**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Tuesday 2 July 2013 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the Tuesday 2 July 2013 at 19:00 UTC.
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-sci-20130702-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul

Attendees:
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group – Primary
Ray Fassett – Registry Stakeholder Group - Primary Ronald Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Primary – Chair
Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP – Alternate
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC Primary
Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary – Vice-Chair
Ken Bour – guest speaker

Apologies:
Jennifer Wolfe – NCA primary

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I'd like to remind participants this conference is being recorded. If you have

any objection you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you (Kim).

Ron Andruff: So...

Julia Charvolen: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the SCI meeting on Tuesday 2nd of July 2013.

On the call today we have James Bladel, Ron Andruff, Angie Graves, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Mikey O'Connor and (Agnes Kitten) and Avri Doria and Ken Bour.

We have apologies from Jennifer Wolf. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself Julia Charvolen. (Unintelligible) please redial...

Julie Hedlund: Oh and also Julia, Ken - did you mention Ken Bour? Sorry.

Julia Charvolen: Yes I have him. I have.

Julie Hedlund: Okay sorry.

Julia Charvolen: I just - I would just like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Ron Andruff: Good afternoon everyone. Thank you for all getting on the call today. As usual we have a full schedule of things we've been discussing. So if we could just go quickly any changes to your statements of interest in the course of the last month since we met?

Hearing none we move forward to the approval of the agenda. Did all - do we have agreement on the agenda today? Very good.

We're now on Number 4, the resubmitting a motion and with 15 minutes to discuss this topic.

As we see that there were two channels to go down. And one was leave it to the discretion of the chair. And I'm sorry - or the other was to set one or more high-level criteria in this order. And there are four elements.

There's been a number of different views coming from the various constituencies as we've gone through this.

There's also a series of questions that Marika asked as we note on the bottom of this sheet we're looking at.

The first question is the question of determination, who would make a determination in terms of what has to be resubmitted words added or not.

The second has to do the PT PDP manual and is looking at the perspective of this is I think language that we had already drafted in the past or have we had some relation to because it looks very familiar.

It's about what are the requirements for this renewed vote. And the third one there, the 12 month period appears to be a long time to be able to reconsider motion.

So with each of the points at hand I'd like to take a queue to see how we'd like to begin to address this please Do I have anyone to take up the issue?

Have I fallen off the call?

Julie Hedlund: I can hear you Ron. This is Julie.

Ron Andruff: Okay. Thank you very much. Well I think the issue then comes down to if there's not - no comment coming from anyone on the call I would recommend that we take two levels of action.

We can take this back to the GNSO Council with the - for them to take the vote on whether we leave it up to the discretion of the chair or we set one or more high level criteria.

So in that case why don't we look at the criteria and determine which criteria we would like to have. And from that point we can send them the choice back to the GNSO Council.

I see James hand. Please go ahead James.

James Bladel: Thank you Ron, James Bladel speaking for transcript. And it's possible that I am misremembering either the call or I have the wrong impression from the chat on the mailing list.

But I thought that we had kind of all started to congeal around option two but we were still discussing what the criteria would be, how many and what the language should be.

But so I guess my question is, is number one still a viable option or is this group still just more about polishing what we want to say for option two?

Or did I miss a call? I guess that's a possibility as well, I completely missed the meeting where we discussed another alternative.

Ron Andruff: Thanks James. The fact is that I think this has gone kind of once around the football field and is coming back around again insomuch as there are - there was discussion about moving on just to sort of a couple of criteria then there was some discussion about the chair.

I don't think we've had enough voices to flesh this out completely so your question is not misappropriated in any way. So perhaps others might want to comment.

Am I - I never heard quite a - yes please. Go ahead James.

James Bladel: Julie was going to - I'll defer to staff sorry.

Ron Andruff: No I'm sorry go ahead.

James Bladel: She had her hand up first. Julie had her hand up...

Ron Andruff: Oh I'm sorry.

James Bladel: ...I'm sorry.

Ron Andruff: I beg your pardon. Very good, Julie please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes thank you very much Ron. This is Julie Hedlund. If you scroll down the document that I have that I have on Adobe Connect -- and I have un-synced it so you can control it yourself -- there were a couple of comments on the list that we took up at the last meeting on June 4. And I think this does speak to James's question.

We had been coalescing around option two. We had been waiting for additional comments from a couple of other groups which we did get.

And as you'll see here it was an issue of the criteria. IPC had agreed to the first two criteria listed in Item 2 and the registrars agreed with the proposed criteria under Item 2 except for 2.4.

And so actually I really should not have included the leave up to discretion of chair option for this discussion today because I have to say that that was misleading.

We really are discussing the Option 2 and the criteria there. And I think it was the lack of agreement on which criteria we wanted to use that is the issue. And then we have the additional questions for Marika. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much for that Julia. That's very helpful. That gets us all on the same page.

So coming back to that then we're looking at opportunity four different choices, love to hear from the committee what your thoughts are on these different elements before we start to address Marika's questions. James please go ahead.

James Bladel: Thank you Ron. James speaking for the transcript. And thank you Julie for clearing that up.

I remembered it the same way because originally I had been a proponent of Option 1 and I had my mind, my opinion changed on that by the discussion so that's kind of one way to help remember things is when you're wrong. So thanks for pointing that out for us.

And I wanted to just clarify that registrars it's not that we were in opposition to criteria number 2.4 I guess is what we're calling it.

It was more a function that registrars believe that if 1, 2 and 3 were adopted that 4 became redundant. I believe that was the statement that we were gathering from the feedback from registrars that if we adopted the first three that four was just more of a extraneous consideration.

So with that unfortunately as I posted in the chat box I do have an appointment that I will have to drop in a few minutes so I won't be around for the bulk of Marika's questions.

But I think if we are ready to approach council with some flavor of scenario two then I think we're on the right track. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: So but James if I also may just catch you before you go did you not specifically say one and two were your preferences or was it two and three?

James Bladel: For registrars I believe their position or the feedback that (Jennifer) and I received was that 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 were - they were supportive of those. And that they believe that 2.4 was...

Ron Andruff: Redundant, yes.

James Bladel: ...kind of baked into those other three...

Ron Andruff: Yes.

James Bladel: So that if they were adopted that 2.4 was redundant correct.

Ron Andruff: Very good. Thank you very much James. I appreciate that. And we'll take it from here then.

Thank you, so very good. So we're getting much more clarity on this. So now we're down to 2.1, two and three unless someone has an opinion as to why we should keep four in this discussion.

So hearing none we drop four. And now we're looking at the question of the three high level criteria that you're looking at here, provide recent justified submission of a motion number one. Publish the text and resubmit a motion number two. And number three require a seconded. Thoughts or comments please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Ron it's (Ann). I'm sorry I just join the call. I had a lot of trouble getting in.

Ron Andruff: Welcome (Ann), no problem. Did you...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes it's from my side. It's is not from your side but...

Ron Andruff: No not at all. Did you hear what I had just said or would you like me to repeat it?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I think that you were calling for comment on the resubmission of the motion. Is that...

Ron Andruff: Yes in fact yes, in fact we're talking about two. We have - we're more or less settled on a resubmission of a motion. There was an option one, an option two. That's been clarified by Julie that option one giving it back to discretion of the chair was not an option so it's been taken off the table.

We're now on number two. And specifically James brought up the fact that number 2.4 would be a redundant element if one through three were carried out. And none of the committee had any objection to removing it.

So now we're discussing these three level of criteria. Do we want one, two or three levels of criteria and if so why? So I've opened the floor and so your timing is excellent.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you.

Ron Andruff: So Avri, Mikey Wolf-Ulrich what are your thoughts on one, two or three?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Hello it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking here.

Ron Andruff: Yes please Wolf.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes. I find this points but it came to my mind after I saw questions from Marika with regards to the deadlines, you know, set here.

It is prior to the next GNSO Council meeting. So this includes the question for me do the question (here) as to how long time, how much time could be left, you know, from the submitting the first submission of this motion under the resubmission.

So is it more than X counter meetings or whatever to be submitted? So and that's a question for me which came up and whether we should discuss that and try to put a figure here into the criteria.

Ron Andruff: My understanding of that Wolf-Ulrich was that the motion had to be resubmitted, that when it is asked for there was a deadline and that the deadline we would put forward. But I didn't understand that to be a 12 month out or anything like that. In my view that was also a very short lead time.

Perhaps Avri might bring some thought to that. But it seems to me that was a very short lead time on the resubmission of a vote we had set the very next board next council meeting as I understood it. And there was a determination as to what that was going to be.

So this kind of takes into account what Marika is saying in her first question, what is included in a resubmission in terms of wording? And I think the language has to be very much similar. But I see Avri's raised her hand so please Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. I raised my hand because you asked me to.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: I think that certainly a year was too far out. To say next meeting could be problematic if it's having more than one meeting.

So yes if you want to put a time limit in it though I don't really think it's needed but if you want to put a time limit in I'd suggest two or three months because that could be just two or three meetings maximum.

So skipping one meeting might happen. Skipping two's probably getting too long. You might as well refile the motion. So I'd say within two months -- something like that.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Is that all right to you Wolf?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes. I agree to that. So that would be fine. I was also thinking, you know, that just the next meeting would be maybe too short. But one meeting left means a second - the following meeting could be agreeable.

Ron Andruff: I think that makes sense as well because that would give the individual that wants that mission - that motion resubmitted time to socialize it amongst his colleagues, his or her colleagues and get some consensus. So I would support that.

Is there anyone on the committee that has any issue with putting in - and the language I would look for would be the second meeting following the submission of the motion.

Seeing no one opposed then I think that we could certainly move that forward. Thank you very much Wolf and Avri.

So then the second point was to publish the text of the resubmitted motion.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Excuse me, I'm sorry Ron. I unfortunately I'm having technical difficulties. It's (Ann) and I'm not able to raise my hand.

Ron Andruff: Oh please. I'm sorry (Ann). Go ahead no problem.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I can't see anything on the screen unfortunately. But I did want to reiterate that the - as far as IPC is concerned there was only agreement to the first two items in Option 2.

And I don't know if you covered before I got on the phone that GNSO Council has now changed the time period for submission of a motion to ten calendar days effective 1159 VTC rather than the previous eight days.

Ron Andruff: That's fine (Ann). Just thank you very much for that particularly with the change so that will be I think and Julie will catch that and make that change in this document accordingly.

And with regard to the first two in fact we are actually talking about the second one as we speak. So Julie has raised her hand. Please Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes thank you Ron. And thank you (Ann). I did actually to your first point in the document that's on the screen which you can't see but at least for reference of others and for yourself there is the email that you had sent where it is true that you had noted that the IPC agreed to the first two criteria listed in Item 2, so 2.1 and 2.2.

With respect to the change for submitting a motion to ten calendar days in the conversation we just had on the time limit for resubmitting a motion I thought we discussed - so I guess what we - sorry I think I misunderstood.

So in my change it would be resubmitted by the second meeting following the resubmission of the motion following the initial motion pardon me. And then

we would include the ten calendar days. But I just want to go ahead and confirm that, that I captured that. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: That sounds fine from my point of view (Ann). Do you have any issues with that logic?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So are we saying that we will have - and I'm fortunately I'm now into the screen. But are we saying that this is going to be redrafted before it goes anywhere else to reflect that change in the - is it ten days? I'm confused, sorry.

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Ron Andruff: The answer would be yes. Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: And then with respect to I - I'm again I apologize since I got this...

Ron Andruff: No apologies necessary.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: The - what I'm trying to figure out at this point is that I heard you make a reference to publishing this but I wasn't - I didn't hear an actual consensus on the criteria.

Ron Andruff: No. What we were getting too was no on the - can you see the screen now the...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...multiple options? Okay very good. So...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh and it has the questions from Marika. Okay good. Okay.

Ron Andruff: Right. And so if you look for what's 2.2 effectively, that's what I was reading. So I - what we had agreed on, 2.1 we agreed on the timing of this now pursuant to this conversation we just had.

And 2.2 is the - is now talking about the text of the resubmission. That has relevance to the first question of Marika who makes the determination whether it considers a resubmission of a motion or whether it is a considered a new motion.

Does it have to be identical to be considered a resubmission if a few words are added or whereas clauses are introduced? Does that make it an a new motion end quote.

So I'm not sure about the rest of the committee but my view on this is that if it's a resubmission of a motion it should be a resubmission of that motion.

When you start to modify it it becomes a new motion. And I'd like to kind of open the dialogue from there.

Do you agree that it would be a new motion if in fact new words are added and new clauses are added or is it the same motion with new clauses?

And I see Avri's hand and I'm not sure you spoke up but you're certainly welcome to speak for Avri if you like.

Avri Doria: Is somebody (unintelligible)...

Ron Andruff: Avri? Avri please.

Avri Doria: Okay. I would think that it should essentially be the same wording but of course it's as subject to friendly amendment as any motion is.

So now, you know, it's always been a good question whether a person can offer their own friendly amendment and accept it themselves.

And I don't think there's ever been a question on it or a ruling on it. But it has been an accepted process.

But by and large this council works on friendly amendments. So if it's something that the original people support and accept as a friendly amendment I don't see why that would make it a different motion. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Avri.

Does anyone have any pushback on the idea that we move forward with the language that Avri and I just more or less explained with regard to resubmission?

It does not have new wording but it is subject to friendly amendments as is the standard practice today.

Very good. Could you just scroll back to number two please? Thank you.

So what we've done - what we've now done is just covered the high level criteria is one and two.

But we've heard that the IPC has a problem with recognizing the third one, a second or - of the motion from each house as a prerequisite.

And I guess I would ask you Ann what - where would you - where were you finding pushback because the - it appears to me on its face if you had two secondaries for a motion then it means that your gaining consensus. Please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thank you Ron. This is (Ann) with the IPC. And this subject
was fully addressed in a full meeting of the IPC at the ICANN Beijing meeting.

And this particular condition was discussed in terms of whether or not, you know, you would actually ever as a practical matter be able to resubmit a motion.

And I think that there was, you know, there was a lot of discussion on the point that this particular condition might in effect prevent you from ever being able to resubmit a motion for any reason...

Ron Andruff: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...just because of the structure of the council.

Ron Andruff: True. But the fact of the matter is it's an unfortunate situation we find ourselves in where we have things like in the United States of Congress that doesn't function for, you know, its own various reasons but it just doesn't function.

And the same way within the ICANN body we have a GNSO council that is not functioning as well as we would hope. But we have to hope that rules we make or propose to the GNSO Council to approve would in fact function well in a well-functioning GNSO Council.

So I find it interesting though that if I'm - if I understood you correctly you said the first part was that most of the people in the room felt that there would be a - they would not see resubmissions very often. Did I understand you correctly or perhaps I misunderstood?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes I think in terms of the just sort of the depending on the subject matter, you know, a lot of course depends on where the constituencies fall in terms of their interests.

The thought is that, you know, requiring someone from both houses might actually require somebody from if you will, the opposing house to go against a prior vote that they'd made with respect to the motion the first time that the motion was submitted.

And, you know, again whether or not that you would agree with that position that the IPC position that it shouldn't require that big of a hurdle to reintroduce in a motion.

Ron Andruff: So I am...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: They're putting somebody on the other side of the house with the - in the position of having to, you know, reverse a previous vote.

Ron Andruff: Understood. No I see I'm caught between two realists, you and Avri Doria. She notes in the chat if - (unintelligible) if you can't get someone from the other house to second it it ain't going to pass.

And so therefore if anyone has difficulty with removing then three as well and we go forward and we sent to council the set - the first and second high level criteria for the submission if we can move this forward that would be excellent.

I see Mikey's hand is up. Please go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I note that we have nobody from the contracted parties house here right now. And I think I'm a little uncomfortable making that decision without James or while somebody from the registry is (unintelligible).

I tend to agree with Avri. You know, if - I think one of the contentious issues in this -- and I have to admit I've never been on the council and feel a little bit

outside scope on this, that there's a thread on the list about this but it seems to me that the way the council's structured Avri's got the right of it.

If we can't get anybody from other house to sign on to the motion then we get into the scenario that we're trying to avoid where motions are basically reintroduced forever until they pass.

And I think that that would probably annoy both sides of the house. I'm living in a completely different situation with that very problem here in Wisconsin. You know, I don't think we want to go there. So I at a minimum I think we've got to get James back on the call and talk...

Ron Andruff: That's fine. Well you raise a good point of order. And so let's just - it's time to move on any case - in any case I've given this more time because we've really I think narrowed it down to this last issue.

Having received good input from the committee where we'll now adjourn this item to the next discussion we have in terms of a meeting. And I think from there we will note that the first bullet of Marika is no longer relevant.

We've addressed that and we've addressed a couple of other issues. We'll get a clean document back in front of us and we'll take it from there. Thank you all.

So now we're moving on to Number 4 on the agenda which is the SCI charter revision. There was some changes from Avri and from Mikey that brought the - they brought back to the charter.

There's a lot of discussion on this and there has been for some time as we know. And I'm now of a mind that we need to really take it outside of the SCI and perhaps give this discussion back to the GNSO Council as to whether or not an SCI has value or not.

I think what's happening here we're navel gazing a little bit and we've got varying opinions. We've had a very robust discussion and dialogue over the course of the last couple of years as we tried to nail out - nail down or iron out but I said the kinks that come with policy development and send that back to council for discussion.

I've enjoyed the discussion and dialogue immensely but I'm just questioning now as well whether we should be continuing. And we have Mikey's voice loud and strong that we should not. So I'm happy to have a conversation about this in more detail and certainly what I just proposed. And we've got now time on the agenda to do so.

So I'll open it up and look for discussion. Julie please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. I just wanted to clarify something that as I was looking at Mikey's changes to the latest version of the charter.

Mikey has put in there that the last quoting in the first paragraph that this is the last in a series of committees to find and implement changes to the policy development process.

Actually the Operations Steering Committee and the Policy Development Process Work Team did more than just make changes to the policy development process.

The Operations Steering Committee covered guidelines for constituencies and stakeholder groups -- quite a range of issues there.

And the Policy Development Process Team had two working groups, work teams, one that dealt with working group processes. And that one produced the working group guidelines. And then the policy development process work team did indeed produce the PDP manual.

But I just wanted to note that the scope is not limited to policy development process but at least as far as the initial, you know, scope of the PSP and the (unintelligible).

Ron Andruff: Thank you Julie, very much appreciate that. Mikey I see your hand raised.

Mikey O'Connor: Julie that's a good catch. My main point in trying to frame that was to ground this committee in that broader effort. And so I would take your thoughts as a friendly (improvement) to that paragraph. That wasn't my intent.

My main intent is to keep us a project and not turn this into this into a (unintelligible). This is something that's come up pretty late on the list. And I don't know that that's navel gazing. I think it's a very important distinction.

I mean if this is an ongoing rules committee of council that's fine. But it's a huge change from what I think the original charter was which was to be the caboose.

And so I think I have mis-framed what we're the caboose of. And so that's why I think Julie's point is very well taken and we view that as friendly.

But I also agree with Ron that it might be a good idea to take this question back to the council and just frame it as that and say, you know, look we were chartered to be a project that's the end of a series of projects.

We're considering revising that charter to become essentially a permanent subcommittee of the council is the way that I kind of view this. What do you think?

And I think of, you know, I've never sat on the council and never will because I don't think the council needs any more white guys in North America.

But I think if I was on the council I'd probably say no I don't want you to be a rules committee to the council. I want you to be the project team leader originally chartered to be. But I think they might be a good gain to ask that question.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Mikey. Any other thoughts, comments? All right then hearing none I'm going to do exactly that. We'll - I'll work with Julie. We'll frame some language and we will send it to the list and to the chair of the GNSO Council.

Wolf-Ulrich I - we are probably much too late to get on the council right now but perhaps we could do this in the form of a letter. Your thoughts?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Sorry you mean to put that thing, you know...

Ron Andruff: Not to council but something to the...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: No. I'm sorry Wolf. What I was trying to say - beg your pardon for interrupting you. I hear we have a time lag between my voice speaking and you hearing.

But I wanted to say that I'm suggesting we would send this over in the form of a letter as an advisement to bring it on to the agenda at some point. How would you see this in terms of informing the council? That's more what my question. I beg your pardon?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Well this is the way how it works. The question is whether it could be taken to the agenda of the next council meeting or not.

So this is - that's the only thing, you know. But that is for example some - for the next council meeting we shall have a pep call next Monday.

So if you put that forward with that question, you know, and we can talk about next Monday about that because we are talking about the agenda, the council meeting agenda in Durban, then it may happen.

Ron Andruff: Well it's a question of timing I'm sure. And I see Mikey has noted in the chat can the council or can the committee look at it before it goes to council? And the answer of course we will send will send it on to this committee...

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Oh yes. Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...for review. So it's a question of timing and see if we could turn something around quickly. But perhaps you could inquire with the chair and let me know Wolf-Ulrich if we're rushing for no sake or if we're rushing for good sake.

And we will try to turn something around in that regard. Does that work for you?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes. I can do that.

Ron Andruff: Very good. Thank you very much. So now that takes us to point Number 6 then...

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry Ron, I had my hand up. This is Julie.

Ron Andruff: I beg your pardon Julie. I see so many microphones lit up in my box I can't see the hands. Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Just a quick clarification for my sake. So the letter to the council is simply on the question of the scope of the SCI is that correct?

Because I don't think that everyone has necessarily agreed to the language that's in this latest version of the charter. And in fact I'd have to make some

changes to it to address, you know, the issue about the PDP language that Mikey has in there.

So just want to - I'm sorry if I'm...

Ron Andruff: Oh no, no, no, not at all. Let me tell you, you know, where we're crossing wires a little bit. This charter that we're looking at right now has not had any discussion whatsoever within the group except with a little bit online in the chat.

Now before we take a another step forward for the (forward) I'm suggesting that we will send a letter to a GNSO Council chair advising them that within the committee we have had some discussions about revising our charter.

And some members of the committee are feeling that without even getting to that we can just say so we're - now the question is do we revise our charter as a committee that goes forward or do we revise our charter as a committee that comes to an end and, you know, please advise us.

So the exact language on that we will - we can shape together and then we'll send it to, around to the committee for their review and then we'll send it on to the chair of the GNSO Council.

Julie Hedlund: Just a follow question that Ron. I'm sorry and I know...

Ron Andruff: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...Wolf-Ulrich had his hand up. As you know -- and I sent some slides earlier the - to you and Avri -- there is an update from you to the council on Saturday in Durban.

This would certainly be also a very useful discussion to have during that working session. And I'd be happy to add a little bit more language to the slides to frame this question.

I'm not saying that this would take the place of a letter to the chair but the letter to the chair then could be that this is teeing up for a discussion in Durban.

The council then does have the option in that working session to decide whether or not to add the item to its agenda for its public meeting.

Ron Andruff: Very good, thank you Julie. That's excellent. I see Wolf-Ulrich has moved from speaking to checkmark. He agrees, (Ann) agrees so excellent.

Anyone opposed to that following that process? And seeing none, sorry Wolf-Ulrich, go ahead please. And Julie I see your hand back up again. Julie?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: It was back up Julie. I would just support what Julie was saying, you know. It's a good opportunity at this Saturday meeting on council that you have - I'm not sure whether you (all) will be available for that. You know, we have a 150 minute slot for the SCI.

Ron Andruff: I am available. I have it on my schedule indeed.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes okay. So that will be the best opportunity (now) to come up with that.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. All right moving on with the agenda unless there's any other comments on that regard. I'm sorry we will not see you in Durban (Ann). I see you in the chat.

All right. We move on now to Item Number 6, the working group self-assessment. To bring this into perspective a little bit we were looking at a

handmade poll that we had designed at one point and we're wondering whether or not it would work.

We talked about the different types of language we had, did it ourselves and found out that we were lacking.

And so Ken Bour was brought in to assist us. And Ken has done some exceptional work in the last period and suggested that we can also be hard - part baking this in but is said into the actual working group charters and so forth. Add so he's done some exceptional work on that.

We understand that nothing can be shared because it's on the wiki. But there was a link sent around the perhaps you can post that link in the chat Julie so that members can quickly go to have a look at that document.

And Ken you would start and in the email you sent in last 24 hours you mentioned that you would be starting on draft two. Perhaps you could give us a quick summary of how draft one ended and where draft two is going? Thank you.

Ken Bour: Yes hi Ron. Hello everyone. The - basically the first draft of the questionnaire was an attempt to take as much material from the working group guidelines and charter that could be used to frame questions that would give us something important to learn about how well a working group functions to achieve if it did achieve its mission or if it didn't why not?

So the idea, the structure is, you know, I started with some design considerations and that - I won't go through them but there's a separate page in which I talked about a number of things and what the focus should be, certain demographic things I thought we ought to take a look at -- methodology and so forth.

And then the next thing I did was to sort of set out some learning objectives. Again I won't go through those in detail. But those were developed from the working group guidelines, charter, templates -- anything I could get my hands on and what would we like to know about the effectiveness of the working group?

And then from there I drafted the first set of questions which is under Questionnaire Draft 1.

And then I sent that material out to you guys. And one of the things for example in my first draft I used a five-point rating scale.

Avri pointed out that, you know, it might be better to constrain respondents to a seven point scale. And I absolutely agreed with that. And in fact my normal approaches is to use seven-point skills wherever possible.

And the only reason I went to five was because in the customer satisfaction survey that ICANN did that I created, management at ICANN thought we should drop from seven to five. And I kind of just remembered that and thought that might be where we would go.

But happily I have pushed it now to a seven point scale in draft V2.

The other thing that happened is Mikey O'Connor made some interesting points about what, he was asking questions around should we be looking at the PDP process while we are looking at the working groups?

They are a very intricately intertwined but they are separate and distinct issues. Nonetheless it helped me think through a way to restructure the survey which I did in Draft 2.

And I kind of re-conceptualized it as having three fundamental pieces or elements -- inputs, processes and outputs. And so I restructured it on that basis.

And as I did I noticed that he was right. One of the major inputs that the - any working group has is its charter and its mission.

And one of the things that can be included in a charter and a mission are various constraints meaning this particular working group must use the PDP process.

That's a constraint that's part of the charter and mission. And we were in evaluating that in draft one. So I added a question to capture that in draft two.

I may not have gone far enough in Mikey's view but that was one of the changes that I made. There were several others.

I noticed that we weren't looking at a few other inputs carefully enough. So the input section ended up with one, two, three, four, five, six separate questions.

The processes ended up with four, actually a couple moved, changed places. Products and outputs stayed the same and personal fulfillment largely stayed the same as - so that's where Draft 2 is that the moment.

So that's kind of a quick recognition of how we got there. What I wanted to do was actually walk through with you the structure of draft two questionnaire and just save you having to sort of fend your way through that on your own.

And then also Wolf Ulrich had raised a couple of questions which he actually posted to the page itself. And I have answered those and we can take a look at those as well.

If that's a decent summary I would try to go ahead and begin so I'll pause.

Ron Andruff: Sure Ken absolutely. No I would just - I will ask if any committee members have questions but I just would make a comment while we wait that it seems to me the seven - the going on a scale of one to seven means you're going to have much more nuance to research.

But the question is can we then use that data in a much more - can we capture that nuanced data when it's is not quite having so much let's call it sharp edges?

It's more, you know, I'm not sure if it's 506. Can we actually glean more information from that and who and how will that be done?

Ken Bour: I'll take a shot at answering. The question of scaling is an intriguing one and there's lots of points of view about it.

The - you know, there are some people actually use 11 and 13 point scales ten point scales. And some of the decisions had determined one of the questions one asks about that is do I want a midpoint?

Whether I use nine or I use eight you notice that nine will give you a midpoint right, because you'll have four on one side, four on the other then you'll have one in the center.

And so some theorists like to present respondents to survey questions with a middle of the road. I, you know, I don't really have a really strong opinion one way or another.

Others do not like that and they want to constrain and force people to pick. You know, you can't be sitting on the fence. You have to either be slightly in favor of this or slightly not in favor of it or think of it as on the scale. And so people can argue about that.

The second dimension is how much variation do you want to give people? It could be as simple as one, two, three -- high, medium and low.

Then you can go to five and then you can go to seven and so forth. Seven seems to be a very highly used scale standard in the industry because it kind of accommodates a little bit of variation and not too much to make it very hard for people to discriminate.

Just a point to point out one thing that happened here. Wolf-Ulrich asked a question about one of the scale dimensions on one of the questions.

And he said gee, I can't imagine anybody answering the question so negatively right because the way I phrased it it was, you know, it was awful right?

But that's what you do with the behaviorally anchored scale is you pick extremes and you put one extreme on one end, the other on low or high end. And then you let people try to figure out where they sit in between those extremes.

A five-point scale makes it tougher because you're always closer to the extreme, seven puts you further away.

So if you say well I thought this working group was just horrid, it was awful, it was despicable -- whatever the characteristic is on the ineffective scale I don't have to pick a one because I have a two available or a three or a four right?

If I only have five then I get closer and if I only had three my goodness I'm kind of stuck with a middle position probably because nobody wants to be on the extremes.

That - I hope that's a little bit helpful...

Ron Andruff: Very helpful, very helpful.

Ken Bour: Yes the other piece of this statistically is that the smaller the scale the more central tendency you get in the measurement.

So if you have a five-point scale you're going to find the numbers tend to center around three just because that's the way averages are.

You know, some people will give it a five, some will give it a one. The great majority will use four, three and two. And the great majority of those will be three.

And so when you get all said and done you look at your data and you say my God the average person is a three on this dimension? What have you learned? And then you have to go to the comments right?

But if you get a seven you, a seven point scale you might find that you get a 3.8 or a 2.7 or something that would be a little bit better than that middle score.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much Ken. One thing is becoming very clearly across is that you know what you're talking about. You now have effectively six or seven minutes just to hit the high points if you would on this document.

And then from there I'm going to recommend that we as a committee kind of take this up between now and our next meeting and kind of focus on this and help Ken to, you know, see any viewpoints that we have - that he's not saying by bringing our thoughts to bear.

So Ken please go ahead, you've got about seven minutes left...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Okay so let's - so the way this is structured is right now it's just all text. But obviously this would be in some tool. We can discuss that as we get further into it.

There's a welcome introduction which we basically lay out why this - who's asking these questions and why? Then there's a section that deals with personal identifying information.

Wolf-Ulrich asked, you know, do we really need that? I think the answer is yes. I've given a couple of reasons and those can be discussed separately.

The - this next section deals with the inputs which I sort of - I've talked a little bit about a few minutes ago. So we're asking - let's just take one question.

First of all everything is on a effectiveness scale. So we're look - we're asking the question how effective was this dimension?

And we're trying to be as specific as we can. So we'll look at the very first one. The working group was given a charter/mission otherwise it wouldn't be called a working group.

And we're saying in the first one is with respect to the charter and mission one highly ineffective means that the charter was confusing, vague, ill structured, unbounded, unrealistic with - in terms of time constraints unachievable so the absolute worst sort of possible condition that a charter could be in right?

Very - you would hardly ever expect to see anybody use the one but that anchors that edge. We know what that means, what highly ineffective means.

And on the other end highly effective is just the opposite. It's understandable, it's clear, well-structured. It's bounded realistic and achievable.

And so now I want some - we want the person to say with respect to the charter and mission I was given on the working group I give it a six or a three or whatever.

And each one of these questions moves it essentially the same way. So we're asking about the expertise of the working group members.

This is another input. How effective the working group can be is dependent to some extent on the expertise of its members.

How about the representativeness of the working group members which is the next one? Then we asked about the external human resources as an input to the working group and how effective or ineffective were they? And there we're talking about briefings and experts, consultants, liaisons and so forth.

Then we ask about the technical resources -- the tools the platforms and templates then the administrative resources.

And so that I think captures a pretty wide selection of what a working group might be given in terms of inputs to conduct its affairs. The next section processes...

Ron Andruff: Before you go again excuse me, before you go further would you stop for a moment? It's very clear, very helpful. I need to ask the committee members if they have any thoughts or comments on the information they're looking at now?

Is there any others - okay I'm not seeing any. I have a question for you however if I may Ken on the expertise issue. And I'm toggling back and forth between screens.

On the expertise issue the - it's a very broad question. And the reality is that within a working group you may have ten or 15 or 20 people. Fifty percent of them may be really knowledgeable, you know, advanced, usable and 50 of them, you know, maybe 50% may be completely the opposite or varying degrees.

Is there any way we could get a little more knowledge there? Because on one hand you're going to throw everyone into a basket and say poor when maybe 50% or 70% were good but a number were so overwhelmingly bad and it caused problems how could we address something like that?

Ken Bour: Yes Ron that's a great point. That issue actually pertains to every one of these questions. There could easily be, you could - representativeness could be the same sort of thing meaning I've got two out of five constituencies covered and somebody might think that's representative enough. Somebody else might think that's highly skewed group. And you're right about the expertise of course.

You know, I think what we're trying to say is, is when you're evaluating the working group I am, when I am as a member. The conditions we're really looking for are ones where it - the expertise is generally overall not effective.

So - and that's what we set up in the instructions. Thinking about the overall effectiveness of the working group recognizing it's going to have variability right, somebody's going to be an X.

If you had one expert and you had a bunch of novices somebody the team might say well we really did not have a very highly expertise group.

But I understand I don't - I'm not exactly sure how to solve the problem because you'd otherwise be asking them to evaluate each member of the group.

Ron Andruff: Knowing you Ken you will think about this one.

Ken Bour: Oh I think about it. Yes of course I'll continue to think...

Ron Andruff: Exactly no, I know your nature. I'm sorry going to let you go for a few more minutes here and if the board, if the committee will stay with me...

Ken Bour: Yes I'm going to fly through these other sections and then...

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Ken Bour: So in processes what we're looking at there now are the norms and the operations and the logistics and so forth of the group, decision-making processes that they have, again overall effectiveness.

So how participative was the climate in the working group? And what's the - how was the overall behavior of the members in terms of people being disruptive and argumentative and disrespectful and those kinds of things or collaborative consensus building?

And we went to look at the decision-making methodology, how effective was that, and then the logistics sort of planning meeting agenda -- that sort of thing.

Then in the products and output section we're basically looking at did the working group achieve its primary mission where effective means that they completely achieved it and ineffective means that they did not accomplish it. And then you'd have variations in-between.

Also the quality of the outputs, it's possible to complete a mission but do it badly right? And so we want to look both at whether it got done and then how well did it get done.

So this is the two dimensions I thought of in that section. And then after that it was sort of would we - wouldn't we be interested or at least I would be interested in knowing how people felt about the experience.

It's not - it's a slightly different dimension than the working group's effectiveness. But it would give us some interesting information about how people felt about the experience in terms of their own participation which is the first question, their own fulfillment second question.

And because if people generally found themselves being highly reworded as a result of participating in a workgroup if we got high scores overall in that I think that would be a great recruitment element to make.

And people would come onto these working groups and at the end of them they feel very good about what they did, not only their own participation but how rewarding it was for them to have done it.

Now if we get the opposite answer then there's additional work to do right, but it's important to note it seems to me.

And then I - there's some demographic type questions, you know, just how did you learn about it, how long have you been involved with ICANN?

These are variables that we can sometimes do cross correlations with to determine, you know, do we find that people who have been with ICANN longer feel this bit way bit better about this than that? And that just gives us some statistical ability to analyze the information.

And that's pretty much it except for an overall comment box at the end.

Ron Andruff: Well I think it's an exceptional piece of work from my point of view and I think the committee members would share my appreciation for, you know, the difference between what we have and where we are now. It's worlds ahead. And thank you for that.

I would as we're coming know to the end of our call I would ask - I see Mikey has a hand up. I'll come to you in a second Mikey.

I would just ask the committee to place have a good long look at this so that we can again give our last and final input to Ken and then perhaps submit it further to our others to review. So Mikey please go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I just wanted to chime in on that same theme. I think this is looking really good Ken. I think I got a little bit down the rat hole and I appreciate you accommodating my question but especially given how influx our charter is.

I think it's great that you push this through because this will stand as a great tool no matter what our charter winds up being. And I think that we will be able to make use of it Ken no matter what our charter is. So mostly just a huge thank and thumbs up for this.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Mikey. I'll chime in and thank you for having spent time with Ken working through this -- excellent. So we're now one minute past the hour. I'd like to ask if there is any other business that we need to discuss at this time?

All right then Julie unless there's anything left on the agenda that I'm not aware of we will bring this call to a close and thank everyone for their participation and look forward to seeing you all in Durban in a couple of weeks and bye for now.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you all. Thank you Ron.

Man: Bye.

END