

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Tuesday 4 June 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 4 June 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-20130604-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#may>

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 Knoblen – ISPCP – Primary
Mikey O’Connor – ISPCP – Alternate
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC Primary
Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary – Vice-Chair
Mary Wong – NCUC – Primary
Amr Elsadr – NCUC - Alternate
Jennifer Wolfe – NCA primary
Ken Bour – guest speaker

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Gery Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the SCI meeting on Tuesday 4 of June, 2013. On the call today we have James Bladel, Ray Fassett, Ron Andruff, Angie Graves, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Mary Wong, Amr Elsadr, Jennifer Wolfe and Ken Bour. We have apologies from Avri Doria. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Glen de Saint G ry and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you. And I see Mikey has just joined the call.

Ron Andruff: Very good. Thank you very much. This is Ron Andruff for the record. Thank you all very much for getting this on your schedule and for having another good turnout. Much appreciated.

We'll pick this up any other business but I had asked if we could take this call again within two weeks of the last one just to finish up a couple of items and then the next call will be probably at the meeting in Durban itself. But as I say we can discuss that a little bit more. Just wanted to give you a heads up that we will not be calling on you again in two weeks but rather seeing each other face to face there.

So thank you all for coming today. I'd like to start the meeting with the statements of interest and ask if anyone has any changes to their SOIs since we've last met. Hearing none we'll note that in the record and we will continue then with the agenda item Number 3 which is the approval of the agenda.

I have to thank Julie for getting these out virtually right after our calls so everyone has time to review these and to add any thoughts that they would like to bring to the agendas so going forward please feel free to do so if you have not already thought about it.

But as for today's agenda does anyone have anything they would like to add to the agenda?

Julie Hedlund: Ron, this is Julie. I'm sorry if I missed it but as any other business did you mention that we would talk about possible Durban meeting?

Ron Andruff: That's it. We'll pick that up then, Julie. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Ron Andruff: All right then moving along to the SCI charter revision. We had the big piece of work on our last call and that was the discussion around full or rough consensus. And the committee came to the determination that full consensus would be appropriate and so that has been added back into this redlined version that we're seeing.

The - I took the time to give it a read through on the clean version prior to this call. And I'm very happy to know - very happy to know that it's working, for my part, very well.

For the road noise I'm seeing in the Chat, yes, indeed I have some road noise outside my window but I can't close that window so I apologize from time to time when that happens.

Coming back to the item at hand, the charter revision, I'd like to open the floor to any thoughts or comments with regard to where the revision stands at this point. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you. This is Anne Aikman-Scalese with IPC. And I'm a little bit in the dark on the charter revision. I wanted to ask just the process question because, as you know, Ron, J. Scott had resigned. And I don't know at what point his participation in this charter revision work team ended.

And I personally, you know, as you know I was not on the last call because of my son's graduation from college. And I personally have not read this and don't know where it stands in terms of IPC participation.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Anne. I trust that your son's graduation was a pleasant one.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Very pleasant. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Very good. Congratulations. With regard to the charter itself there was really a couple of things. And just to actually - Mikey was not current - or was not on the committee at the time and there are also perhaps a few others.

What happened was our SCI has been functional now for I think going on three years, maybe a little bit longer. And it was time - when I came on as the chair I went back and reviewed the original charter and there was a lot of language in there that had no relevance to where we are today.

And as part of ICANN's ongoing process we try to keep our charters up to date so felt it was time to give that a review. I asked a sub committee of volunteers to take a shot at trying to clean up that language. And I understand they had a couple of calls. And what we're looking at now is the marked up version of that.

And what we would like to do - there were two key elements in there; one, removing the outdated language and, two, I brought forward the discussion of whether we should have full consensus or rough consensus in the determinations that we send back to the GNSO Council.

And the committee felt that - and that was the basis of last week's work. The committee felt that it was better to stay in full consensus rather than rough consensus and that's where we ended up the work from last week.

So the document was circulated by Julie for us to review and to bring their thoughts to it. And so today's discussion we've got about 15-20 minutes just to kind of discuss the various elements that are in this charter. And if anyone has any problems with any particular language or would like to see something else added in.

So that's really where we're at right now. There's no - there was nothing lost in the handover from J. Scott to you if I could put it in those terms.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So this draft - excuse me, just asking for the clarification, Ron.
And it's Anne again with IPC. What - this draft represents something that J. Scott also participated in except for the issue that was addressed in the last call in relation to full consensus or rough consensus?

Ron Andruff: That's correct.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you.

Ron Andruff: Yeah. So has anyone had a chance to actually go through the review of this document in this last period? And if so do you have any thoughts? If we haven't gone through it then we might just take some time now because we have time on our schedule to actually start to review the document. It's actually quite short. And we might start breaking up those parts. But first I'll take a queue on just general comments or thoughts?

So, Julie, would you mind just expanding that, just bringing the text or making the text a little bit larger and we'll just look at the first section, General.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I can do that if I - though if I make the text bigger the comments aren't going to show completely - roll over to them. I think I have un-synced it, by the way so that people can scroll it themselves. Could somebody give that a try? Oops, now it went back.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: So that if you want to make it larger or, you know, go down through the pages I think you can do it yourself.

Ron Andruff: Oh, very good. Yes, in fact we can.

Julie Hedlund: Good.

Ron Andruff: So if you go down to the bottom of the page and click on the plus sign, everyone, we can actually make this text large enough so we can read. And so if you look to the right you'll see J. Scott and Avri's comments and others. And this was the language here where we had - under Avri's comment, you'll see the reference to OSC and PPSC and others.

And those were the elements that did not have relevance to this document. So that's where we started. And you could see what's been deleted. And as it stands right now it basically says that the Standing Committee on Improvements is responsible for reviewing and assessing the effective functioning of the GNSO Procedures and Working Group Guidelines. Its tasks include making recommendations.

A request for those procedures and guidelines that have been identified as presenting immediate problems or on periodic time scale for procedures and guidelines in order to identify possible issues and/or improvements to be defined by the SCI.

And then finally the SCI is also responsible for considering requests, issues related to GNSO Council processes and procedures and to working group guidelines.

So that's the general preamble. Mikey, I see your hand up; please go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi all. This is Mikey. This is a massive change but in the last line of that section I think there's a typo. It should probably read, "...chartered..." past tense, "...by the GNSO Council." Otherwise I don't think it makes sense.

Ron Andruff: You're referring to the last sentence in the General section that begins in red text, "The SCI is..."

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: Okay. Let's have a look at that. "The SCI is also responsible for considering requests concerning issues related to - issues related to the GNSO Council Processes and Procedures and to the Working Group Guidelines that have been identified either by the GNSO Council or a group chartered..." correct, "...by the GNSO Council as needing discussion."

So there's two words. Insert to, "...related to the GNSO Council." And, "...chartered by the GNSO Council." Thank you for bringing that forward. So we'll just continue to go through this document if it's okay with everyone for the next few minutes. And then if others have comments they want to bring to the list afterwards then please feel free to do so. We'll certainly start talking about it now.

Yes, and Mary notes there's a capitalization issue on Working Group. So if we scroll down to the next section, Working Methods, there was not a lot of changes in this section. As you can see all of the deletions and additions really refer to the first section.

But it comes to this paragraph that begins - the fourth paragraph down, "For items that are submitted for review on request, the SCI expects to receive detailed input from the group affected by the process/operational change concerned. Such requests could be made by either the GNSO Council or a group chartered by the GNSO Council in order to have comprehensive information on the issue available to the SCI."

"The request should provide the following information." And it lists, "Which group do you represent? To which rules or processes do you refer. Please outline the problems. What specific changes do you propose to address? The identified problems. And do you have any additional suggestions for making the rules/processes easier to administer?"

"One member of the group that submitted the request should already be represented in the SCI, be nominated as an observer to the SCI until the

review of the issue in question has been completed." Comments or issue?

Anne, I see your hand. Please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you. It was actually, again, just sort of a typo in this section. It seems that it should say, "...on the issue available to SCI."

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: It seems to say the request should provide the following information not - maybe I...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Yeah, no that's fine. That's fine, Anne. If you would like to just, you know, word-smith that one and post it in the Chat what you're thinking because, I agree, that's kind of a clumsy statement. "In order to have comprehensive information on the issue available to the SCI..." seems a little clumsy. And we could certainly clean that up.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: And then I think, Ron, that up in the General section when Mikey was commenting on the last sentence we were actually looking for the preposition 'by' the GNSO Council. When you say, "...that have been identified either by the GNSO Council or a group chartered by the GNSO Council as needing discussion."

Ron Andruff: Right.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Rather than to.

Ron Andruff: No, it was actually - I was referring to above that. In fact it says - the very first sentence. "The SCI is also responsible for considering requests concerning issues related to..."

Anne Aikman-Scalese: To, oh okay.

Ron Andruff: "...the GNSO Council processes" the word 'to' is missing there "...that have been identified by either the Council and then chartered..."

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh, "That has been identified either..."

Ron Andruff: "Either by the GNSO Council."

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: It's - right now it says "...by either..." and that's - again that could be corrected. Either by the GNSO Council, I think that makes sense.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, generally speaking - again this is Anne with IPC. I - just reacting first time to this document so I don't expect to, you know, obtain any closure on IPC point of view in this particular call. When we issue the revision that will come after this call then I'll be able to, you know, put this charter revision to the IPC so thank you.

Ron Andruff: Exactly, Anne. Thank you very much. That's my hope that we can kind of go through this today altogether, make sure that we're more or less satisfied so we can get it out to our constituencies and then when we convene in Durban we can bring all that to the table. Thank you.

Mikey, I see your hand is up. Please.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Ron. It's Mikey. I'm on the bulleted list in Working Method. And this is a substantive question rather than a typo. I think this is where - if you look at

the deleted thing J. Scott deleted a phrase, "Implemented by the OSC." And then there are four other things that were deleted but it's squished out of this PDF. And I plead guilt, I should probably go back to the Word document and open those up.

But it seems to me that this is the big change is that we're changing our charter from being a group that was supposed to ride herd on stuff that was done during the GNSO reforms to being a permanent rules committee, if you will. And I don't, you know, I'm a newbie, I'm an alternate. I don't have real strong opinions. We can run back and I defer to those of you who have been on this the whole way.

But it seems to me that this is the key point of discussion in this document. I'd sort of like to hear from those of you who have been in on this for a longer time sort of what the pros and cons are of doing that at least as a way to record why we're doing it. Because this document transmogrifies us into something that has no sunset and yet has pretty substantial power. So that seems like a worthy task. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Certainly, Mikey. One correction and that is that we don't make rules. What would happen here is that when policy is established and they put that policy into action and then it's not functioning the way it had been envisioned because of one issue or another it's then kicked over to us to have a longer look at it. Hence, members from all of the constituencies are party to the SCI.

And our job is really - I use the example, knocking the rough edges off the wheel so it turns more smoothly. Or look at it say, you know what, it's not such an issue that we think we need to make any changes to it. And let's watch and put it out there on the watch list and come back and revisit it one year from now and see how - whether or not it kind of found its way into a proper development within the policy body.

So that's the most important thing to know about this SCI is that we do not make policy; what we do is we review issues that aren't - that are policy issues that aren't working in practice as we - as they had been seen in theory.

But I'd also ask Wolf-Ulrich if he might chime in a little bit because my understanding is that the SCI is going forward now on a more permanent fashion as much because the GNSO Council is happy to have us here doing this work.

Wolf-Ulrich, would you mind if I impose on you to add some thoughts to that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Hi, good evening. Thank you, Ron. So that's what I heard from Mikey's question, well, to understand the step from the beginning of the SCI where we have been mandated from the - from the GNSO - the old GNSO improvements process and through these different organizations like the OSC and the PPSC and all the stuff which they produced.

So the mandate was coming from that time just look at this, how this evolves, the (start) which was produced from these groups. And if there are problems then the SCI might be the one - the body to solve those problems or to come up with recommendations, well, to bring the processes in line with the requirements.

So right now this time - that was the discussion before you joined, Mikey. The SCI this time seemed to be outdated since the OSC and the PPSC and those organizations doesn't exist anymore. It's just the groups - the working groups that are existing and it's the GNSO itself and there are the rules and there are the working group procedures.

So it was the question, well, then to polish the mandate in that way that it is actualized, you know, and gets rid of this reference to the OSC and the PPSC. And that is where it comes from. So it's not a term that - what Ron

was saying that the SCI is now going the way, well, to interfere in the policy itself rather than to, well, to update the mandate regarding these - the processes. That's how I - and that was what was discussed.

If you have doubts that this is reflected in the right way here or that you are missing that I think we should be open, well, to discuss that.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. For those - just to make everyone informed the reason I asked Wolf to speak was because he was the first chair and chaired the committee for a couple of years. He's also been a member of the GNSO Council through that period and to this day so he has a little bit of background - more background on that.

Mikey, please go ahead. I see your hand.

Mikey O'Connor: Well thanks to both of you for the background. It seems to me that this is still a pretty fundamental change. You know, if you read the name of this committee, it's Standing Committee on Improvements. And I think originally that improvements that were being referred to are improvements flowing out of those committees so improvements that - in the past.

And some of those improvements needed some rough edges taken off and the original committees that created them are gone. And so it's our job to look at those improvements introduced in the past if there are problems with them.

This charter is - so you might say that the full name of that group is Standing Committee on Improvements made during the GNSO improvements process.

Ron Andruff: Mikey, if I could just...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: If I could just interrupt just to put a clarification?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Ron, you know, you complain when other people interrupt you, if you would let me finish my sentence then you can insert yours. Is that all right?

Ron Andruff: I just wanted to point out that we were resubmitting a motion is one of the things on our list today, it's not from the past. That's what I...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Well I understand that, Ron. And that's part of the reason I'm concerned because it seems to me that what we are doing with this revision is we are changing our title and changing our charter to a Standing Committee on Improving the GNSO in the future. And that's a pretty substantive change.

I don't necessarily hold a view one way or the other but one version of this charter is that we are the caboose that wraps up a process in the past. And this new version is we are the place to bring improvements to the GNSO in the future. And those are very different charters.

So the words don't change very much but the meaning changes a lot. And I'd like to have some pretty substantial discussion about the merits of that.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Mikey. Wolf, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, thanks. Thanks, Mikey. Well I think that is definitely a misunderstanding; I think so. And so because I have never approached this discussion in that way, well, to come up that the SCI should - a body, well, to improve the GNSO.

You know, the word improvement just came from that - from the old time, you know, when the GNSO improvements project was established. And then

afterwards it was - we were thinking about the name, you know, which is close to that project because it was related to the outcome of that project.

And that should stay, really. So if you think, you know, you read that from the definitions here in the charter and from the charter itself and from the name of this committee then we should really discuss that because that was not intended.

The intention is still related to the outcome to the existing GNSO structure and the rules including PDP rules and working group rules, guideline rules including - which charter we have.

So to improve this in the sense if they are (unintelligible) that and if we are mandated by the Council or a group chartered by the Council, well, to do so. And we should stay with that. And if the wording doesn't say that then let's discuss it how we can improve the wording. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you. This is Anne with IPC. And I guess my question is about the meaning of the language of the original charter where, you know, maybe Mikey knows, maybe others know. When we look at those two bullet points in the general category there are a couple of phrases that kind of pop out in terms of what's the mission of SCI.

The first bullet point says on request so trying to understand what did the GNSO mean when they were speaking about, you know, what request that they could make.

And then in the second bullet point there's this phrase, "periodic time scale" and that seems to imply some sort of, you know, ongoing review of something. And, you know, I'm probably as much at a loss in terms of, you know, lacking history with the original purpose and charter.

But the periodic time scale question makes me think that there is some kind of ongoing responsibility intended. I know that folks have mentioned in the past, for example, Avri and J. Scott and others, that after a certain period of time with respect to the adoption of the PDP manual that there will be SCI review of that PDP manual process and that's supposed to occur at some point in the future.

And then, you know, as Ron was pointing out there was this request recently from GNSO where I don't know, I guess they think it's within charter to ask about resubmitting a motion. So I guess what I'm wondering is do we want to say to GNSO, you know, we believe that these charter changes reflect, you know, your current practice but want to point out that we're not certain that this is how you intend this group to operate.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Anne. In fact that has been communicated to the GNSO chair that we are actually reviewing our charter because it's a old historic document that we would bring it back to their attention. But in the meantime since the implementation issues from the review have all passed and we've been looking at now more current things that the mandate has been maintained by the Council, in fact.

Ray, please go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Thank you, Ron. Ray Fassett. I'll provide what I hope is constructive perspective to Mikey's question. The origination of this group, I think, goes back to the days of the GNSO improvements as it relates to the GNSO Operating Procedures which had not been updated since the days of the DNSL.

So that was a task that we had put together and update the DNSO in order to provide the GNSO a set of operating procedures in order to function as a

group. That was done in, what, 2008? Maybe Julie can refresh my memory on the date on that.

And then because these were new operating procedures for the GNSO, never before implemented in some ways, in many ways, not all but most, it was not known at the time how they would actually work in practice.

So the purpose of the SCI was to have as a body where those that are actually involved in the GNSO, its council members, etcetera, those involved in working groups potentially, could submit something back to the SCI for a review that a certain procedure that was - that's in the new Operating Procedure or at that time were new, they're not new now but at the time were new, are not functioning properly or could be improved and can you look at this? And that would be the purpose of this body.

So I think to Mikey's point it was more of reactive standing committee as opposed to a proactive standing committee, if I understand the distinctions here, where the SCI in and of itself in a vacuum, say, potentially could, you know, offer improvements on the GNSO Operating Procedures.

But I think that is meant to be a scope of the Standing Committee is the Operating Procedures themselves, any changes or modifications or reviews periodic or otherwise of those procedures triggered by somebody who's actually having to work within those operating procedures vis-à-vis the council members want to have such a thing reviewed.

And there is, therefore, a standing committee, to take that task on versus nothing. So that's my recollection. I hope that's constructive and helpful.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Ray. And in fact Julie has responded to your question and said that the GNSO improvements process started in 2008, as you had said, and extended into 2010.

Wolf, I'll let you take the floor please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, thank you. And thank you, Ray, you explained it comprehensively what happened that time. Just to add on this point and we had this discussion already at the beginning of the SCI, you know, two or almost three years ago when we drafted the original charter.

And that was about those two points on general, the question whether the SCI should be - should work on a reactive basis or on a proactive basis or both. And we had this extensive discussion about that. And we were of the opinion at that time, okay, let's not exclude the active part because it may - it could lead to a point that the SCI could get forward and if they find out any problem with some rules they could draw attention to that - to the Council and to that.

But it was the thing not to exclude. But when it came then to the implementation of this charter, so when we started really to work on that, I remember, I raised this question to the committee as well how shall we, in practice, act and work here.

And there was the opinion at that time, well, let's - we don't like to start really proactively; let's look at that - what's coming in to the committee from outside, from the other groups dealing with the improved procedures that time. And if there are problems then let's deal with that.

And that was the reason why it started really slowly, let me say, with that work. So at the beginning we didn't have really many meetings and not even monthly meetings sometimes because there was, you know, there was no experience enough from the group dealing with the procedures.

And then it started. And there was a time when it came to that point that we had these biweekly meetings because we had a lot of things to do. And that's

different. So it's just those points coming back to that, the active point is, well, it's not a must; it is just to be comprehensive.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. Mikey, I'll give you the last word on this and we'll move on to the next topic. Please. Oh he's dropped off. Are you available, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Oops, sorry, wrong phone. Wrong button. There now it should work.

Ron Andruff: Good.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, all. That's very helpful. I'm going to drag us right back up to the - pretty much to the very top of the document where Avri deleted the phrase, "Recommendations provided by the various steering committees and approved by the GNSO." That to me is that backward-looking thing.

So if there is a question or a problem that people in the working groups or on the Council have that flowed out of that project. It's pretty clear to me that that belongs here because we're the caboose that ends that process.

That was deleted. And so let me give you an example. Let's say that I am sitting here in a working group, we've actually got an issue like this that's perking along right now; I'm not ready to reveal it or act on it. But I've got an interesting puzzler that I'm working on.

And let's say that it doesn't have anything to do with the work that flowed out of those committees; it's a problem that existed before the improvements and it's - not a problem in the bad sense but a puzzle that existed before the improvements work took place and it still exists today.

Under the old charter I would not have thought to bring that puzzle to this group because that's outside of the scope of this group; this group is supposed to knock the rough edges off of things introduced during that project.

Under this charter it seems to me that that would be in scope and thus this committee would last forever because there will always be things that people want to bring forward as improvements to the process.

And as I said at the top, I don't know where I stand on this but I don't think this language makes very clear what our intent is. And so I'm going to keep chipping away on this. And I have a lot of access to Wolf-Ulrich in Durban that this might occur over a beer or two.

But I am really curious about this and I think it's a pretty fundamental change to our charter that we should go into with our eyes open. So thanks for taking all that time for me.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Mikey, for bringing it up. And thanks, everyone, for your input. Ray, I see your hand is up. We're really getting close on time if you want to just make a short comment?

Ray Fassett: Yeah, just...

Ron Andruff: Please.

Ray Fassett: ...real quick. Ray Fassett. Just a clarification. Isn't the first question on any matter that would come before the SCI is what operating procedure is impacted by whatever it is the issue is about? So, Mikey, for example, why I can appreciate you don't want to share whatever this challenge or puzzle is wouldn't the - it has to fall into some operating procedure that is not efficiently handling the situation for you. That would be my first inclination.

Mikey O'Connor: If I can just quickly respond? If it falls outside of the procedures changed by the various committees but it's all inside the PDP if that helps.

Ron Andruff: So thank you, all, for this discussion. This is what I was hoping we would do is really drill down and get this right. I think Mikey, in just a word I would say that, again, what we're doing here is we're trying to refine a charter that we can send to the GNSO - the Council itself would determine if they want to make changes to that recommendation, if they like that recommendation or if they want to throw it out wholesale.

Our job here is really just to try to update the document. So it's a good exercise and a good discussion. And with that I'd like to ask Julie to make those small typo corrections that she did already. And if she can send that to the list and I would be very grateful if we can continue this discussion now over the next several weeks so we can try to refine this as much as we can and then really address it finally in Durban.

Julie, I'm sorry, I was going to ask - because Ken Bour has been very graciously listening and paying attention to our conversation. But he has a period, if he's here, that we will speak to it's the Working Group Self Assessment Number 6. If we can take up resubmitting a motion if we have time for it after that?

So if I might just turn to Ken and he has submitted some comments in an email to you - to all of us, in fact, following our last call. And he talked specifically about the idea of the - adding what we'll call our survey, our self assessment, to the working group and getting it to each working group and getting it into the charter of the working group.

Ken, would you mind if I just turn to you and ask you to share a few words about that?

Ken Bour: Yeah sure. Thanks, Ron. Can everybody hear me all right?

Ron Andruff: Hear you well. Thank you.

Ken Bour: Good. I did send, at your request from the last meeting, I summarized the sort of preamble I gave you, an overview of an alternative to having a sort of one-time survey in which you might collect information about the general focus of your original survey as you guys were working on it was really the documentation of the charters and the guidelines and the procedures.

And as I went back and remembered my early work with this team we had built in this idea of a self assessment where each working group at the end of its cycle, when it started its closure procedures, would take time to develop some ideas and thoughts around the process and, you know, the collaboration, maybe the inputs, the members and the deliberations, the consensus, the decision making, the products and outputs, those sorts of things were kind of in my mind when I created that idea.

It didn't go anywhere at that point; it sort of just maybe went onto a back burner and then the working team worked very diligently - and I remembered this for many, many months, working on really nailing down the consensus methodology which was very sketchy in the original draft and now is very fully laid out as all of you know in detail.

So anyway my thought was instead of trying to do a survey, you know, what if we resurrected the idea of the self assessment and every group would go through that little process at the end and collect feedback about what happened in that working group; the good, the bad, the ugly and so forth.

And that would be more of a dynamic process versus static, you know, going out and saying well let's go and collect up the information from all working group members who have been on a team in the last 12 months or something.

And, you know, one of the problems that we saw with that when several of you from the team looked at it is oh gosh, that was a - that team I worked on

was, you know, eight months ago and I don't remember any of it or very little of it. And I can't provide any useful feedback.

So whereas when you do thing on a self assessment basis at the end of each cycle if the information is relatively fresh, people have just finished working and they may have some very strong ideas about what went well and what didn't.

So anyway that was what my email message basically said. And I got some feedback from Mikey, thank you, and Ron. But I didn't hear anything else. The proposition before the team was do you like this concept? And are you guys in agreement that rather than do a survey we should go at it this way more or less sort of process improvement on a going-forward basis rather than sort of one time or administering a survey multiple times over the course of every 6 or 8 or 12 months, that kind of thing.

And if you like the idea then the second question would be would you like me to try to put together a draft of a self assessment instrument of some kind? So why don't I stop there and see if I'm on track?

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Ken. That's a great summary. And really appreciate the write-up that you sent around. I think it would be good for Julie to recirculate that. And I'm seeing Avri is giving you a thumbs up on that idea.

So in any case I think that the idea of creating a working group self assessment template sounds like a very good one to me. And unless anyone on the committee has any problem with you're going forward and actually preparing a draft of that then I would like to encourage that. Thoughts from the members?

I see Mikey is giving a thumbs up on that one. We had seen earlier from Avri. Anyone opposed or have any reason not to have Ken go forward with this?

Looks like the committee is looking forward to giving you some work, Mr. Bour.

Ken Bour: That's wonderful.

Ron Andruff: So...

Ken Bour: I don't mean to prejudice your decision or a conclusion about that but I did start thinking about it this morning; I wanted to kind of - I had a sense that maybe you were going to go for this based on the feedback I had received. And so I've kind of started thinking about how this might go. And I've gone back and reread the guidelines and the charter templates and other things. And so I'm actually off the dime, as it were.

Ron Andruff: Excellent. Excellent. That's very good. So if you could start pulling that together, Ken. And then are you - just for interest sake, will you be in Durban?

Ken Bour: That's not on the current plan, no.

Ron Andruff: Okay. So what - the reason I ask the question then if that's the case perhaps we can all get on the list and kind of work with Ken on this document so that he is not having to get up at some ungodly hour to get on the phone with us when we have our meeting in Durban. So...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: ...if anybody else has any thoughts? Please.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I'm sorry. Let me just interject. It is not a problem for me to get up at an ungodly hour to be with you. I've done it before. And it's not - that's not much of an imposition so please don't be shy about asking for that.

Ron Andruff: Very gracious.

Ken Bour: ICANN is a long-term client and I enjoy working on these problems and I'm happy to make whatever concessions need to be made in order to keep the process moving forward.

Ron Andruff: Very gracious. Thank you very much. Any one else have some thoughts or questions with regard to Ken's activities? All right hearing none, thank you very much, Ken. Thank you for that.

And, as I say, I would still recommend that as Ken posts if we could all please bring forward our comments and try to work through this as much as we can during this point.

That takes us to - it's eight minutes before we're to finish and we have the discussion about resubmitting a motion, Number 5. So this has been out for some time. And I understand that the IP Constituency and their Registrar Constituency have now approved this document but there was some exceptions.

And perhaps I could let Anne speak first and then James just to clarify what those are and - for the committee's benefit. Thank you. So Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you, Ron. It's Anne with IPC. And after our meeting in Beijing there was a full meeting of the IPC. And they looked at the document and they considered the options. And I think as you know J. Scott had actually urged, you know, no change whatsoever and had wanted to go with the - sort of the discretion of the chair.

But after a full discussion within IPC in Beijing the IPC agreed to endorse two of the four high level criteria contained in Option 2 and those were the two first criteria; provide the reasoning to justify the resubmission, complete no

later than the deadline for submitting a motion, eight days prior to the next GNSO Council meeting and publish the text, you know, eight days prior.

So that was the IPC position. There was discussion of Items 3 and 4 in the high level criteria and those were rejected by the full IPC.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Anne. And James.

James Bladel: Hi, Ron. Thank you. James Bladel speaking for the transcript. So as I mentioned in the email - and I don't think I have much to add beyond that message, Jennifer and I posted the options along with kind of some context introductory comments to the Registrar Stakeholder Group mailing list. And there was a fairly healthy discussion with a lot of agreements and plus ones following on from various registrars.

But I think in general where we came down was a strong, in fact, unanimous support for Option 2. A couple of registrars noted that Item 2.4 was - could be considered redundant if Item 2.1 and 2.2 and 2.3 were strictly observed as far as criteria or thresholds that needed to be established.

The one new item that was introduced by registrars, I believe, was this concept that a motion would have to be limited in terms of how frequently it could be reintroduced so that there would be some minimum timeframe before it could be reintroduced or some minimum - or some maximum number of instances within a timeframe that a motion could be reintroduced either permanently or on a recurring process.

And that's something I don't know that our group - I'm not sure if we discussed it and I missed it on one of the calls I wasn't able to attend or if it hasn't been discussed at all. But it is something that I think registrars wanted to see as an additional protection against any, you know, zombie-type motion that just wouldn't every go away and would just be continuously reintroduced on a recurring basis.

I'm not sure that that is likely but it is possible with what the current criteria is. So that was the - in general the feedback from registrars. And as I said, they were very strongly in support of Option 2, particularly Option 2.1 through 2.3.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, James. Thank you very much. I think that the - when you posted that the idea of making sure that there's no zombie-motion - I like the term - I think that is a very strong statement. Avri also I think responded to that on the list.

So I think then what I'd like to do is we're coming up close to the hour now rather than going into it deeply here I think that for my understanding - and please, members of the committee weigh in and correct me where I'm wrong - is that we now have all of the constituencies have weighed in and for the most part everyone is in agreement on the Option 2 and certainly on 1 and 2.

The question is if anyone feels very strongly that we need to keep 3 and 4 in place. And so that is the discussion we will pick up on our next call - our next meeting. Do we need 3 or 4 included in 2? And if so what's the argument for that as well as the question of how many times this happened, the so-called zombie so we'll pick that up from there.

James, please go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi. Sorry, Ron. Just for clarification we're saying that we would discuss this at our next face to face meeting in Durban or you would like us to continue this discussion on the list? I'm sorry I wasn't clear on that.

Ron Andruff: No, I wasn't clear. And for my part I'm always happy to see things discussed on the list because it helps for people to think and consider and move the view - move their views further forward in terms of consensus so absolutely that can happen on the list. But my point here is that we would like to get it completed at the next meeting which will be the face to face in Durban.

And actually speaking to that that would move me now to the any other business and then that comes up the discussion about our Durban meeting. And before I go there I think that generally the committee felt that meeting once a month was enough and I don't think anyone's in disagreement with not having - or with having less meetings in their lives. So that - I think that's the way we'll go forward, meeting once a month.

And now because Durban falls just a week or two after - in fact one week after what would be our next call I'm going to recommend that we have the meeting in Durban. I have asked for a meeting room and perhaps Julia or Julie might be able to shed some light on that.

The time I had requested was as late in the day on Sunday, the day before the meeting begins, with the consideration that most people will be flying in on the weekend for preliminary meetings or certainly trying to get in for their Monday start which would perhaps put them in - as many of us as possible in Durban at the same time.

So, Julie, could I ask you to - or, Julia, to respond to that the meeting room in time?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. I actually will defer to the Secretariats on that. The request did go to the Secretariats and that's Julia and Glen and Nathalie. But Glen in particular is working on fitting that in with, you know, within the context of all the various GNSO meetings - that request. But, Julia, if you're - Julia, if you have anything you'd like to add that would be...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Hello? Julia?

Julia Charvolen: Yes, hello. This is Julia. I don't have anything to add. But I don't know if Glen can hear us because I know she's on the call. But we will get back to you very quickly about this.

Glen de Saint Géry: Hello, Ron? Can you hear me?

Ron Andruff: Yes, Glen. Please, Glen, go ahead.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Sorry I was on mute and I couldn't get off quickly. Ron is fine. I can put in a meeting for you on Sunday afternoon as I saw from some of the emails. As we had in Beijing would the time say 5:00 to 6:00 or 4:00 to 6:00 work for you?

Ron Andruff: Let's go 4:00 to 6:00. We ran out of time in Beijing and hopefully we won't - if we had a slot that gives us enough time we might finish early that would be ideal but I'd rather not to jump out - run out of time again if possible.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. So we'll make it 4:00 to 6:00. May I also just remind you that at the 4:00 to 6:00 time - Wolf-Ulrich is probably on the call too so he knows about it - there is a CSG meeting planned so that will be opposite yours.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Ron Andruff: All right, I see Wolf-Ulrich and Mikey's hands up. So, Mikey, please go forward and then Wolf, you'll follow Mikey.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'll bet Wolf is going to say the same thing and it was just mentioned that we have a conflicting meeting and then I just noted in the Chat that this is not a meeting that has to happen in Durban; it would actually be better for several reasons to have it in the regular rotation on the phone. That way we'd have Ken with us in real time not shifted six hours. And it would take time pressure off of what, at least for most of us, I think, is already a crushed schedule in Durban.

So, you know, again I'm a newbie and I'm not sure that I've got any pull but, boy, I think it'd be great not to have a meeting in Durban. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Ron. Well, I would just join Mikey because I have this - we have this problem. We tried, well, I'm responsible for the GNSO schedule in Durban and we tried, well, to clear the time between - from 4:00 onward on Sunday afternoon, well, to have it available for separate stakeholder group meetings which shall happen at that time.

So I wonder whether other stakeholder groups, besides the CSG, are planning, well, to have meetings there maybe. And then we may have problems within the SCI, well, to get members available.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalse: Thank you. Unfortunately I don't think I'm going to be able to attend the meeting in Durban. But I did want to remark that I thought it was extremely helpful when the group was able to meet in person. And I would, for sure, make a strong effort to, you know, participate by phone if a Durban meeting is set up that I can, you know, set my alarm and call in for or whatever is needed.

I wonder if the issue is not so much, you know, whether or not this group should meet in Durban because I do think it greatly improves cooperation in the group if people can see each other and talk to each other in the same room but more so the particular time that's chosen.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Anne. So we're now past our time so I'm going to bring this discussion to an end. I'm going to ask if Julia - Julia, Julie - together can coordinate just a quick poll for us as an entire committee to make this decision whether we meet or not.

I also feel it's a value to actually look people in the eye and get a chance to meet the committee members a little more personally. But I do understand the pressures. And I, too, have a lot - as many pressures as the others are being mentioned so I can't disagree with them in any way.

Perhaps if we could get this poll done quickly and then see if Glen might be able to find a time that would be more efficient for the members that would be great. And obviously if we can't then what we would end up doing is having our call one week prior to the Durban meeting.

So, Julie, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, just quickly I can say from experience, and I think others here who - there won't be a time to schedule the call that is not conflicting. That's just not possible given the short time frame. So I'll do a poll but people should keep in mind that if we have a meeting in Durban it will conflict with something that someone wants to do.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. All right so with that then we will now draw this call to a close. I would like to thank everyone for, as always, for the valuable contributions. And we will, during the course of the next few days, sort out whether or not we will see each other face to face in Durban at a meeting. And certainly for those that are attending we will see each other face to face.

So with that thank you all very much for attending and we can bring this call to a close.

END