conducting to set of surveys. I think that's a really great point.

Larisa, I guess as we move forward as the 360 is developed - let me just look at the timeframe. You know what was the time frame when that would be occurring?

Larisa Gurnick: Sure, this is Larisa Gurnick. The timeframe for the 360 is to kick it off in pretty short order actually middle of June so that we give people plenty of time to respond. And as you can see in the timeline we would hope to get summary of results by the end of July.

Jennifer Wolfe: So the framing of the 360 will be occurring essentially in the next 60 days is that right?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct. And it was our hope that the working party, for lack of a different term for now, or committee, would be assembled in time and that would become really one of the first areas of focus for us is to take the criteria that we've been collecting in draft mode and get input and feedback on how to take that criteria and apply it to the GNSO review and specifically the 360.

And then the 360 in itself becomes the starting point for the independent examiner's review for one of the early data inputs into that review.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Jen. In response to Avri's comment my suggestion to go back to counsel was intended to take a slightly different route. Avri, I think you're perfectly correct in assuming that various groups will ask instantly what questions they would be asked and what they would need to respond to.

I was more concerned about process. I think it doesn't do any harm, you know, to say I think it's inevitably required for us to get the buy-in from the Council, i.e. from the councilors after having consulted with their respective groups on the procedural approach which, as I understand, would be notifying the GNSO of the overall approach, asking them whether they would be happy with a subcommittee - which would be us designing the questionnaire for the self-review, them getting an opportunity to collaborate with us.

And then once the self-assessment format is finalized that than the groups would respond to it. And I think that's different approach from asking what questions might ultimately be asked because that certainly we don't yet know. So I guess I'd like to get the buy-in from all GNSO groups that this path is the right one to pursue.

But what I guess is also required and that's the question that I've asked earlier and that Avri has sort of echoed and both Jen and Larisa you've started getting answers to that. But I guess we haven't yet fully understood - or at least I haven't fully understood - how the self-review would fit in with the 360. And there would be follow up questions such as is the independent reviewer required to build on what we do regardless of what it is that we do.

Or is it where possible that the independent reviewer says okay the format for self-review that's something that I don't like; I want us to take a completely

different route. So I think we should brief counsel with the overall architecture of this approach.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Thomas. And I see Avri's hand is up. I'll just comment briefly. I think a lot of this is we do have to see how the 360 shapes up. And just looking at the timeframe I think we have a Council meeting this Thursday and then again on June 5 prior to the London meeting.

So to the extent we want to see and gather more information before we present this to Council that could be one way forward. But I'll stop. Avri, go ahead please.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. So if I understand we have already sort of been informed that there is going to be a self-review by the GNSO as part of the SIC-defined 360. That seems to be something that, as far as I could tell, is already determined. So I'm not sure let utility various in asking, do we agree to do it although perhaps there is utility in us actually asking the question or at least letting the Council know that we will be doing a self-review as part of the Board SIC-determined 360. So that being that.

In terms of going - what I was thinking of, Thomas, in terms of asking more detailed questions was not so far as to ask that specific question but to sort of ask in the category. And there's the category of questions about PDP and working group processes, how does that work.

There's a question about - various questions about (representivity) of Council. There's questions about structures of houses. There's questions about the organization of stakeholder groups and still from the top level, not getting into the bottom up part of a constituency defining a stakeholder group but the SIC is involved in determining how that evolved.

So I wasn't really looking for specific questions that we would go back to sort of - for the part of our self-review that we may be able to self-determine

because they'll be a predetermined part that is SIC defined and then there may be a self-defined part of self-review, a GNSO defined part of self-review in the GNSO part.

How deep do we want to go on asking ourselves questions about ourselves? I figure on the SIC part we have nothing to say about it. We can decide to answer or not answer but the Board is going to impose what the Board imposes being that it's the Board SIC and that's what they do.

So those are the kinds of questions I've got still. But I think when we go to Council we still have to be able to explain to them how we understand - I guess it's you Jen that's got that task of somehow explaining to them what's going on and what question we are actually asking them. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Relative to the construct of the 360 and some of the things that the SIC, and Ray in particular, has been discussing with the GNSO Council as part of the development of the approach to the GNSO review is that there would be quite a lot of collaboration and input from the GNSO as the 360 is being framed.

This was a new concept; it hadn't been used in the review process before. And it was the hope that the GNSO review working party would be able to provide quite a lot of considerable input into the process so that as those questions involved it would be reflective of the kinds of areas and criteria that would be appropriate and not just developed by someone outside of the organization. So that is why it be independent examiner will not be developing the 360.

Jennifer Wolfe: Great. And I think everybody's got really good points here is that we have to see how the 360 is shaped because you're right, Avri, we are going to

provide input the ultimately it's that SIC that gives the final okay on the criteria and how the 360 is going to work.

So I think to some extent we have to allow this to evolve so that as that 360 we provide input, we evaluate do we like it? Is there anything that we think we should add or expand within our own self review? And then we could frame up the self-review piece to be our own, as the word self-determined scope.

So to the extent that the 360 mirrors what we think should happen then I think we could use that same data. If we think more is needed than we could layer on our additional, you know, surveys of the groups and the community to gather additional data points.

I think ultimately the goal with the self-review is that we are taking some responsibility of evaluating the same data that's gathered and running it through our lands versus the Independent lens. Larisa, is that still your hand up or was that from before?

Larisa Gurnick: Sorry.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, no, no, that's okay I didn't know you have anything else to add. Does that make sense to everyone that, I mean, I think we have to allow this to evolve. We don't have to have all of the answers today. But I think really looking at that time frame within - before the London meeting the 360 should be framed right?

So if we should set our goal that by the time we get to the London meeting we could really be framing and determining do we need additional self-review and if so, you know, to what extent and how do we frame that and then gathering input at that point in time.

Avri, I see you have a check, I guess you agree with that? Does that make sense to everyone? Okay well good well then that may be a way forward on

the self-review is we'll allow that to evolve with the time frame that as we see the 360 take shape then we determine and make recommendations to the Council and the GNSO on how a self-review could be framed and conducted on top of that.

So than just moving on in our agenda the next question that we had to discuss was the size and composition of this committee. There has been interest expressed by the Brand Registry Group. Of course we need to make sure there's complete transparency so that anyone who wants to contribute to this group or provide input can do so.

But wanted to get everyone's opinion on who else should be a part of this. And Marika, I see your hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. We had a brief conversation this morning with the Council chairs in preparation for the call on Thursday. And we also spoke about the GNSO review and agenda item that is on there. And one suggestion that was made that is indeed there's probably need to broaden the membership but at the same time I guess that needs to be a kind of balance and, you know, a huge group may not be constructed in actually doing this work.

One way of moving forward may be to put out a call for interest to see, you know, who else or how many others are interested to participate in this work as well clearly outlining what the time requirements may be and also noting that, indeed depending on the feedback received there may be a need to, you know, balance the group or (unintelligible) but basically select a number of participants. And that may be a way of moving forward.

And obviously if, you know, there's limited interest in - when we have a good group moving forward there's no need to have any kind of selection or, you know, rebalancing. But I think we may need to think about, you know, how to make sure I think the group reflects as well the device or tea in the GNSO

community and at the same time making sure as well that it maintains a workable number to conduct these kind of conversations.

Jennifer Wolfe: So any comments on extending the invitation to a larger group? I mean, we've got a pretty small group here so, you know, I don't think we're at risk of being flooded but what are thoughts? Should we open this up to a wider group beyond Council?

One per - what are you saying Avri - one - go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah so if we want this to sort of be accountably representative what I was saying is there should be at least one version from each stakeholder group in this. And, you know, and I'm not saying limiting them just saying at least one. Perhaps it's getting larger and it's actually one per constituency and Registry Stakeholder Group interest groups since they formalized the notion of interest groups in the same sense we in the non-contracted parties house deal with constituencies one way or another.

So, you know, that seems - now in terms of limiting it to Council members I don't see a reason especially if we think scope is beyond - and the fact it looks like SIC is intending a scope that is beyond just Council working group and PDP practice.

If it is indeed the wider scope on the GNSO then I think we should be able to draw the group members from that. I don't think we wanted to get too big but I do think we have to take for ourselves review an adequate scope so that everyone, you know, every grouping feels represented. Thanks.

Jennifer Wolfe: So is there consensus then we should extend an invitation to the larger community? I know Philip from the Brand Registry Group has said he would like to be involved; he represents a large group of the new dotBrands. I mean, I guess I look at it I don't see, you know, if there are people interested in participating and this is supposed to be representative of the community

we should invite those who have an interest, you know, as long as, you know, the group doesn't become too unwieldy. Any thoughts on that? Okay.

So maybe go ahead and extend the invitation out to the broader community? Is this something you think we need to take to Council? Marika, sorry, just...

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I think you already went to the point I think indeed as the Council meeting on Thursday would be very good probably to, you know, provide an update and already indicate that.

And I'm happy then to work with you or maybe writing up a small, you know, call for volunteers or call for expressions of interest at least I think reflecting, you know, what this group and probably attaching as well the document we have here and making very clear that of course a certain time commitment is expected in doing this work And that indeed quite some work might need to take place between now and London on the 360 so really making sure as well that people understand what they are signing up for.

Jennifer Wolfe: Right. I think that makes sense. Does anybody have an objection to that approach? Okay so we'll add that. Marika, I haven't seen the agenda for the Council meeting on Thursday. I assume we have a slot on the agenda is that right or...

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes, that's correct.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Okay. Okay so then we can just raise that issue in the call on Thursday, does that work for everyone? On that issue. Okay there's no objection.

All right so moving on to the last couple of items on our agenda, the frequency of meetings. Is this something - is there any general consensus should this be an every other week? I mean, we've got a lot to do between now and June. So probably initially we may need to have an every other

week meeting and then once we get to the - once the 360 is framed and we determine what sort of self-review looks like we might be able to segment the meetings more tailored to the schedule.

We are already in May. Yes you're right. Okay, weekly? Weekly? Okay so weekly meetings. So do we want to send out - will send out a Doodle poll to try to get a weekly meeting set does that sound good to everyone for now?

So I think what we could look at is a weekly meetings through the London meeting and then once we get to that point we could take a look at what the schedule looks like thereafter because it may spread out a bit more at that point in time so we wouldn't need to meet weekly. Does that make sense? Yes? Okay.

So, Marika or Larisa, can you help With the Doodle poll?

Marika Konings: Yes, we'll work on that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Perfect. Perfect. And then the webinar preparation, we have the webinar scheduled for tomorrow. And what's the update on how many have signed up for it?

Larisa Gurnick: We have about 50 - this is Larisa - we have about 50 people so far.

Jennifer Wolfe: Oh that's great. That's a good number. So, Larisa, do you want to just overview how the webinar is scheduled for tomorrow?

Larisa Gurnick: Sure. Happy to do that. For those of you that may have seen the presentation that was done in Singapore that Ray came to visit I think it was the GNSO Council this presentation will build on that. And I see it coming up on the screen.

So it's intended to provide an overview for people to understand what the process is and the different steps, the roles and responsibilities of the different parties, the Structural Improvement Committee, staff, the working party and so on and the independent examiner.

And really it's intended to familiarize people with the process, the timeline and the approach and collect feedback on that as well as any other questions or concerns.

Jennifer Wolfe: And, Larisa, Ray is presenting most of this with you and then you asked me to step in on the 360 piece is that correct? That's how we framed it?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes that's correct. Ray will do an introduction up front then I will present most of the slides. And I thought it would be really helpful, Jen, if you could speak to the 360...

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure.

Larisa Gurnick: ...Particularly because there's been some conversations about the self-review and, you know, as we had in this meeting so - to express some clarity as to how we envision this working and to make sure that there's no overlap or, you know, the sense that it's getting confusing. So that would be terrific.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Any comments or questions about the weather in terms of kicking this off with the community? I think it should be the fairly straightforward but does anybody have anything they want to add? No? Okay. So next steps is we will send out a Doodle poll to get a regular meeting set.

And our first order of business will then be working on the scope of the 360. And we'll take to the Council on Thursday the composition of this committee so to the extent we need to extend invitations further we can do so. And we can address Brand Registry Group interests at the Council level.

Any other comments? Marika? Larisa? Anything else that I have missed or should hit?

Marika Konings: No, not from my side.

Larisa Gurnick: Nothing from here either. Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay. Anyone else, any final comments? Okay, well great. Well thank you. I appreciate everybody's time. I appreciate you coming to the call and look forward to working with you over the next couple of months to frame up this review.

Everybody have a great day.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Jen. Bye-bye, everybody.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jen, everybody. Bye.

Jennifer Wolfe: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Louise), you may now stop the recordings.

Coordinator: Thank you for participating in today's conference call. You may now disconnect.

END