

**Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation (SCI)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 21 March 2013 at 2000 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation (SCI) meeting on Wednesday 21 March 2013 at 2000 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/gns0/gns0-sci-20130321-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar#feb>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Ronald Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Primary - chair
Anne Aikman-Scalase – IPC Primary
J. Scott Evans – IPC - Alternate
Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary – vice chair
Jennifer Wolfe – NCA primary
Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate
Mary Wong – NCUC - Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary

Apologies :

Amr Elsadr – NCUC – Alternate
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP – Alternate

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: ...everyone. This is the operator. Just need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: So thank you very much, (Laurie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the SCI call on the 20th of March, 2013. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Angie Graves, Ron Andruff, Wolf Knoben, Mary Wong and Jennifer Wolfe. We have apologies from Amr Elsadr and Mikey O'Connor.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Good morning to those in the - still morning. Thank you for joining the call today.

I'd like to start by just - we've gone through our roll call. We've discussed who's not here and we expect others will join and we'll catch them up as we go.

So let's move to Item 2 and that's the statements of interest and to ask if anyone's had any change to their SOI since we've last spoken? Hearing none we'll move on to - we'll mark that as no changes to the SOIs by anyone on the Committee.

And we'll move to Agenda Item Number 3, approval of the agenda. Did anyone have any questions or comments with regard to the agenda that was circulated after our last meeting and has been on the wiki now for a period of time; it's on the right hand side of our screen.

And Julie Hedlund's hand is up. Julie, please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Ron. This is Julie Hedlund. I just wanted to note something to add in Any Other Business and that is to alert people to the meetings that will be

in Beijing. That is the update to the Council and the regular meeting of the SCI. And so I suggest adding those to the agenda.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Julie. Perfect. All right then so we'll go to - immediately to Point Number 4 and that's resubmitting a motion. We've been talking about this now for several months and I think that we've - everyone was going to send this out to their various constituencies and get some feedback back from them to give us some guidance to go forward.

Mary, if I'm not mistaken you are part of this drafting team on developing this. And I'm wondering if...

Mary Wong: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...if in fact I'm correct on that if you wouldn't mind just kind of talking through (unintelligible) I think is clear and Point 2 - well, actually, why don't you talk through all of the elements to kind of give us an understanding of what that subgroup was thinking, please.

Mary Wong: Sure, happy to do that real quickly. We're really talking about two alternatives at the moment and as we set the first one the subgroup felt was unlikely to gain consensus. But we left it in there because it is still an alternative and that is leaving the issue up to the discretion of the Council Chair, whoever that is at that point.

The second one I think is the one that we are hopeful will gain consensus but is obviously more complicated. And essentially it involves fulfilling a number of steps or criteria, as it were. Really this was to illustrate that point that's under B1 - I guess B1 is not really so much a criteria as it is the framework in that in order for a motion to be reconsidered there must be some sort of change in circumstance that merits it.

So we thought that the steps that we developed might be one way to do that. So first of all the text of the resubmitted motion has to be published. In other words, you know, these - I think, you know, there's just this sense that we want to align it to the Council's own procedures and timing as well. So it can't be a last minute thing which is why some of these things were required.

The actual full text has to be published as if it were an original motion, which meets the eight days notice. There needs to be a seconder of the motion; one from each house. And what then happens if these two steps are followed is that at that Council meeting this item will be placed on the consent agenda. In other words it would be presumed that the Council will agree to consider the motion.

However, at that point any councilor from any house or group can say I object to us even going forward. I'd like to discuss whether or not we should even be considering it at which point the motion is taken off the consent agenda and opened for discussion and a vote on whether the Council wants to reconsider. And all this has to happen before the actual substance of the motion is even discussed and voted on.

Did I just make it more complicated or is that clear?

Ron Andruff: No, thank you. It's helpful to understand that the group themselves, what your thinking was behind it. One question I have is - while I'm inviting any other questions from the committee so please raise your hand if you have some thoughts or comments you'd like to bring. But one thought that went through my mind, Mary, is what's the rationale for this to go on a consent agenda?

Is there - because that - 3 and 4 are linked in so much as there's a consent agenda element. And I'm just wondering why would we want consent agenda - consent agenda element as opposed to just putting it on the agenda for discussion and vote?

Mary Wong: That's a great question, Ron. And, you know, I think the thinking behind that was to make it clear that there are really two issues or procedural issues. One is actually accepting that a motion can be resubmitted and reconsidered in the first place and that that has to take place before the motion itself is to be considered.

So because of that distinction we tried to find a way where that distinction would be made clear and we thought that the new consent agenda that the Council has might be a good way to do that.

We also realized that that might make it somewhat clunky and I think Avri and others pointed out that it does require all councilors and everybody watching to really understand the GNSO operating procedures.

So, you know, if this group, as a whole, think that's too complicated I think the subgroup would be quite happy to amend or drop it as long as there is an understanding when we present this - excuse me - to the Council that we do want to make a distinction between accepting the fact of resubmission and then considering the substance of the resubmission.

Ron Andruff: So if I understand you correct then putting it on the consent agenda is accepting the fact and then it will come to a discussion?

Mary Wong: Exactly. Because if a councilor, you know, really feels strongly that it shouldn't even be resubmitted in the first place they have the chance to say, you know what, I want to talk about it.

Ron Andruff: Very good. Thank you for that. Comments or thoughts from the committee with regard to this resubmitting a motion and the suggested approach?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking if I can?

Ron Andruff: Please, Wolf, step forward.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Yes. Well, we had a small chat about this within our constituency as well. And there is a - there was, well, nobody was in favor of leaving the option up to the discretion of the Chair. So there was - within that discussion.

So the constituency is inclined, well, to be in favor of the Option B and in addition especially with the point of 2 and 3 that means publishing, okay, more organizational things, publishing that eight days prior to the next Council meeting and requiring of the seconder of the motion.

So that is the - that was the opinion of the constituency here. Not any else - not any more comment to that. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. So my takeaway on that is that the ISP Constituency is supportive of this way forward, is that correct?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Yes, it is correct, yes.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Thank you very much. And the BC is more or less in favor of this as well going forward. I wonder if others are bringing the message back from their constituency? Even if you haven't had a chance to get the full decision from your constituency which way you're leaning it would be helpful if you could share that with us so we can understand if there's work to be done or if we're just waiting on approvals.

Avri, perhaps I could look to you or Jennifer? Mary?

Avri Doria: I haven't done much on it yet but I don't see a problem but that's just my guess at the moment.

Ron Andruff: That's fine. That's all I'm trying to do is just take the temperature. So in general you're feeling that this way forward would be acceptable to your constituency?

Avri Doria: As long as A is taken off, yes.

Ron Andruff: Yes, 2a we're referring to, correct?

Avri Doria: Right, yeah.

Ron Andruff: Leave it up to the discretion of the Chair. Right, I think everyone feels the same way that that's a nonstarter so I think we can - we all agree there. Mary, please.

Mary Wong: Thanks. And similarly from the NCUC side first of all the 2a would probably have to go. And I floated the, you know, text of 2b to the list but admittedly very late in the midst of all the new gTLD stuff I'm not sure if anyone's really paid much attention to it.

So far I haven't heard any squawking back so I'm hopeful that NCUC will support 2b as well.

Ron Andruff: Very good. Thank you. And in fact for those who have not yet had a chance to kind of get a temperature from your constituency it would be helpful if we could have that for our meeting in Beijing so we can, you know, put this one to bed because I think we're all of a general mind; we're moving in the same direction. And so I think that's very helpful.

I see Anne has joined the call. Anne, we were just talking about the resubmitting of a motion. And I was asking for members even if they did not have full approval or a way forward from their constituency if they could just share the general feeling is this something that's going to be acceptable or do we have to do more work?

So, Anne, could I look to you?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, unfortunately our leadership was not able to react in time today. I think that it has a lot to do with the planning for Beijing and other - and comment periods that are still open but especially in relation to Beijing.

And so I think - and I don't know if J. Scott's on the line or not. But I think the discussion and debate among IPC is going to be probably between A, which as you know, J. Scott strongly advocates and will likely advocate that, you know, with leadership. And then what I would call B but, you know, in terms of the question of one or more it would be, well, just one of those or two of those probably not, you know, not too much enthusiasm for 3.

So I wish I had a better answer. I don't but part of that is because, you know, I know that J. Scott is a strong advocate of A. So I think...

Ron Andruff: Right.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...you know, like I could see where picking one or more of B would make a lot of sense. And the discussion just hasn't been able to happen at the leadership level due to the, you know, the Beijing planning and everything that's been open for comment so I apologize.

Ron Andruff: That's fine, Anne. Thank you for that. I think that from what I'm hearing from the rest of the committee is that the majority are feeling that it's 2b. A is not getting a lot of support from the other constituencies.

And when we refer to 2b there are actually four points. As Mary pointed out the first one is really the Point 1, change in circumstance. That's really kind of the framework that we're discussing. And then we would be talking about 2, 3 and 4 in terms of more high level criteria.

I think the general feeling is that it would be very helpful to everyone and particularly in an organization we want to keep transparent and open so it's

really clear as to what happened and why that we, as the SCI, bring back a set of instructions of how this should be managed.

There was a lot of debate in the beginning. It really didn't matter - where the debate was saying that it didn't really matter what happened in a consensus-based organization the bottom line is consensus was reached. But I think that didn't sit well with a lot of us in so much as there really needs to be proper processes and structures in place to make sure that (unintelligible) that we look to guidance or whoever is in the Chair at that point could look to guidance as to how to handle that.

So the general feeling is that we need to put something in place and some high level criteria are important requiring of second - a seconder of the motion from each house puts the bar that much higher. And if it was just a general error as happened this last time where it was an accident, if one would like to put it in those terms, then the seconder from each house wouldn't have been a problem to move that forward.

So I continue to apply what we have here in terms of an approach back to the actual problem that arose that created this. And when I look at these potential ways of resolving it or moving through it it seems to me that we found a very good course.

So with that I would just ask that if all members can take this on themselves as a high priority item so that we can discuss this in Beijing on our April 6 meeting, which we'll talk about shortly.

If there's no more comments to come with that then we can move on to our next discussion item and that is Number 5, termination and suspension of a PDP. And this is a staff update on comments from the public forum.

I see a note here saying, "None as of 20th of March." Can I just get a confirmation from staff that that's correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Ron, this is Julie Hedlund. I did check the form today and there are no comments as of today.

Ron Andruff: Very good. And, Julie, just remind us when will this public comment period finish?

Julie Hedlund: The comment period has two pieces to it. And it's a comment period and a reply period. If there are any comments received then it will continue on and complete as of April 27th. But let me just, if you don't mind, I will just check that quickly. I should have remembered from seeing it this morning but - or seeing it this afternoon actually. And I can check it very quickly here.

And I can check again while I'm in there to just make sure there are no comments. But this should be very easy to do. Okay, yes, so the comment close date is the 6th of April. The reply date, if there are comments, closes - sorry, the 28th of April. If there are no comments by the 6th of April then we'll close the forum. And just to check again there are indeed no comments at this point.

Ron Andruff: Okay so that's good. Termination and suspension of the PDP, public comment period closes on the 6th of April. That's when we meet. So if there are still no comments at that point in time there's no reply. And we should then, at that point, this forum (unintelligible) to the GNSO Council, is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's right. We can report out to the GNSO Council present actually the final version for a Council vote although I might note that we would not meet the motion deadline for the Council meeting in Beijing. So...

Ron Andruff: No that's fine, that's fine. That's understood. And in fact, you know, it would just be a timely thing for us to hand it off when we make the presentation to

the GNSO on the following day on the - actually we present on the Saturday, I'm sorry, so that's fine. No problem. Very good. Thank you, Julie.

Any comments or questions with regard to that matter from the committee? Hearing none we'll move on.

And we move on to the Item Number 6 which is the Charter Revision Drafting Team. And we've picked up a little bit of time so we can certainly get into this discussion a little more deeply today.

With that I can't recall who was on that team. I know Angie, Avri, Wolf-Ulrich, as I'm looking down the list, I think James Bladel was on there as well and J. Scott. Perhaps I can hand it off to one of you to bring us up to speed on what your subgroup is doing and to confirm that in fact all those guys are members I've just mentioned. Who would like to jump in?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Ron, it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I would like but I missed the last meeting. I'm sorry about that. But I was one-hour late yesterday. There was a shift in my calendar so as I recall we were, at the beginning, but maybe Avri can help me as well.

And we're looking to the existing charter and we're trying to find out bullet points as to what it can or to what - in which direction the new charter should go. There have been ideas to - let me say to move, well, in different ways away from the original - from the original text meaning on the one hand that this text is a little bit - seems to be a little bit outdated because it reflects just the situation when we started with the SCI two years ago or some months ago - more than two years ago.

But on the other hand there was a discussion as well what are the real tasks of the SCI and so where should we share - which kind of tasks should be that. So this is the discussion going on as to my knowledge as I have so far.

But, Avri, please or Julie you could please add and complete what's going on please. Avri maybe - but she may be on mute?

Ron Andruff: Julie or Avri, whoever convened that meeting it would be helpful to hear from you.

Avri Doria: Julie convened it but I guess only J. Scot and I and Julie were there. And basically I guess - I have a minimalist position and that's whereas I believe J. Scott goes a little further. And Julie had taken our comments and put them into a version but I'm not quite sure where that is.

But basically I have a minimalist position which says basically yeah we should change the stuff at the top that mentions the PSC and such. And really I just recommend erasing three lines from the overview. But other than that I'm very strongly of the opinion of not expanding the role of the SCI that it's there to deal with problems that are brought to it and that it should be setting a periodic schedule for just reviewing, you know, the general processes.

I'm also very strongly of the opinion not to change from being a full consensus body because I think we've seen over two years that by and large that works. Very few things have gotten stopped. In the cases where there was some disagreement we worked through them all and did find a consensus point.

Part of the reason I'm doing - I'm very much in favor of that is this shouldn't be a group with an agenda. This should not be a group where anyone wants to change something. It should be a group where when there is a problem it is reviewed. When there is a review it is discussed and then if something needs to be changed it needs to be.

So while in most cases I am truly anti-status quo-ism in a group like this that is reviewing something it should take the view if it's not broken don't fix it and

that it shouldn't be anything which upsets any balances within the operation of the group.

And if you're going to be changing procedures on the fly that everybody can't buy into then what you're doing is you're creating an imbalance within the Council and I think that that would be a bad thing for this group to be responsible for doing. And so I think that was part of the reasoning behind that in the first place, you know, that consensus rule in the first place and such.

Now we have a rule in there that we never use which is we can decide by consensus, first, that some issue that we're going to explore is such that I - maybe it's not that important or, B, maybe it has to do with some set of esoteric rules and it's not going to break anything if people don't all agree at the end. But it's a very subjective kind of subject.

So up front we say, you know, in recasting how we rewrite this thing we are willing to work on a majority basis. We have the ability to make that kind of consensus decision. We've never done it but we could.

And we've had various discussions where I could have seen us before we started the discussion sort of saying, you know, this one looks like that kind of topic. Sure, why not? But other than that I'm - now J. Scott went a little further and perhaps Julie would be better discussing his point of view than me.

But he did go further in terms of thinking there was something to think about more that it could help us move more quickly, you know, and take more assertive actions. Exactly the opposite of the reason that I want to keep it the way it is. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Avri. Wolf, I see Julie had her hand up and then I'll come to you s, Julie, please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Ron. This is Julie Hedlund. I just wanted to comment on the status of the work of the drafting team. It was a meeting, as Avri noted, with myself and Avri and J. Scott on Monday of this week that was rescheduled from last Thursday. And we have another meeting scheduled next Thursday.

And where we stand is that several people have submitted suggestions for changes to the charter, Avri, J. Scott and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (unintelligible) those. And what I did after Monday's meeting is sent them around to the Charter Drafting Team group and asked James and Angie, who had not been on the call, to comment on those changes.

Angie sent in some comments. We're waiting to hear from James. I will then combine all of the comments and the Drafting Team will consider them collectively at their next meeting.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen:: Yes, thank you, Ron. Well it's (unintelligible) very well the discussion Avri and Julie what's going on. And I think - following what Avri was saying I think maybe this (more) group - this (more) team needs a little bit guidance here from this group, from the SCI at all with regards to which way we should go.

And because we have to come up - there's a text at the end - a draft text. So if I recall correctly so the original task was to have been - which have been set by the Council were originated from this GNSO improvement process and the outcome of that. You remember those - all these committees we had, OSC, PPSC and the subgroups and the recommendations which came out of that process.

And that is the basis on which the SCI is working with regards to those recommendations. So it must be then clear whether we should - this group should think about even, well, to go beyond those points that maybe looking

to the future when a new GNSO review is coming up which will take off this year I guess.

And - or anything else. Or whether we just shall stick on that - on those points which have been set at this time as outcomes from the recommendations of the GNSO improvements. So there is also, as you recall, there is no other mandate given by the Council, not yet. It's just this what we have.

I personally also tend to stay where we are with that mandate. But we should discuss that whether there's a new environment, this new upcoming GNSO reviews there might be a different view with regards to those targets. But I think this is - that should be a discussion we should do here on the SCI as a whole. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. I see your hand there, Avri. I'm just - well I would like just to make a quick comment - response to some of the things that have been stated here. I think that what's really important to recognize is what we had asked - what I had asked as Chair is if we could form a small subgroup that would just have a look at the charter and as you just said, Wolf, kind of shape the discussion or frame a discussion for the larger SCI to sink our teeth into.

And so that's the basis of this subgroup. And if I can impose on Julie to really reach out to the other members of the subgroup and really lock everybody in for this next call so that the subgroup can put some effort towards it.

And then, Julie, if you would be so kind as to publish that to our wiki so that we as members then could see what the general thinking is and where it's going so when we get together in a couple of weeks in Beijing this will be high on the agenda to discuss and that would give us an opportunity to really kind of drill down on this one.

But the subgroup has to do that work first. They need to kind of shape and frame the discussion for the larger group. And so that is a really important point.

The second point I wanted to bring up was that in response to Avri's comments earlier about whether we stay with full consensus or rough consensus or we take advantage of the situation and say, you know, on this particular matter we'll do rough consensus, on another one we'll do full consensus.

I don't think we need that many options. And I think one of the problems we have within ICANN is there are five levels of consensus right now. And basically we all get stuck on the first one; we're all stuck on the very first one, full consensus. And often we find ourselves with working groups in a hung jury environment where both sides have kind of settled in to their positions and can't find the way forward.

I know that IRTP does the rough consensus on everything and then they work back from there to see what they can get full consensus on. And I think that's a good model for us to look at. And what I find attractive about the rough consensus model is simply that the parties that feel that they were standing on the other side of the ultimate determination have a right to put into the record what they felt and why they felt that way.

And considering that our job is really to try look at things more closely for the GNSO Council and then once we do and we find kind of a way that we think is a good way forward we submit it back to them for their determination about how they want to go forward with it.

So I think in serving the GNSO Council it would be much better for us to be able to give back to them this is the general thinking of the - of the majority of the group and here are the minority statements, if I could use those terms, about why they feel it should be another way.

And in that way the Council would have a broader body of information to make their determinations on. So those are the general feelings I have about that. It's already in practice and I think it's something we should certainly look more closely at.

But again the key right now is for our subcommittee to have a good look at this and come back to us with more information. So now I'll turn to Avri and I see J. Scott has also joined so, J. Scott, you'll follow Avri. Please, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. First of all as a point of order I'd like to recommend that in the future you also use the - putting your hand up to put yourself in the thing when you want to speak from a personal opinion as opposed to a chair position just sort of a practice recommendation I'd like to make.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Avri.

Avri Doria: In terms of - in terms of this group itself - first of all every other working group I am a part of, and I'm a part of way too many of them, we definitely work on the levels of agreement, rough consensus and try to find full consensus. And I'm fully in favor of that.

This is the one group - because it changes how the Council works and because it can be used to change the rules at a particular time to force an issue to go one way or another way in the Council. So this group has a different power in a sense than a regular working group. And in fact it's not a working group; it's a standing committee.

So - and it has representatives from each of the stakeholder groups as opposed to a group of people any of which want to participate can participate. And so that's why I'm really citing hard for the status quo of this group not being able to be used for somebody's agenda by proposing something and then getting a rough consensus.

What I can point out that this group can always do is say this group could not reach consensus; these are the following positions on the question you sent us. We're stuck. We're giving it back to you.

But the idea that we would produce a recommendation that didn't have full consensus is what I find very problematic for the reasons I explained before. Thank you.

Ron Andruuff: Thank you, Avri. So my hand is up in the queue.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Ron Andruuff: So I will take my moment to speak personally. I just want to correct what it sounded me to like a mischaracterization of what we can and cannot do. The SCI cannot force any change at GNSO Council level. What the SCI can do is make a recommendation and only that recommendation can go forward in terms of a recommendation.

And then the Council will take that recommendation and make its determination as to what it wants to do with it. So I want to make sure that we're clear here. We don't have any bully pulpit to whip the GNSO into shape in terms of a decision we want.

And I think that the other matter which is a little bit of a red herring is that, you know, are there individuals here that would pursue an agenda? I've been on this committee since it began - I think you have as well - I have not one time seen anyone pursue an individual agenda. What I've seen is great collegial effort in working together. And I think that's what's made this organization - this particular committee one that's been a pleasure for me and others to work on because it is the ICANN multistakeholder model in action.

So let's be clear that, you know, there's no - no one here is pursuing an agenda. We haven't seen it yet since this organization - this committee has been founded. And I don't think that we're going to see it going forward because of the collegial environment we're working in together.

With that, J. Scott, please.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I'm not here to express an opinion at this time one way or the other with regards to this particular issue. What I'd like to speak to is what I've found - what I'm finding troubling is the fact that when I looked at this personally and I looked at what charter says we're to do I'm not so sure that's what we're doing because I look at the charter and it says that we're supposed to respond to specific parts of the improvements that someone has a question about.

Well where does a reconsideration of a motion come in?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Oh yes.

J. Scott Evans: Because I don't think that - that the GNSO Council will accept motions was a recommendation by anybody. And so now we've been asked a question that has to do with the operation of the GNSO, I'll grant you that. But it doesn't have to do with looking at what was proposed by either the PPSC or the operations committee.

So I'm a little concerned with that. And that's one of the reasons I agree that we need to take a close look and redo our charter because I think we've evolved from where we started out to something that's still useful and still has good value but I'm not so sure it's strictly in line with what our charter says we're there to do.

You know, I see that Wolf and the - in the Chat seems to disagree and thinks it's a matter of the rules. But that's not what it - it doesn't say about the rules;

it's talking about the specific recommendations. And it even says in the working guidelines section that you should identify the particular recommendation that you want us to consider, not rule.

So I think there are certain things there that are disturbing to me. And I think we do need to deal with this. And I think we need to drill down on those issues.

And I would agree, I mean, I know that, you know, we've tried to have calls and we have two people here - and I've been - as Chair I've just been reticent to discuss these issues when all the representatives aren't there because I don't want it to be seen that all voices aren't being heard when we make our recommendation back to the larger committee.

And that's the reason we've done this online the way we have to date is simply because, you know, there are some pretty well-entrenched and also, you know, valuable inputs that need to be heard before any recommendation is made. And it's difficult to do that when those voices aren't present.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, J. Scott. I absolutely agree with everything you just said and I appreciate those comments. It is indeed that point that you've drawn that is so important, you know, what are we doing here at the SCI? And that's why I wanted to see that charter updated from - right away because I think, as you've said, we've found a place within the ICANN community that seems to be important.

In fact often I get asked in the BC call is this something the SCI could take up? So it seems that there is a need for an organization - or for a body within the organization such as ours but we really need to have that charter defined and we need the GNSO Council to approve that charter so that we can then really make sure our framework is clear.

And I appreciate the way you've approached it and thank you for that. Avri, go ahead, please.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yeah, I think, you know, J. Scott makes a good point about the purpose of the group and that definitely is worth talking about. I guess I tend to think similarly to Wolf. But I think making the wording more explicit for broader requests from Council is probably a reasonable thing.

I wanted to come back to the two places which you were refuting what I had said. I think you're actually wrong in that because of the voting threshold in the Council it would be quite possible if there was both voting thresholds in this group and voting thresholds in the Council that, yes, indeed a majority that wanted something and needed a rule change to get it could indeed do it.

And basically requiring that rules change recommendations be unanimous at this level so that then the Council can vote on it based on their various voting charts of majority here, super majority there, at least half of this, at least a quarter of that that basically that mechanism isn't reproduced in this committee. Otherwise you do get the ability.

As for no one in this group ever having agendas while I totally agree with you about it being a very collegial group I would have a hard time saying I have never seen something that I might have considered an agenda. We're all relatively political animals and just the notion that all of us would sit here for close to three years now and no one ever had an agenda would be a statement that would be very hard for me to swear to. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Avri. All right unless anyone else - any other comments to add to this particular - this particular topic I will ask that the subgroup please take it up next Thursday and hopefully as many as possible can join that and give us more direction so we sit in Beijing we can really get into this. I think the fact we'll have everyone around one table will also be very helpful and that certainly should help us move forward on this topic.

So moving on then to the Topic Number 7 and that's the working group guideline survey. We discussed this survey at length. We've gone through all the questions and we had put it out to members within the IRTP Working Group.

And we have had two responses in the survey and three on the list. Not sure exact if I understand that, Julie, perhaps you could clarify?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, this is Julie Hedlund. And I ask you to refer to the document I have up on the Adobe Connect screen. What I did today was I reviewed how many responses we'd had in the survey, that is people who took the survey and provided comments.

Two people have taken the survey since we invited the IRTP-C to take the survey. And I have collected the comments that they have provided in the survey. And I have them here in this document.

And then the other note here is that we've had some people who commented on the IRTP-C list but did not necessarily take the survey or did this separately from the survey and I've collected those as well.

Now the survey, I should note, we asked for responses by Monday, the 25th. So the - we are still hopeful to collect responses. And once that time is up I will compile the final results that we have from those who have taken the survey.

Ron Andruff: Excellent. Excellent. Very helpful. And it's good that - it would be good if you could send around or ask the chairs to send around a reminder to those members of that working group today or tomorrow saying if you wouldn't mind just to take a quick look at that survey for us it would be helpful.

Always two responses, three responses is really not enough data for us to work with so if we could get a few more it would be very helpful and we could take this up also in Beijing. Any thoughts, comments, questions from the committee? Okay hearing none I'm going to suggest then we move on to any other business.

And in that case Julie brought it up at the top of the meeting there's one thing that we do want to remind everyone of and that is that we have on Sunday, April 6 in the Rainbow Room - Rainbow like sunshine - a meeting from 1500 hrs to 1700 hrs. We have - they've given us a two-hour slot; I don't think we're going to need that much but I would think 60-90 minutes would be a fair amount of time to a lot for your schedule.

And if you would please make note of that. And I think that that will be a very helpful meeting for all of us to actually have everyone in the room and be able to spend some time discussing these issues particularly about charter and getting some of these other issues like the termination and suspension and resubmission (unintelligible) can get those kind of cleaned up and off the table.

I see some hands up, Avri and then Wolf.

Avri Doria: Sorry, when was that meeting? What day?

Ron Andruff: Sunday April 6 at - do have it right, April 6 - just checking, I'm sorry, Sunday, April 7, I beg your pardon, Sunday April 7 from 3:00 to 5:00 local time. There will be dial-in. There will be transcripts and a recording.

Avri Doria: I may have a conflict but thank you.

Ron Andruff: Are you - will be in Beijing but you may not physically be able to be there?

Avri Doria: Exactly, yeah. I may have two subjects in two places that I have to deal with. I'll check on that timing.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Thank you very much. And, Wolf, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Yes, thanks, Ron. That may be same to me because, you know, we have the GNSO meeting Sunday. It is not fixed right now, it's still floating around whether we shall be tardy at that time or other, let me say, from the Board. So there may be a conflict as well for me.

Ron Andruff: Okay. Well I'd asked that they could put this as late in the day as possible and this was the time we've been given so...

J. Scott Evans: Is it on the schedule? It's not on the schedule.

Ron Andruff: It's not on the schedule. It's not listed on the schedule, no. I just got that from Glen a day or two ago.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Okay.

Ron Andruff: Actually good - I'm glad you brought that up J. Scott. And, Julie, please make a note to people that they may not find this meeting on the schedule in our notes and actions because...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Ron?

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: ...chances are it will not be on the schedule. Wolf-Ulrich, please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Yeah, Ron, just a question of you mentioned it may be enough to have a one-hour meeting or a one and a half hour meeting so it could be shifted within those two hours so that means depending on, let me say, if we come

up after one week and so okay maybe this is better for me to join the meeting at that time. So are we a little bit flexible with that?

Ron Andruff: Yes, we have that two hour slot...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...so if in fact we wanted to - instead of starting at 3:00, start at 3:30 and - or I'm sorry, yes, yes start at 3:30 and go on to 5:00 and then we could work on some of the things like survey and other elements that are a little less, you know, need less minds, let's put it that way, around the table we could work on those things first and work on other things later if that works schedule wise.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Okay.

Avri Doria: That...

Ron Andruff: Did someone call out? I'm sorry. Was that Anne?

Avri Doria: No...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No but if I'm recognized I have a question.

Ron Andruff: I see your hand in the air, madam, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. This is Anne with IPC. And my question is in relation to the scheduling of the meeting being as this is the day after we meet with the GNSO. Did I hear you say earlier that SCI report will be given to GNSO on Saturday?

Ron Andruff: Yes, Anne. Basically what that is it's kind of a summary of, you know, what are we working on and that does the timeline look for finishing some things and sending them back to Council.

So it's really kind of an update to Council; it's not a discussion in so much as them drilling down and getting into the details on things, it's more about informing them to where we are and if they have a few questions, you know, we're happy to answer them. But it doesn't - the presentation of the Council doesn't reflect on the meeting that we'll have the following day.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. And it's Anne again. It seems as though the question that J. Scott and Avri were talking about in relation to charter and what's the charter and what are we actually being asked to do that we should be asking the GNSO about that but yet we don't have another meeting before that meeting with the GNSO on Saturday or do we? I'm...

Ron Andruff: No we do not. And that's why I'm anxious to have that sub-committee kind of give us - work through kind of a framework how they feel we should move forward with the charter. So what we will do as at the meeting is explain to the Council that now it's been a couple of years so we're reviewing the charter.

We'll be coming back with kind of a recommendation as to how we feel we should move forward for the GNSO Council's review approval and/or amendment but that's really what that is. Again it's really kind of - it's an opportunity - it says in our charter that we have to bring the Council up to speed at a face to face meeting at least at the ICANN meetings so that's why we're doing it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, it would be wonderful - of course we meet on Saturday and then go before GNSO on Sunday but I know that scheduling is a nightmare with GNSO and so...

Ron Andruff: Right.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...probably nothing we can do about it. And we probably can't meet early morning on Saturday I gather?

Ron Andruff: Well it's finding meeting rooms and getting all of that and transcription and so forth we're kind of locked into it at this point. But...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...for the future that's one of the things we can try to certainly look to so it's a good comment and I'll take that under advisement, thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, thanks.

Ron Andruff: Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yeah, just wanted to point out two things. One is on the Saturday I can't participate at all because I'm in the ATRT meeting all day. And on the Sunday I have another meeting I'm supposed to speak at, it's at 4:30. So now that means that I would need to leave late so - or early. So with Wolf-Ulrich pushing it on one side and me leaving me on the other side we're constraining to a middle there but that's okay.

Plus there's a possibility that the other meeting I have to speak in will be delayed so I will be sitting watching Skype waiting to a summons that says you're up at which point I'll run off. But I do have a conflict at the moment for the last half hour of our time slot. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Avri. That's fine. So knowing that we'll try to find an agenda that accommodates everyone. And, Wolf, you'll let us know as soon as you have little tighter parameters on your meeting as well I assume, correct?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Yes, yes.

Ron Andruff: Great. All right so we've come to that point in the meeting where we've finished up on the working group. We're at AOB and we're coming to the end of any other business. Does anyone have other business that should be brought before the committee at this time?

Hearing none I will thank everyone for joining and bringing your thoughts and comments to the table today, very helpful as always. And look forward to seeing all of you, as many of you as we can, and in fact it would be very kind of you could let Julie know if you will not be in attendance just so we have a sense of who to expect in Beijing that would be very helpful.

And those who are not traveling to Beijing for reasons as I mentioned we will have dial-in and transcripts and recordings of our meeting. So that will serve those who aren't able to attend. But please let Julie know if you cannot come, that will be helpful.

With that any other comments from anyone?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thank you all.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:: Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Okay.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Ron and everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Laurie). You may now stop the recordings. Thank you.

END