Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation (SCI) TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 12 July 2012 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation on 12 July 2012, 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:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-sci-20120712-en.mp3 on page
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul

Attendees

Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary
Ray Fassett - Registry Stakeholder Group - Primary
Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency - Alternate
Mary Wong – Non-Commercial Users Constituency - Primary
J. Scott Evans - Intellectual Property Constituency – Primary

Apology:
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC Alternate
Ron Andruff - Commercial and Business Users Constituency - Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary –
Marika Konings

Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Nathalie Peregrine

Natalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Becky). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the SCI call on the 12th of July 2012. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Ray Fassett, J. Scott Evans, Mary Wong. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Margie Milan and myself, Natalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Ron Andruff, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Anne Aikman-Schalese and Marika Konings.

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

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Next part is the statement of interest. I'll start out with updating mine though at this point I've done it in a few meetings so it's probably getting redundant.

I updated my SOI and the main change is that I went from being a consultant that never spoke for one of my clients to actually being employed half time by Dot Gay LLC and in some cases when announced I would be speaking for them. In respect to this grouping, I remain an NCUC and NCSG voting member and still no change.

I don't know if anybody has any questions for me on that. As I say, I've updated my online SOI. Does anyone else have a statement of interest notification to give? Okay. Hearing none, going to the agenda.

So the agenda for today following these first three items had a status update on community review, consent agenda and GNSO Council voting results. Then continuing discussion and possibly suggest a solution on the open topics, the proxy voting procedure, the deferral of motion and the voting thresholds for delaying a PDP.

After that there's raising an issue. Basically a question hasn't been sufficiently clarified. You know, currently needs to come from G Council or from a working group. Didn't know if there was any more discussion we needed to have on that or whatever, so put it on the agenda.

Then there's the status update on the working group survey work that has been going on and any other business. Any issues with the agenda? Any changes? Any other business that anybody wants to add at this point already? I'll ask the question again when we get there at the end. No. Okay.

Then moving with this agenda. The first thing is the status review - status update on the community review. And I guess Julie can you give that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes sure. And I just want to note if you haven't seen it in the chat room that Angie Graves has joined the call.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: And also for transcript purposes. So if you are in the chat room if you see in front of you that we did open a public comment period on the proposed modifications to the GNSO operating procedures and those are, as Avri mentioned, the consent agenda item procedures and the GNSO Council voting results.

As you'll see here, that was opened on the 9th. And we'll close then on the 30th and then that will be followed by the usual reply comment period, the 31st through the 20th. I can check and see if we've gotten any comments so far. I would be surprised but I suppose it's not something that could not be out of place.

So if you all would bear with me I think I can check this really quite quickly if you're interested. Avri, is that of interest do you think?

Avri Doria: Might as well although I'll be shocked too if you find anything.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. I'll just quickly look. This should be - it is actually the top of the list of the operating procedure - the top of the list of the comment forum and looking at the comments submitted there are none.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: That was easy.

Avri Doria: Okay. Does anybody have any comments or questions on this item? Okay. It's got quite a ways to run yet. Till the end of the month for comments and 20 August. So should probably make sure that all of our stakeholder groups have seen it and know of it. But okay, moving on.

So continuing discussions and suggest solutions. I put the proxy voting procedure first. It's obvious to me and I don't know if it's, you know, other people agree that we're not moving towards a consensus to change the rules.

One of the suggestions that I did put forward in the recommendation which I haven't seen too much objected to -- in fact I'm not sure I've seen any but I might have missed -- is the notion of asking staff to look into a slight modification in the way it's done in terms of basically the announcement has to go to the Secretariat of the GNSO.

But and then what happens is she gets it; when she's got time to process it and then sends out notification to the G Council list. What I'm recommending is that the notification go in parallel both to the Secretariat and to the G Council list.

And this is basically to allow for two things to happen. One it means that the Secretariat doesn't have to be asked to check her mail for these things before every meeting to make sure nothing came in in the last day or what have you. And B, it does allow for, you know, last minute changes. But still last minute before the meeting started.

So no changes being made in the notification to the Secretariat must be before the meeting starts but - and so you've got time stamps and everything else showing that but still it allows for a later proxy substitution than currently we have simply because of the hands processing time needed by the Secretariat.

So I wanted to put that on the table to just see if there were further discussions on it, to see if anybody told me I was wrong and that that no we probably could come to consensus on changing the rules though I would be surprised. And if not, then I would recommended to, you know, to Wolf-Ulrich coming out of this meeting that we follow that up with a discussion with people in the staff that make the changes and see what was happening.

So open the queue on that one. Does anyone have a comment? No comments. Does anybody think this is not a path we should follow to put a - what is it a red X or - no, that means he's left the discussion for a while. I'll put a - no, the circle with the red X to say disagree with following through on the change of practice but not rule. No comment at all. Okay.

So then I guess the next step will be to put out the recommendation on the mailing list, get a certain amount of time for comment and then get some comment perhaps from staff on whether this is possible and what it would take to do it. Anything else on this one. Okay. Thank you Mary for the check. Any other comment? Okay. Then I'll move on to deferral of motions.

On deferral of motions we got email from J. Scott Evans right before the meeting. I basically cut and paste J. Scott's email into the Wiki so it's all there together. We had been having also on the Wiki a back and forth discussion and in looking through this doing my homework; knowing I was going to play chair today, I figured I had to do homework last night.

And I had written down some questions that pretty much repeat the questions that were in the email exchange between (Jonathan) and J. Scott. And the first one had been a question of leave it as a practice or create a rule. And on that one we seem to still have a divided group. And I'm not sure we have - certainly we had one recommendation earlier. I think this was from - and I hope I don't get the names wrong.

I think Ron had suggested that we leave it as a practice and review it and come back in a year and see how things are going. We also seem to have separate viewpoints. Even if we create a rule then going down what kind of rule. We had (Carlos) with a simple rule that reflects the current practice, which was basically limit deferral motions. Everybody gets to do it once but only once.

Then we have various flavors of more complex rules. I had offered one. I believe one emerges from a conversation between (Jonathan) and J. Scott on is a reason required - is a reason required only a second time? Is it required a first time? If there is a reason, is the reason just accepted? Does the reason get checked? Can you defer more than once with an appropriate reason, et cetera?

At the moment I think that we're still pretty much well divided across almost all of these issues starting out with the first one they practice or not. So I wanted to open the floor and see if anybody has any suggestions about how we move on from here bringing it closer to a - something that we might have rough consensus on. Anyone want to get into it. J. Scott, you sent the last message so, you know.

J. Scott Evans: Well I mean Avri all I found in all my research both with (Roberts) and just asking around, you know, deferral of a motion is a common practice for various and sundry reasons. (Roberts) of course if very formulaic and formula - formalistic about how it does it.

But most boards I checked with have it. But it's just a motion that takes place by the party seeking the deferral. And then that motion gets voted on. And it's, you know, they say we'd like to defer to the next meeting. Everyone either agrees or doesn't agree. There's a debate on it and it's just a motion like any other motion rather than some sort of automatic practice.

So it seems to me that by saying that, you know, deferral of motions will - can be brought by a regular motions process at least takes out the argument that it's being used if it's granted somehow automatically in some sort of gaming fashion by anyone because all the parties debate it and then they decide.

But, you know, so it - that - I just put that forward to the group. I mean you could just as easily have something like I think (Jonathan) talked about or some folks talked about where you have an automatic grant subject to challenge I guess. But I mean I'll leave that to others.

I'm just, you know, what happened here is this was an informal practice that then when everyone got to looking at it there was no idea of how to handle the situation because it'd never been formalized in any fashion. So I guess in formalizing it we just need to decide how it will be handled. And I'm just putting out ideas for thought to spur conversation.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. Is there a consensus - okay, we're only a few here. So it's, you know, it's just a notion. But do we believe as a group that there's consensus on formalizing and what's open is just the how do we formalize it? Or with Ron and perhaps others do we still have those that believe that we really should just let it ride for a year, monitor it, perhaps even give some guidelines?

I know I'm sort of, you know, ambivalent about it myself. I think I can go either way. And I might have specific views if we are creating rules but I'm also fine to just leave it a practice. Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Avri. Excuse me. Pardon my voice everybody. I'm ambivalent myself. I think that there are merits in both approaches. If we formalize it, I don't think that there's consensus as to how we do it. So it merits the discussions.

If we monitor it, I think that we want to be quite clear what we're monitoring for as opposed to just saying no, let's just see what happens. And I (can't)

remember Ron or others have suggested a way forward for that. So I think before we decide - at least before I decide, I'd like to kind of get a sense of what we would be monitoring if we decide not to make any formal recommendations at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any other issues? One thing I'd like to add that I though of on what J. Scott said about having a motion. We need to make sure that formalizing it into a motion when we have an eight-day rule on motions other than amendments is something...

J. Scott Evans: (No).

Avri Doria: ...that we don't have to add a rule on.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Just so you'll know, the way they treated (Roberts) was like an amendment.

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

J. Scott Evans: So it's treated in the - it's treated a (Roberts) the same way just because the issue of why it needed to be tabled may not come up until the meeting. Right?

Avri Doria: Right. Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So I would suggest, and I'm not trying to force feed anything. I'm just saying that's how they treated it.

Avri Doria: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: It's like a - it's like a subsidiary of motion, a motion to amend or something like that.

Avri Doria: Okay. I got it. Thanks. So that gets rid of that problem (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Right. It's still attached - it's still attached to the main motion because it is related to that. And the one thing that they do say if you read their text is you're not supposed to have a substantive discussion about the motion. You're only supposed to have a discussion about whether it should be deferred. So the debate shouldn't be about the substance of the motion.

Avri Doria: Right.

J. Scott Evans: It should be about whether it should be deferred or not.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay. Anyone else want to comment on this now? So in terms of looking about how to just come out of this meeting recommending forward progress would be to have people read through all the comments. And I think I've - I made sure that they're in the Wiki but if not, we can add them.

                   And first of all take the reading on the (Levas) practice, get Mary's question answered, you know, what does monitoring it for a year mean and, you know, what are we watching for, et cetera.

                   And assuming that we are going through with formalizing, start talking about the various approaches. As I say, from the simplest, which is (Carlos)' approach, basically just take this current practice and make it formal to something that's got meat on its bones and got ways of redressing, ways of looking legitimate, ways of being legitimate.

                   So anyone else want to add anything on this one at the moment? Okay.

J. Scott Evans: No, I agree with you Avri that it looks like the best way forward is to get - to find out what the (constituent)'s position is with regards to your first question.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay. Thanks. So I'll write something up after the meeting and send it to the list on this issue. Hopefully we can get some discussion going there for them that doesn't want to use the Wiki or whatever. Okay. Anything else on the deferral of motion for now? Okay. Put that one on the continuing.

Then the next one, and really this was just an update of teamwork and how to move forward. So same update on teamwork and how to move forward on voting thresholds for delaying a PDP.

On this one there's been a conversation going back and forth between several of them again because I was doing homework as opposed to just joining in the meeting when it happened. I, you know, came up with a proposal and I think that there's a - certainly a difference of opinion between Marika and I on this in terms of, you know, my not necessarily believing we need any change because of the two conditions.

And one condition, the one that brought up the problem, where the deferral is happening before the drafting team has even created a charter or a charter's been approved. You know, it's basically in the Council's hands then the timetable for creating a charter.

Now in terms of changing the timeline once there is a charter, I've argued that it's the same as changing anything in the charter and therefore should require a majority vote as the working rules - the operating rules or ready required to change anything in the charter once approved requires a, you know, the greater than majority in both houses vote.

Marika is saying that an indefinite delay is something that, you know, is akin to a (gameable) way of canceling a PDP that you didn't want. And so therefore an infinite delay or an indefinite delay should have the higher threshold.

Now I sort of think an indefinite delay is the same as cancellation. We're playing words there. But I also worry about if we make any change to the timeline a super majority issue, then that becomes yet another thing that one can use to game the process by not allowing for a proper workable change to the timeline.

You know, you could force a PDP working group into deadlock or inability to complete. And we thwart one of the things that was a driver in the new PDP, which is timeliness, predictability and if you're going off the rails in terms of your schedule you say so, you know, you get the new milestones approved by the G Council and you keep working.

So I think - and then Angie I guess you have some comments in this discussion that I was responding to and others. I don't know if you want to add, you know, anything to this (unintelligible).

Angie Graves: I appreciate the opportunity - sure, sorry. This is Angie and I appreciate the opportunity. You know, I'm kind of new around here so a lot of my input is questions and therefore kind of orientation for me. But I think they brought to light some other pieces - parts of this. And so I don't have anything per se to add but thank you for offering.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. So I think that's where it is at the moment. I, you know, I recommend that people read in it. I think both Marika and I have gotten into quoting bits and pieces of procedures and working group procedures, which of course probably J. Scott knows by heart anyway.

But and basically trying to put those in, trying to find - and I'm still on the point of it's a minimal change if anything and I'm still not sure we need a change to Marika being convinced that we do need a change. And, you know, if a change then what change?

So, you know, with one of the key votes - one of the key open issues being if we change anything, are we defining it as a super majority vote for a delay or a majority vote for delay and do we have to differentiate between a bounded delay, you know, three months delay to do X. Or even a year delay to do X versus and indefinite delay that begins to look very similar to a cancellation.

So yes Julie. I see your hand up.

Julie Hedlund: Actually Avri, you were just raising the issue that I had picked up that you'd noted in one of your emails. And that was - which led me to the question talking about different types of delays just something for the workgroup to consider is their value to defining the types of delays or discussing or including anything about the types of delays, as you just said, a bounded delay or an indefinite delay. Just putting the question out there.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. And I appreciate that. Margie.

Margie Milam: Yes, hi Avri. It's Margie. I was kind of chatting with Marika before this call and...

Avri Doria: (Good).

Margie Milam: ...just kind of leaning towards what Julie suggested. That maybe what we're really talking about is definitions and maybe not so much a delay that she's worried about but it's more a suspension, if you will.

And if we have a definition of what a suspension is, then I don't think we pick up your concern of what the ordinary delays are to some, you know, working groups maybe not meeting their deadlines, that sort of thing, which is a completely different situation from what we're trying to, you know, trying to solve.

So maybe that's - when approached to come up with definitions and really what we're talking about is some rules related to suspending a PDP as opposed to delaying.

Avri Doria: Okay. That would probably be a good thing to explore. The other thing that we probably do have to explore because we do have a hole in the process is although if you cover suspension, is this the pre-charter? I don't think we ever mentioned that there would be a (gameable) period in the pre-charter.

And, you know, because the charter's sort of there's this first step. And I guess some of us had discussed always having to link charter and PDP vote in a single event or a paired event. But they're not a paired event.

So we do have a gap of time and there really is very little that governs what happens in that time and how long that time is leaving it completely up to the Council. And as any other vote that's un-discussed making it a majority vote. So we probably need to think about that respect too.

I mean it's a good thing that we have the default motion that anything is the default vote I believe is a majority vote but still. Okay. Anything else? Who's going to suggest some language for the definitional (pure)? Is that something that Margie, Marika, Julie staff side would do? Or is that something I should suggest.

J. Scott Evans: Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I have a question. Maybe I'm a little confused here because...

Avri Doria: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...it seems like we have a couple of scenarios, right.

Avri Doria: Right.

J. Scott Evans: One is that there's a PDP going along and something's occurred that's going to change the timeline.

Avri Doria: Right. Charter already written.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And they've discovered that in their work something's going to change the timeline for their deliverable. I think that's one situation. Right?

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So that's adjustment of timeline.

Avri Doria: Right.

J. Scott Evans: Then there's delay, right, which - or suspension, which we're talking about where something occurs that has either made it moot or we have to wait for something else to happen before the work, you know, something like that. In other words it's suspended until some future time. I think there are two different things aren't they?

Avri Doria: Well that's - I think that's what I've been distinguishing as a bounded delay...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...and an unbounded delay. I see (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. I get you now. I'm sorry. I wasn't following your nomenclature. My apologies.

Avri Doria: Sorry. I probably, you know...

J. Scott Evans: No. You were clear. I just didn't put the two together. I have to connect the dots from my end.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. Margie.

Margie Milam: Right. Just to follow up, yes, I mean we would certainly if you want us to, Julie, Marika and I can kind of brainstorm on how we would define that. And just to J. Scott to kind of give you examples of what we're talking about, in recent cases we had the PDP that was approved on thick Whois without any kind of delay of, you know, of when it would start.

                    And then subsequent to that there was a request to push it off until I think the .com agreement was, you know, negotiated or something to that affect. So one example where it wasn't really tied to the actual approval but it somehow happened afterwards.

                    And then an earlier situation where it happened, you know, the same time as the PDP approval was the UDRP PDP for example where we agreed to do a PDP on the, you know, the current state of the UDRP but it's going to be kicked off 18 months after the, you know, the new gTLD program has been in effect. So those are kind of two examples of that and just to illustrate, you know, things that have happened in the last, you know, year or so.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. So thanks. Thanks Margie. I think that that, you know, seeing if we can solve it with just definitions as opposed to creating new rules certainly is something that I'm very much in favor of. I find that very conservative on wanting to create new rules until we've lived with these for a bit. But so yes, thank you. Anything else on this issue? Okay. Then that's it I think on the open working things other than the working group survey, which I have one after.

Another issue has come up but didn't get assigned to any particular teamwork was the whole notion of raising a SCI issue. And there was a certain amount of discussion where who has standing as it were to raise an issue.

And at one point there was an impression that a constituency or a stakeholder group could raise an issue directly or a, you know, a liaison group or advisory group could raise an issue.

And in looking back through our charter, it looks like really the two paths to raising an issue are through the Council, which means any constituency, stakeholder group or liaison, you know, or even advisory group that doesn't have a liaison can bring the issue up to the Council and then the Council directs the SCI or a working group that's having a problem and having a problem now with a rule now can bring it directly.

And so - and we had this discussion and it kind of looked like it had reached closure. But I wanted to put it on the agenda to make sure that that's the case. And that A, it's clear that those are the constraints and those are the standings and that the - there's nothing we want to do about it because obviously we could always go back to the Council and request a change if that's what we thought was the best thing for the SCI.

So that's why I wanted to bring that one up just to make sure that we don't have any issue there anymore. And if we do, find out what it is. Anyone wish to comment? No. Is there general acceptance that the two types of standing through the G Council or from a working group should stand? Great. I see nothing. I'm assuming - yes, Mary.

Mary Wong: Hey Avri, excuse me, sorry. Can you say that again because I thought I was following but then I think I lost track of it.

Avri Doria: Okay. I probably went into one of my (unintelligible).

Mary Wong: No, no. I think I just...

Avri Doria: But anyhow, at the moment basically there's two ways to bring an issue to the SCI. Well there's actually two plus one. There's G Council send an issue. There's working groups can send an issue. The third way is if we're doing our periodic reviews and we see an issue, that's a different story.

                  So at the moment those are the only ways for an issue to get to the SCI. So then the question becomes does everyone agree with that interpretation. And that's mine and I haven't seen anybody at this point saying no that's wrong. But I just want to make sure that that's the agreed upon interpretation. And to me if it is the agreed upon interpretation, are we comfortable with it or do we feel the need to change it.

Mary Wong: Okay. Thanks. And this goes back to a point I think I made on email that I agree that that's what the language says, you know, the two ways that you described with the plus one as a possibility.

                  But I still recall that we had the impression that constituent groups within the GNSO could also bring an issue; i.e., not individuals for no reason but a constituency for example or a stakeholder group. And that didn't seem to be captured either by the language or by the framework you described.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes, no, the framework I described they had to bring it through the Council.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Mary Wong: Right.

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) that that's the answer right. If the intellectual property
                   constituency or registries or the NCUC have a problem, they would voice that
                   and ask the GNSO to take it to the SCI, right?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Mary Wong: Right. And I don't think I have a problem with that. It seems to be more a
                   procedural thing. I just wanted to clarify that the intent was that constituent
                   groups could do it and also the second clarification is, you know, at the risk of
                   adding on process and more discussions that, you know, it's not going to be
                   something that the Council might feel - there's a question as to whether the
                   Council can question one of the constituencies or stakeholder groups saying I
                   want to raise this issue to the SCI.

                   And the only way I can do it is go through the Council. Can the Council stop it
                   at that point? Do we have any sense about whether that is or isn't the case?

Avri Doria: I guess as it stands now I would understand them to be able to say no. And
                   so I think, you know, so it strikes me as that may be a point where we want to
                   - if we have enough, you know, consensus for asking.

                   It is a point that we should probably discuss further and, you know, go back to
                   the Council and if there's an agreement in this group and consensus in this
                   group that we'd like it clarified or we'd like a stakeholder group and/or
                   constituency to be able to bring an issue directly.

                   I don't think we can at the moment so I would think it would take going back
                   to the Council and saying listen, our charter says this. We would like it to say
                   that. What do you say? But first someone would have to suggest what
                   changes we would think and we'd have to get consensus on those changes.

J. Scott Evans: I mean my - this is J. Scott Evans. I certainly think that one of the reasons for
                   the reorganization of the structure back in 2008, 2009 was to make the

Council the manager of the process. So I would not feel comfortable having a direct line to us because they should have to go to the project manager and request that it be given to us.

Mary Wong: Avri, this is Mary. Can I...

Avri Doria: Yes. Please.

Mary Wong: Yes. I agree with that too. I guess my discomfort such as it is is I don't think (unintelligible) rises to that level is depending on what the group is or what the complaint is or, you know, question might be, there is the possibility that the Council has the (un-feathered) ability to check things at that stage. And I'm not trying to (strap any) negativity to anybody here or on the Council or anything like that.

But there is that possibility and I think we do need to raise that to the Council and say exactly what you and J. Scott just said that this is how it's done and you guys, the Council, you're the project managers and in fact that's sort of your role under the reconstituted GNSO.

But at the SCI we, you know, simply want to flag the possibility that because the Council can refuse to further submit the request of the SCI that A, that's something the Council is comfortable with and B, does the Council want any kind of guidelines as to the sort of request it will forward plus the request that it won't. I'm planning on staying that really well because I'm not - (unintelligible) but I think you get the idea.

J. Scott Evans: I'm not sure I agree with the last part of Mary's statement. This is J. Scott again for the recording. But I do think we should confirm with the Council that our interpretation of our charter is in fact how they see it.

Ray Fassett: This is Ray. I agree with J. Scott and much of what Mary said as well.

Avri Doria: Okay. So we can check on that. But okay, so that does seem like we
                    definitely do have something to write up and send to Council checking on the
                    interpretation.

                    One point I'd like to add on this is it's interesting J. Scott in the way you
                    described it is that stakeholder groups and constituencies need to go through
                    the manager. But working groups as far as I understand don't need to. So we
                    may be in one of those cases of do we want to make one like the other and if
                    so, which.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I express no opinion on one way or the other. But it seems to me that it
                    would make most sense if we allowed the GNSO Council to do the job it's
                    been tasked with.

                    Now if they say they don't want that task and they want to push it down to us,
                    I - you know, because they think the interpretation should be different, then I
                    think we listen to them. But my default is to set up a system whereby they are
                    the project manager.

Avri Doria: So J. Scott if I understand correctly, you would think also that in this
                    consistency working groups would also have to through their liaison go to the
                    Council before an issue came here.

J. Scott Evans: I think that would probably be appropriate.

Avri Doria: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And I'm not advocating one way or other but I see your point.

Avri Doria: I understand. Right.

J. Scott Evans: I see your point Avri. What's good for the goose is good for the gander. And...

Avri Doria: Yes. (Unintelligible) my left hand write like my right hand or something like that.

J. Scott Evans: ...and with regard to - I just think, you know, I want to stay true to what the improvements were supposed to do.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And that is make GNSO Council a manager of the process.

Avri Doria: Does anyone wish to volunteer for writing the first draft of this note that we would send to the Council? And we can discuss the note both on Wiki, on email and at a next meeting. Any volunteers?

Mary Wong: Avri, are you thinking -- excuse me - this is Mary again -- sending it to the Council before this group next meets?

Avri Doria: No. I was thinking that the letter would get - because I don't think it's an emergency issue.

Mary Wong: Right. That's why I asked. So...

Avri Doria: Right. No, I was thinking that before the next meeting we should have a letter that's been floated that, you know, that people on the list have had a chance to at least read for a day or two or something. So getting a draft written in the next two weeks and then starting to discuss it.

Mary Wong: I'm happy to do that draft if that's the timing.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Mary, if you'd like me to help as your editor.

Mary Wong: That would be great J. Scott. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: I don't know if I'm well versed in the history of the art. I've seen a lot going back with Anne Aikman-Schalese and Ron Andruff on this issue and I'm just not well versed enough in the history but I'm happy to look at it and help present it to review.

Mary Wong: Thank you. And my thinking right now is probably it'll be relatively short and simply states some of that background and get into our interpretation and just ask the question.

J. Scott Williams: Absolutely. But I...

Mary Wong: Okay.

J. Scott Williams: ...sometimes it's good to have two eyes on it before it goes to the bigger group and I'm happy to help serve that function.

Mary Wong: Great. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you both. Anything else on this issue where the answer to my question was has it been sufficiently clarified is a resounding no and we have a forward path. Anything else on that one?

                     Okay. Next one was status update on working group survey. Is that something Julie you were going to do or who was going to do?

Julie Hedlund: Well we do actually have an update that Marika sent and just to pull that up. She did send around to the list...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...a revised version and this is later - this was earlier today of the draft survey
                   for GNSO working groups that included in red line some suggestions from
                   Ken Bour who is closely involved in the development of the GNSO Working
                   Group guidelines.

                   And then she asked the list if there were any, you know, suggestions in her
                   comments or edits to share those with the mailing list. Now I'd be happy to
                   pull that up into Adobe Connect right now if you'd give me a moment if you'd
                   like to.

Avri Doria: Might as well.

Julie Hedlund: Great. Let me get it...

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: ...saved somewhere where I can pull it up quickly. (Unintelligible). Hold on.
                   I'm not nearly as fast at this as Marika is.

Avri Doria: And you can probably thank your lucky stars.

Julie Hedlund: Oh I see that - it won't let me bring it up unless it's in PDF. So hang one more
                   moment and we shall save it as PDF. Don't know why it won't do that but let
                   me try one more time. And there it is and...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...and it is coming. And here it is in the Adobe Connect room and looking
                   down through the document these are Ken's edits. He's added some
                   additional questions beginning with Number 3. Can everyone see that in the
                   Adobe Connect room?

J. Scott Williams: I can.

Avri Doria: Agree it's probably not the best color for it (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Oh. Pale green. Do you want me to read through this? Would that be helpful?

Avri Doria: I don't know. I think if you just give us a chance to (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Let me just give you a little time - (let me) pull it down. That view encompasses Questions 3, 4, 5. And then six was already in the original version.

Avri Doria: If you (loosen) the - can you set it so that we all have independent motion on it. That it's not synchronized.

Julie Hedlund: Let me see how that...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...button there that you press for synchronized versus not.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Let me see if I can figure that out. Sorry. That's not what I wanted.

Avri Doria: So what's the plan for this next?

Julie Hedlund: I think that Marika was interested in getting comments on these suggested edits to the survey and any other comments on the survey that people had. Just scanning down through here.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Three aren't a lot of changes. It's - the additions are - from the original version there's three, four, five are new additions and eight is a new addition. Otherwise it looks like it's largely unchanged from the last version.

Avri Doria: So this is something we could put on our agendas for next time with everyone having the work assignment to review it before then so that it can be discussed and hopefully finalized at a next meeting. Is that a - is that a good way forward on it?

J. Scott Williams: I think so.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks J. Scott.

J. Scott Williams: Because we have a lot of people who aren't here today.

Avri Doria: Exactly.

J. Scott Williams: And let's be fair that they get a chance to weight in especially since most of them went to the trouble to send apologies.

Avri Doria: Yes. Does anyone have any questions though on it as it is now especially on the green sections that were added that we could ask at least put into the asking view now? They seem fairly cut and dry to me.

J. Scott Williams: I think they just look like they're drilling down for greater specifics. And I think that would be helpful.

Avri Doria: I think the only place I would bicker on asking for one to seven scale might be overkill. But...

J. Scott Williams: Yes. One to five probably...

Avri Doria: But that's really, you know...

J. Scott Williams: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...(unintelligible) of a comment of mine. But still. Okay. So I'll just ask that people review that. You know, I'll send a response out to Marika's mail sending the same thing. You know, we took a quick look at it at this meeting and, you know, putting it on the agenda for the next meeting to try and finalize. So please read and comment in the meantime.

Anything else anybody would like to add on this item? Okay. Has anybody come up with any other business during the course of the meeting? No. In which case I'd say we were done. And I thank you all...

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. Just to confirm, Natalie, when is our next scheduled call?

Avri Doria: Probably two weeks in.

Natalie Peregrine: Yes. This is Natalie. Normally it's biweekly.

Avri Doria: Right.

Natalie Peregrine: So the next one would be - (unintelligible) next one would be on the 26th of July (unintelligible) everyone.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you for that Natalie. I just wanted to make sure we're on the same page.

Natalie Peregrine: Okay. Terrific.

Avri Doria: Okay then. I thank you all. And we'll talk to you in some other meeting.

J. Scott Williams: All right. Thanks Avri.

Avri Doria: The next one (today). Thanks a lot. Bye bye.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you everyone.

Woman: Thank you very much (Becky).

Woman: Thank you (Becky) and also the recording.

Woman: Thanks. Bye bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Woman: Bye bye.

                                END