

Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI)

Transcription

Wednesday 01 June 2011 at 1800 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation call on Wednesday 1 June 2011 at 1800 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-20110601-en.mp3>

on page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jun>

Attendees

Philip Sheppard – Commercial and Business Users Constituency Primary

Ron Andruff - Commercial and Business Users Constituency - Alternate

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP – Primary – Chair

Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary

Mary Wong – NCUC - Primary

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee

James Bladel – Registrar SG – Alternate

Ray Fassett – Registries SG – Primary

Jonathan Robinson - Registries SG – Alternate

ICANN Staff

Marika Konings

Julie Hedlund

Glen de Saint Géry

Glen de Saint Géry: Good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the SCI call on the 1st of June. And on the call we have Carlos Aguirre, James Bladel, Jonathan Robinson, Wolf-Ulrich-Knoblen, Philip Sheppard, Avri Doria and Mary Wong. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. Thank you very much and over to you Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you very much, Glen. And good evening, good afternoon to everybody. Of this standing committee we have our first meeting -

regular meeting today. And I would like to welcome all of the participants.

I have sent out with the agenda a small introduction with a link to the existing working group - the working group guidelines which outlines okay and so new groups should have a kind of team building process which I think when I look to the member list would be not necessary tonight if just - unless somebody would like to do something that means that everybody should introduce themselves.

I think everybody knows the others from different - from several of the working teams, from several occasions. So that we can just make this some - this (hint) to the working group guidelines. And then start with this is our work.

And the working group guidelines also make reference to the statement of interest which would be provided to each working group. And this afternoon I have received from Julie a kind of (unintelligible) understood is the kind of new form of - or a new process of coming up with the statement of interest.

And that maybe Julie at first could just explain us a little bit what is behind that. And she was asking us - our group - to use this process as the first test group to see whether this process is running or not. And Julie, could you sum - tell us something about that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thanks Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. So as I noted in the email I sent around to the group in the new procedures for statements of interest, Chapter 5 of the GNSO Council Operating Procedures, there is a Section 5.3.2, electronic form and publication, that states that

to ensure consistency ICANN staff shall develop, maintain and provide to relevant parties an electronic statement of interest form including procedures and instructions pertaining to its completion online.

And so we thought that to help facilitate a discussion of this online process, this requirement for an online process to collect statements of interest that staff would develop a draft online form and procedures. And the form has actually the various slots, you know, questions and - that are actually in Chapter 5 statements of interest and the latest approved version.

And what we thought would be extremely helpful is if this group, the improvement implementation group, could help us to test this draft template draft online form and see if you have any questions, see how it works. We've done a little testing ourselves as staff but I think it's much more useful to have folks out in the community using it and see what kind of questions come up.

There are several new useful features in this new solution for collecting statements of interest in addition to the online form which is a requirement of the procedures. There's a wiki page where all of the statements of interest will be gathered and so they can be easily searched in that one place.

And when you, you know, when someone from the community in a work group or work team or whatever enters a statement of interest then that person can decide and select an option to restrict editing rights to the SOI. And then of course any of the work parties and work groups can go ahead and link to the SOI page where all the SOIs will be.

So what we thought if this group agrees is we'll go ahead and send out - for those of you who don't have wiki access - go ahead and send out a login ID and password to each of you and then you can go to the link that we have given in the email and there's a 10 minute tutorial, a video tutorial, on how to use the online tool.

And then we would ask you to go ahead and use the process to enter in your statement of interest for this group and let us know how it works so that we can make some improvements.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you. Thank you very much, Julie, for that explanation. Before we go to the questions - of the participants so I understand that everybody, of us, you know, from the members so is familiar with statement of interest. So we have discussed it in the - with regards to the rules and procedures.

And everybody has already provided a statement of interest. And so I understand that it's a tool to be provided right now. And so there may be some questions around that. And I would like to open the floor for that. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. I think it's a great idea. I think us having to go through any procedures that are being imposed to truly understand them is a great idea. I tried it and I get a page not found. So perhaps I'm doing something wrong or something. But anyway - but I think it's a great idea. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: And Wolf Ulrich, this is Julie. Avri, thank you. I'm so glad that you did try and I apologize that you got page not found. It actually answers I

think a question that Glen and I and Marika were discussing before this meeting.

You know, we have the new confluence wiki process and, you know, it wasn't entirely clear to us whether or not this group would have specific logins for that wiki page. I know that you have, you know, a login for, you know, another page that you use with the NCSG.

But I think we have to give specific logins to this page. So we'll solve that issue and make sure that this - it works for everyone. And so I think what that means is that you'll be seeing that everyone will get individually a login - an ID and a login and then you shouldn't get the page not found.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Has - so anybody - any further question for explanation or with regards to the - opinion about those online SOIs? I understand Avri...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...it's full of support so I didn't try it but I'm open now to do that as well. So if there is no further question...

Avri Doria: Can I get...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...then my question would be...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Avri is it you? You would like to ask something?

Avri Doria: Yeah I'd like to ask a follow up question.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Avri Doria: Which is why would we need a separate user name and separate password from the other account we're using? I don't quite understand that but...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As I just put in the chat I think it might be a case that you as a user need to be added as the authorized user for that specific page which might not require a new login...

Avri Doria: Oh.

Marika Konings: ...and password. We just need to verify that but I'm actually...

Avri Doria: That makes a lot of sense.

Marika Konings: ...assuming that that might be the case. If you're already a user that has a login it probably just requires adding you as one of the authorized users to that specific space. But we'll check and let you know.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, this is Julie. And sorry about that. I think you're right, Marika. I think it's just a matter of saying hey these people who are already out there need access to this page so then hopefully we won't run into that problem. But we'll find out about that right away.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay I see Ron and Ray also joined the call. Welcome to the call here. And we were just talking about to use the new online statement of interest procedure that was - the questions were about.

And I understand while it's helpful to do so. And if there are no further questions and nobody opposed to that so I would say okay. We should try - we as a group - we as group members we should test it. So I call - I also was on this page in the afternoon. I got the page; there was a page asking for a username and a password. And so I think it could work.

So if nobody is opposed I would say okay we are going - as much we are going to use that. And we'll try it. Do we have - well what is your time expectation, Julie, for that test?

Julie Hedlund: Well certainly we'll very quickly get the issue of the access to the page settled. And then I think we probably would like to give people at least a week. I mean, I'd like to get a sense from the group here how much time they think we might need.

I know people are busy leading up to, you know, to Singapore, possibly even two weeks. Wolf-Ulrich or others do you have a sense of how much time you'd like to have?

Avri Doria: A couple days.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: A couple of days; one week or so, yeah?

Julie Hedlund: Well then why don't we say a week and we'll check back and see what kind of responses. But of course as soon as anybody...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...use it, you know, any feedback and, you know, immediate feedback is quite useful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ron is asking how long does it take, five minutes to half an hour or what?

Julie Hedlund: I think it's...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ten minutes Marika is saying.

Julie Hedlund: It depends on how much information - this is Julie, sorry - it depends on how much information but, yeah, Marika is noting 10 minutes for the tutorial and then just how long it takes you to fill out the fields.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay good. I think there is agreement that we should do that and they'll do it. Thank you. So let's go back to the agenda - to my proposal to the agenda. So I - on the agenda we have selection of chair and vice chair and we have the review of charter working group guidelines and the working plan and to discussion of time table.

Is there anything else you would like to talk about today? I see none. So I think everybody should be aware of what this standing committee is about because since it was implementation by the Council, by the GNSO Council and the charter was accepted there and the - I think we will come to the charter later on the topic Item Number 3.

And so there could be questions raised whether we have the same understanding of what the goals of this committee are and what are the tasks of that.

Let's go then to the Item Number 2, selection of chair and the vice chair. So let's just formally I picked up a sentence which says the newly elected chair will act on a provisional basis until the chartering organization has confirmed the appointment. This is later on in the working group guidelines. But it means formally the Council has then to confirm the appointment.

So how do we select the chair and the vice chair? There is no procedure for that. Can we do that - yeah, let me say that. Okay, Avri has something - has...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. I have a question that relates to the charter and it relates tot the chair. Does this group, first of all, have somebody in the liaison role that, you know, if we're sort of following the working group guidelines there's not only a chair role there's a liaison role. And...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I think we need one. I know that at the moment I guess a couple of you are Council members but that's different than being a liaison role that's bringing the stuff back and forth. And if we do have one of those then it needs to be somebody different than the chair is an assumption I'd have.

In terms of how we pick the chair if we end up with more than one candidate then we probably need to vote on it. But other than that we can use a Doodle poll for that if we need to. But really my first question is do we have a liaison? If so who is that liaison?

And my feeling that obviously the - I think it's an obvious feeling of mine that a liaison shouldn't be the same as the chair. And if we do have a liaison I think a chair who is perhaps not a Council member might be worth considering. So those are my thoughts, thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just for my understanding, Avri, liaison - you mean liaison to the GNSO or liaison to any other...

Avri Doria: No to the Council - the Council liaison.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The Council liaison, okay.

Avri Doria: The one that speaks for the group in the Council and the one that speaks for the Council in the group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so - when you look to the members list so far we have - we have only members from the different stakeholder groups, from the NVAs, is Carlos and the different stakeholder groups and

constituencies. And there is no one from the IPC, not yet, announced. So that's what we have at the time being.

So we should talk about - so about the question - the liaison questions not only to the Council but also with regard to the members of other advisory committees for example the ALAC and maybe others so. So whether we should approach them, the others, in order to announce - to nominate a liaison or member to this group.

What was that definitely with regards to the Council liaison? Okay let's talk about so as I see Ron and then James. So - sorry, was Avri the first one or are you still from the last time? So I see Ron and then James. Ron please.

Ron Andruff: Good afternoon Wolf-Ulrich and all. I'm just - I'm not sure the, you know, we can read the charter for this group and we can imply all kinds of different things that we could do but I think what we should be - what we should be trying to do if this is going to be a standing committee is create kind of a nimble and clean operation in so much as when we start talking about liaisons to the GNSO and adding more realms of activity I'm not sure why our chair is just not that liaison.

So I'm just trying to understand the point Avri is trying to draw out. But from my point of view this body should be a very - we're not a judiciary, we're not a heavy thing, we're not, you know, all we do is manage a certain activity and so therefore I would think our chair should be the one that is the liaison whether it's the ALAC, whether it's the GAC or whether it's the GNSO or whoever it may be. If something has to be said by the group it should come from the chair. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Ron. James please.

James Bladel: Hi, thank you, Wolf, James speaking. So just an observation since there are - for lack of a better description two categories of membership here. There are our primary members and alternate members. As a matter of just for being - for practicality I would recommend that only primary members be considered for chair and vice chair. And I realize that that takes me out of the eligibility for either and that's fine.

And I would also point out that for those folks who are primary for one group and alternate for another group that if they were to participate as chair or vice chair that they would participate in the capacity of whichever group they were primary for. So that's just a matter for practicality. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, Avri disagreeing but anyway Mary is the next.

Mary Wong: Oh thanks Wolf. Was Ron's hand raised before mine? I'm happy to let him go first.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry I didn't hear you?

Ron Andruff: I apologize, Mary.

Mary Wong: Oh that's okay, thanks Ron. So I had a couple of questions. And I think this was probably because I'm not as familiar with the working group guidelines as I probably should be by now.

But it occurs to me that I think, you know, as you know I think it's a great idea that we follow the working group guidelines that were adopted by the Council.

To some extent the - I guess the word of the SCI is a little different in the sense of, you know, supervising or reviewing implementations and recommendations.

So I'm wondering if we want to put our thoughts to two things, one is whether there's a term for the chair or does that run continuously until such time and secondly to the extent that we have a chair and vice chair for that matter what happens when we're reviewing something for which that chair or vice chair was say the chair of the working group we're reviewing?

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Okay so your question was, okay, if there is a - let me say a - maybe a conflict of interest if I understand that correctly which could arise for a certain vice chair or chair having two hats or so? Philip, next question please.

Philip Sheppard: Yes thank you. I'm disagreeing with what Mary was saying in terms of following working group guidelines. I think again indeed this group is a little bit different to the structure of which those guidelines are written. So I think we just need to be pragmatic as we go through those; use what is useful for us and realize there maybe some stuff which is overly complex for our needs.

And I guess also on the question of conflict of interest, I mean, that's fairly straightforward to manage, I mean, that's typically whoever is - has a conflict refuses themselves during the conversation there and

that's typically why you have vice chairs, etcetera if the chair has a conflict. So I hope that will be the way that we would proceed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: So thank you. Okay so we have a - okay so we have certain alternatives. The question is for me right now so how to proceed. Shall we - I could ask for some - okay, volunteers - volunteering for the chair and the vice chair because then we can discuss (unintelligible) well which kind of positions they have coming from which part of this team and then - well okay then come to consensus or so.

But I see Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. I wanted to get back as before we went that step to the idea that secondaries not be chair or vice chair. I actually think secondaries if they're willing to put in the time are excellent as chair and vice chair material because most of the time they would be able to act purely in the neutral position that a chair requires without needing to also be keeping track of their primary hat whereas anyone else who's a primary is always going to have, you know, the primary position unless they permanently pass it off to the secondary.

So I don't think that secondaries should be excluded; I think they're appointed to the group by their SGs or constituencies and, you know, they should be considered. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay so Ron, as an alternate, please...

Ron Andruff: Actually, thank you Wolf. And I want to preface this by saying my hat is not in the ring. But, yeah, no I think we've got a small pool of candidates and therefore what Avri just said is exactly right, you know,

the - the fact that an alternate might well be very neutral, more neutral than the leader but that's, you know, neither here nor there.

I think it's just - it's a small pool and I don't know why we would procedurally just say one or the other. I don't know what the working group comments said but it doesn't seem to make sense for me; it's a small group. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So okay then let's taking this into consideration and then I think the floor is open for volunteers or for somebody who would like to nominate somebody else to - for the chair and the vice chair positions.

I would say the best way for - if there's no - nothing opposed to that so it would be - well if - we would have two volunteers; one for the chair and vice chair and we could come to consensus - at least two, let me say at least two that means - and we could come to consensus for these positions both together.

If anybody is not agreeing to that that means that we should elect the first chair and then a vice chair then I'm open also for that. So okay let's go and who is going to volunteer primaries as well as alternates for chair and for vice chair or who is - Ron?

Ron Andruff: Thank you. Thank you Wolf. If you're - my thinking is if you would be open to continuing as chair that would be from my point of view something I would be happy with. And I was going to recommend - I haven't checked with Philip but Philip has a lot of experience as well as a vice chair. Does that make sense for you? Would you consider that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I - thank you. And Avri first.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I would be concerned about having people from the same stakeholder group. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so I understood Ron's question - well, about myself. And he was suggesting Philip as vice chair. So Avri is not happy with that but - that both come from the same stakeholder groups. Mary please.

Mary Wong: Thanks Wolf. And I share Avri's concern though obviously these are not comments about the persons themselves just the representation. I would like if I may to nominate Avri for chair or vice chair and keeping in mind that too - we want to keep a balanced representation across as many groups as possible.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, Avri.

Avri Doria: I'd be willing but I'd also like to throw James's name into the considerations for either chair or vice chair.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so we have James. So Ron was also coming out with my name. So I would agree to that also except (unintelligible). Somebody else? So we have three names. Three - I would ask, okay, if one of the other to which position they are looking or are they open. Avri, would you be open for both positions?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, as well. And James, you?

James Bladel: I'm sorry, folks, until the affirmation of commitment review team winds down I will not be able to take on any other - I do appreciate the nomination but I just won't be able to take that on.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Good so I understand that's - we are still two. And Ron please.

Ron Andruff: I was just going to suggest that we - because we're - there's no - how should I put it? You could be chair or vice chair and I'd suggest a slate - I would break that slate in two meaning that Philip could also be a chair as well as a vice chair and, Wolf, I would select you as chair or vice chair as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So what you're suggesting is Philip as well for this?

Ron Andruff: Right, I'm saying - my comment would be that I had suggested a slate of you as chair and Philip as vice chair and I'm recommending that I could reverse that as well that Philip could be chair and you as vice chair or any combination of Philip as chair or you as chair or Philip as vice chair and you as vice chair. So I'm saying I want to keep both of you in the race in some form. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so then - okay, Philip, I would like to ask you what's your opinion please?

Philip Sheppard: Yeah just exactly - I'd be very happy to serve.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So you would be prepared for that?

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So let's talk about this. So we have three candidates so it's Avri, it's Philip and myself for either position of that. So could we discuss a little bit further on there because there was - there were arguments so which we should take into consideration coming from Avri and from Mary that means a - since we are a group of GNSO stakeholders so chair and vice chair should not come from the same stakeholder group.

And I wonder whether this is a principal in the working group guidelines as well? I'm not sure about that. Or is that - does anybody know that, Marika or Julie?

Avri Doria: I don't think so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm not sure about that. But, okay.

Avri Doria: Wolf-Ulrich...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I can't get my hand up. Yeah, I don't think it's a guideline; it's a personal preference. It's something I suggested. I do not believe - and in case the guidelines are just guidelines. So, you know, and so I'm really indicating a preference and I'm not trying to state that the guidelines state they shouldn't be. I don't remember if we actually discussed it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, okay but it's an opinion we should really discuss that. I'm open for that. Ron please.

Ron Andruff: You know, earlier it had been brought up that perhaps we should, you know, have principals or alternates speaking but I - again I defer to the fact that we really are a small number of people and our job is to go back to the charter and the activities that we're supposed to undertake. I don't think it's going to be a political one per se; I think our job is - it's about implementation, is this being the implemented the way it should be implemented.

So this is an administrative role and it's not - this is not a role in my view that is the same as being the chair of the GNSO, you know, they are two different activities. This is implementation right in the name. So my thought on this is that we might want just to put it out for election for a week; have all of the people participating in the SCI come in with their vote and then we'll take it from there.

We can debate different things as we go along but at the end of the day I think we've got a qualified group of people and I think our job is implementation and I think we need good implementers to, you know, steer the ship. So...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...whether they're from the same SG, not from the same SG, same, you know, constituency it should be really irrelevant. Really, let's just pick the best horses for the courses and step forward. That's my view. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you very much, Ron. So I've - I would join this opinion so in saying also let's continue right now with the meeting. And since

there was - for me also an open question what is really in the working group guidelines. We have to check it first so that we can follow that, so this is one.

I would say the (unintelligible) to chairs and vice chair and the question of balancing we should follow what is in the working group guidelines. And then we can follow what you were saying that means that we come up with - we have three candidates, Avri, Philip and myself, and we will come out and send out this for voting to all the members of SCI and then we'll see what is going to happen.

And so far if I understand I would be the interim - continue as the interim chair of this group and then we could continue. Ron, are you still on for questioning?

Ron Andruff: Oh I beg your pardon. This is - I'm just learning this system, I beg your pardon; I'm down.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so Avri also agreeing and James is also agreeing to that, I as well. So then (unintelligible) participant and Philip also is agreeing to that. Good. So then let's go to the next - to the next item. The next item is reading of charter - of the charter and working group guidelines maybe and any other documents.

I have send out a list with the documents I was - being as relevant for this group and the charter as well. And I would like just for those who are not that familiar with the charter and with the goals of this group briefly come back to the main tasks laid down in the charter.

This is the very - in the very first part of - in the general paragraph which says the standing committee will be responsible for reviewing and assessing the effective functioning of recommendations provided by the OSD, the PPSC and the policy develop process working team and approved by the Council - by the GNSO Council.

And in two ways we'll be responsible for reviewing that. The first is on request; that means for those recommendations that have been identified to present immediate problems for example with regard to the all the procedures we had something in the past with regards to statement of interest or to the voting and proxy and these things.

And on the second way - on the periodic time scale for all recommendations in order to identify possible issues and/or improvements subject to a clear definition by the SCI on which recommendations should be reviewed.

So this is - very understandable. What - so that's the main targets and the main tasks of this group. In - I should recall that we still have the OSC and we have the PDP working team working. So the OSC is still handling some items with regards to proxy voting and maybe others as well.

And the PDP working team is still finalizing finishing the work with the - for the policy development process (unintelligible). So that means our work is going to be in parallel for a certain time with those teams.

So the question is - first question is, for me, okay is that clear to everybody or does anybody has a different question specifically asked

to the work to be done? So just summarize that means this group has a reactive part, let me say that, in that way for the first part of this task.

And the other one could be inactive if there is something to be done; if there is a work program which we come up with and that would be our active part. The other one would be a reactive part just waiting for problems let me say and then reacting and picking up those problems and streamlining.

Let me add another thing, so when I prepared that meeting so I was aware that on board level we have also a structural committee, the Board Structural Committee, which is supervising the - all the organizational and improvements aspect of the - of ICANN let me say, in that respect.

And the GNSO improvement part is also one - I think they are supervising or they are, let me say, supervising in a way - I don't know in which way but it's on the agenda.

So I was thinking about whether we should establish a link to this group - to this structural committee as well, you know, just to tell them, okay, here we are; we are also - we are from the GNSO this group which is focusing on the improvement and on the affectivity of the improvements already implemented.

And if you have a different question to that so please by those questions and come up with that. Okay just an idea. Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Wolf. With regard to your last part of your comment about if I understood what you said correctly it's about having a liaison to the

board governance group on improvements. And I support that idea; I think that would be a very good idea.

And again the chair should be that liaison - the chair and vice chair - I really think the two should be connected when we talk about liaisons to GAC or ALAC or GNSO or to this particular body you've just spoken about so both parties are privy to what's going on and we can carry on smooth operations in that regard.

And that - but bringing that - that brings me back to the actual activity that we undertake. I can - when I review the charter I see a lot of words but I just - I wonder is there a - where are the trigger points in your mind, as the acting chair, what are the trigger points when we actually engage? Or perhaps some staff can give us some sense of the trigger points in real clear terms.

So when do we engage and when do we step back? Is there any kind of thinking of guidelines on that? Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Well if I can start there is - for me it's the question because the charter is saying okay we should review the effective policies that - effective handling or - and certainly effective functioning of the recommendations.

So then the question would be what does it mean effective functioning? So, you know, the first part is just react. So we could lean back and waiting okay if somebody is crying, okay, something is crazy, you know, to handle so with regard to the rules and procedures or with regards to later on with the policy development process or what else. So okay they would like to refer to us. So that's one part.

If we go to the second part I would say we have to do something that before we come up with a list of what we should do we have to understand what is the - the - what is the purpose of that? So that means what does it mean effective functioning of recommendations?

Does it just mean okay if nobody is crying then it's effective or does it mean okay we should go into the mechanisms of the implementation of recommendations and look at this is it effective with regards to the overall work of the GNSO? Or does it mean - could we save time for example if you modify amend something? Although it's just an idea.

So the question is for me the key is what is effective functioning? So that's what I would like to discuss and what I would like to have an opinion on that. If there are ideas so could be just an idea. Today I didn't prepare more in detail that but it's an open question for me.

Ron Andruff: Well, Wolf, this is Ron. If I might just respond to what you said?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Ron Andruff: I think the thought of, you know, finding that trigger point, defining that trigger point should be something we should try to get to more quickly. Obviously it's going to be a, you know, it's going to be broad in so much we can't narrow it down to really defined terms but at least we can consider what that concept looks like.

I don't feel that we should be starting to go in and look at systems. You know, I think it's more the former; you said if people are making a lot of

noise we should be talking about; if they're not making a lot of noise we shouldn't be. I'm more of that school of thought.

But I think that that's something that - the charter is decidedly vague and I think that this group initially is going to - we should certainly set that kind of framework up at least how do we think about it? Maybe a face to face meeting in Singapore might give us some - be a good place for us to start to address that that at least we can all sort of understand, you know, who are we and what do we do in this role? And Singapore might be that opportunity. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So on the chat I saw Philip saying trigger point is for the first PDP and then (unintelligible) for example. So just - at the time being so the PDP is not yet an item for us I would say because it's not yet implemented so we - what we should talk about is recommendations which have been implemented.

And if you go to the - to the list which was sent out - the document list - there is shown the list of documents already that is for example we have the recommendation to develop a global outreach program which is implemented or under implementation.

We have the communications (quality) recommendations from the OSD under implementation. The toolkit services under implementation and the working group guidelines in - and the broadest sense; there are some parts still under consideration. So that's it what we have at the time being.

In our, James, our working group guidelines they are implemented, yes but the operating procedures I would say these are in part

implemented as well. So that's - these are the recommendations we should look at at first. So that's my understanding.

And then step by step so we could pick up the others when they come to implementation. Avri please.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. I guess I'm not quite sure the degree to which we're being proactive on this. And I didn't think we would necessarily - that this committee would necessarily be that proactive. I mean, that - yes some of the things that have been implemented and have had a year or two then there was the whole notion of doing the review.

But that otherwise I thought that some problem had to be brought before and that we weren't just looking for issues. So I don't - I guess I'm having a little curiosity about to what degree we're deciding to be proactive and decide that, okay, this one has been approved therefore we need to look into it. I'm - I guess I don't understand. Thanks.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, this is Ray. I haven't raised my hand but if I can speak?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fassett: I agree with Avri. I think that was very well said. I think - and importantly for us is to maintain our legitimacy as we move along and progress. And the ability to have methods of communication to this group I think is significant to that end, ways to be contacted over what the issue might be and then the ability to move quickly and begin to address whatever the issue is.

Which is more of a reactive mode than being necessarily going out and looking for problems or looking to be proactive to get involved but instead maintain our legitimacy by being the sounding board or the place that folks can come to when they feel there is an issue.

And then how do we - a secondary question then that pops into my mind is how do we - what is the way for them to articulate what the issue is? Is it an online forum? Is it a series of questions? Is it - I would think though a standardized way of informing is group of what the issue is might be something for us to look at as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Marika, please. Marika. Oh Marika are you on mute or...

Marika Konings: Yes, can you hear me now?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay sorry, I think I was on mute. So this is Marika. So on the more proactive notion that we're talking about, I mean, the charter does talk about periodic review of recommendations. And then actually what it does talk about is that the SCI is expected to actually develop a plan, a review plan and indicating when items should reviewed, a proposed timeline and as well indicating if any resources might be needed, I guess, you know, like a working group for example or additional maybe staff support.

So instead of indeed saying well we need to review all these items that are in the other document the SCI might want to focus on indeed what timeframe would be appropriate for considering a periodic review of those items so that might be something as a - it's not an immediate but

it would be a more proactive approach in - towards reviewing some of those items.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay thank you. And Philip.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah, I agree with all that. I think maybe some things that are suitable to a timed - a periodic review. And other things I think can be more ad hoc. I mean, I would be asked probably as a regular meeting each time a working group finishes or PDP led by somebody, whoever finishes, having a conversation with the people who are leading that process and finding out what they thought was good in the process, what wasn't.

And so just a bit of sort of ad hoc learning as things go on. So you flag up a few things which you can, you know, we may just file away. That's interesting; they had problems with that. And then we do it the next time and we find they have the same problems and then you start thinking is this something that's more systemic rather than individual to that particular group.

And I would see us working a little bit more like that as well as things go on, different types of (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay that's a very good suggestion I would say as well. Could refer to those groups that are just coming to an end to - of their word or really (unintelligible) sometime experience with their policies and work and we could discuss that and then ask them, okay, what could be - it could be improved though. Okay, there are some ideas, thank you.

To my mind came also if so if we go that ways, you know, to - for periodically reviewing recommendations that would at first I think be we must have a status about that. So we have a status right now on the list - a general one which means, okay, it's under implementation or it's implemented.

But implemented means if you look to the different recommendations for example, outreach program or toolkit or working group guidelines so it's a lot of different recommendations in it. So it is - I think we need more transparency about that.

What does it mean? What is the status of - the action status of the implementation of that in order really to come up - and what is the timeline of that to be implemented in order to come up with our own review process or timeline with regards to those different recommendations.

In this respect I would like to refer to staff and ask them, Marika or Julie, how do you see that? So is that possible that we get a rather detailed status of the different implementation processes? Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. You're talking about the implementation of the different recommendations?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, you know, I refer to the documents list, you know, we have so...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And we have different implementation status let me say. So because each recommendation - or each output of - the working group output has a set of recommendations for example the communication (quality) recommendations.

Marika Konings: Right. I think that maybe Julie can help with that because I think most of the items that are in implementation are from the OSC so I don't know if Julie or Rob might be able to help there and provide a more detailed overview.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes...

Julie Hedlund: Sure.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...for example let me just come to an example for the communication (quality) recommendation. So we have just - came out with a new wiki I think so this is - that is more or less implemented right now. And but there are also recommendations in the - in the set of recommendations for communications.

And so what we just - would like to see let me say they have a list of the different recommendations in saying okay it's not yet implemented, it's implemented, it's planned for this and that so that we can just go through and see what's happening there. Julie please.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thanks Wolf-Ulrich. So as I understand you then - and I'm happy to do this - take this one - is to go through each of these items as we look at the document names here and to indicate where we stand on implementation and any items that may not have been addressed thus far.

So where are we, you know, status of implementation on each of the, complete or not or where and then those items that perhaps haven't been addressed and so we can determine a plan for addressing them. Is that along the lines of what you were thinking?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes that would be very helpful I think so...

Julie Hedlund: All right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...so then this is - this could be a basis also for our timeline.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie. That would be - in some cases that will be quite straightforward to do for many of these. And I'll work with Rob Hogarth on the toolkit services because he's been keeping a close eye on that. And the only item then that I'd get some input from Marika on is the new policy development process and just there's a little bit of an update there that we can add.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you. So okay thank you very much. Ron.

Ron Andruff: Wolf-Ulrich I'm a little concerned about your - what that request is just now because Philip was going down the avenue of we'll just sort of keep an eye on things as they progress just more or less at a distance meaning in my view that our chair or vice chair would be kind of checking in with the chair of that working group to see if there were any issues or problems as opposed to taking a deep dive into this which is what I heard.

And I may be wrong but what I heard you say was you wanted to have detailed information on all of the different things that are happening right now. Some of those things might be going along very smoothly.

I think that it's at the point - and I come back to my question about the trigger - at what point do we engage? If we follow Philip's suggested methodology of just keeping a light touch and kind of watching how things are going and then when we reconvene let's say 30 days later and we look at it again it's either gotten better or it's gotten worse.

And if it's getting worse at that point we would start asking for detailed information. I'm a little concerned that we're going to start now delving into, you know, putting heavy burden on staff and also the committee in so much as it's a lot of reading you're going to be giving us on top of all the other working groups and so forth we do.

So I just wanted to have a clarification of that. I'm a little concerned about deep diving; light touch is my view. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Maybe - give me a chance to briefly explain. So I wouldn't be so let me say to deeply dive in those details. The only thing - what I was saying was we have, you know, we have to - we have different basic documents to look at if we go - if we also go proactively which are discussing as well not only the reactive way.

So that means that we have these different documents which we could say okay they are in part or also in total implemented. I don't know - I don't have this overview very clear to me.

So - and in this respect for example if say - if somebody comes up with regard to problem - with regard to document or recommendations which are fully implemented then we should pick it up.

But we need this transparency. I wouldn't go then the other way, you know, to dive in and to pick up any or every recommendation by itself and dive in and turn it around and look for what could be improved. It should come from the practicability and from the experience from - with which other people have.

So I fully agree to that. So for me it was only the question so is this list of documents which we have and the status which is saying okay partly under implementation or it's still in implementation is that enough for our purposes or not; that was my question so. Philip.

Philip Sheppard: I think my - yes, I think our work plan looks good. I think the ideas that we talked about on the call so far look good. I like, Mary, also have to leave the call momentarily. I'd just like to comment on time table in (five) and the work plan and meeting schedule.

I'd have thought that should really be the job of the new chair and vice chairs to work together, come up with a proposal and come back to the group on that. It would seem to be a natural task for those people once we select them.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, yes I see. So we have - we have our deadline was 9 o'clock here in Europe. So we can leave that part as well. And I would come up with some proposal for that.

What we have with regards to our - the time table is that - I have to - or the chair has to provide some information to the Council in Singapore to give a brief status report of this group. And okay we can exchange some view - some views on the list. And I could put that together for the Council as well.

We have on the time table we have on the schedule one meeting scheduled in Singapore if that meets your timetable as well. And this is scheduled I think on - either Saturday or Sunday. Marika? I think Saturday morning isn't it?

Marika Konings: That's correct.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Saturday morning 9 o'clock.

Marika Konings: Yes that's correct from Saturday from 9:00 to 10:00.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: From 9:00 to 10:00. So I would say that that could be very helpful to have this face to face meeting as well. And I will put together the ideas you are talking about today and put it on the list and send - we can exchange some views.

And maybe we have some more - with regard to the (trickling) and discuss that further on then in Singapore. So if there - for today I would say it was an open discussion and there were some ideas for starting this group.

And I would say okay if there are not - no further question to that then we would put this meeting on the schedule for Singapore. And we will stay in contact on the list and then meet again in Singapore.

Avri Doria: Sounds good.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So are there any further questions or yet?

Ron Andruff: Well done, Wolf-Ulrich, thank you very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much...

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...for that.

James Bladel: Thank you Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And good bye.

END