

**Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation (SCI)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Thursday 17 May 2012 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation on 17 May 2012, at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-sci-20120517-en.mp3>

on page

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

Attendees

Ron Andruff - Commercial and Business Users Constituency - Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary – Chair
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC Alternate
Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate
Alain Berranger – NPOC Primary
Ray Fassett – Registries SG- Alternate
Jonathan Robinson - Registries SG- Primary

Apology:

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee
Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary
Mary Wong – NCUC – Primary

Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Géry

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

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Standing Committee for the GNSO Improvements Implementation and it is on the 17th of May. On this call we have Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, who is the Chair, Alain Berranger

representing the NPOC, Ron Andruff representing the BC, Anne Aikman-Scalese representing the IPC, Angie Graves from the BC. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Glen de Saint G ry.

We have apologies from Mary Wong and Avri Doria. And if anybody else has apologies could we please have them now? Not hearing any may I just remind you please to say your name before you speak for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much, Glen and hello everyone. And so we have today our SCI meeting. And we have a agenda for this SCI meeting. And at first I would like to ask, as usual, is there anybody who has something to disclose with regards to the Statement of Interest?

Alain Berranger: Yes, this is Alain Berranger. I'd like to make a statement please?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please, Alain.

Alain Berranger: Thank you very much, Wolf. I'm afraid that I'm going to have to admit that I joined this working group for learning purposes. I'm relatively new to ICANN. And I am - and so I'm getting up the learning curve. So I must apologize because I'm fully aware that my level of knowledge is not sufficient enough to contribute for now. So I ask for your understanding. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you very much, Alain, for this. So - and welcome to this group. Well anybody is welcome to that and I think that's great that you're joining us, well, to hear and maybe also if you can to contribute

something. And, well, it's great to have you here. Thank you very much.

With regards to the agenda I would like to ask whether we have any comments to the agenda? I personally - well let me start with that - I have a comment to the agenda. I would like following the email conversation we had yesterday and today with regard to the working method proposed on this SCI to - I would like to discuss that in order that we have a common understanding on that.

And I would like to start with that if you agree so that's my comment to the agenda. Is - are there any further comment? I hear none.

And so let me start with that - the point that we should just briefly discuss, well, our working method and have a common understanding on how to work. We had an email conversation - I had an email conversation - you have seen that with Ron. Ron was quite, well, to explain that it may be confusing that we are dealing - that we go or seem to go in parallel, in different lines.

That means on the one hand we have established working teams for specific topics. On the other hand we are going to discuss those topics directly although on the level of the SCI. So that's what I understand your comments, Ron, on the one hand.

And I would like to - for me, you know, from my understanding it is - the first thing is that we have to, well, to get things rolling, you know, that's - that we really - there is no, let me say, no kind of waiting on the different teams - waiting for somebody who is starting with that.

It should be clear that, well, somebody should start with that - with that and then we can discuss on the level of the teams and on the level of the SCI as well.

I would like, well, to maybe - to refer to Ron first, well, and ask him, well, so whether - what is the real issue here and then how we can solve the - maybe communication problem we had in the past. Ron please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. Ron Andruff for the record. You know, I think you've summarized it quite well. The issue for me is really one of which track are we following because I was - I'm a little bit uncomfortable being part of a body that is to make definitive statements on certain issues. These are issues that come back from the GNSO Council or come back from other members of the community that need to be refined in terms of an implementation policy, practice whatever.

If in fact I don't have enough background information about that topic to really give proper consideration to it and try to bring some logical thinking to it - to the benefit of our colleagues who are working together on this thing as well as to the greater whole of ICANN.

So the - my understanding was that we would break down into smaller teams and kind of gather that background rather than just handing it off to staff to do but instead we would do it ourselves. We'd go out and kind of gather some background around each one of these effectively four or five topics that we have.

And then bring that to the attention and to the awareness of all of the members of the SCI. And at that point we would get into some

substantial conversation about it and the goal of doing that two-step process, one, gather information, bring it to the group and then the group discuss would be to try to expedite the process and come to some logical conclusions.

The second path is on where we're just saying, okay, I have a general sense of what that is and maybe not even that much information but I'll pick it up along the way through the various discussions within the SCI and within my own stakeholder group. And based upon that knowledge then we as a group will take decisions and determine which is the best way forward.

The former method versus the latter method is that you gather more information and with more information we have - we can make a - I would hope a better determination. The latter method where we just start looking at these issues and start to debate and dialogue amongst ourselves without the benefit of having full knowledge of the topic is, in my view, fraught with problems. And we're really not doing our job sufficiently.

If we are a standing committee we're supposed to be doing some work here that really, you know, irons out these issues. And I don't feel that we as a committee can do that unless we have the information. Information is our friend as we always say. So without having information or the benefit of full information I'm struggling to see how we can make these determinations.

For myself, when I look through these things and as we're in these various dialogues I can shoot from the hip on most of these things. And, you know, I may hit the bulls-eye or I may be so far off the market

it doesn't even hit the target. And that's the concern I have is that a lot of us may just be shooting from the hip with some of these ideas and that's really not doing the service to the community that we should be.

So that's the reason that I posted that email. I am confused as to which way we're going and I do see on the agenda today, you know, a discussion about proxy voting and consent agenda and other things. So I just want to try and understand are we kind of - which direction are we going? It's as simple as that. I really don't feel we can walk down two parallel paths. I think that's kind of foolish. There's no reason for it. I think we need focus on the SCI and so hence my comments.

So I'll just leave it at that but that's really where I'm coming from. Happy to go either direction; whichever the Chair and the committee decides should go we'll go that way but I think what's really clear - important that we have one clear path that we're all walking down. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks - thanks, Ron, well, for that. Let me personally, if nobody else would like to immediately comment, well, let me personally comment on that. So it is a little bit thinking about the understanding of the SCI.

On the one hand it's called a committee. But so I personally, up until now, have the feeling that it is not comparable with a committee you had in the past like OSC or the (PPSC) the Operations Steering Committee and the other steering committee which had sub teams working on really heavy and big items.

You know, when I say big items is, for example, you know that from your own experience and we have been working together on the working team which was just working on the rules of procedure - of the entire rules of procedures. And now, for example, we have - just an example we have just an element of the rules of the procedures which is called the proxy voting. We have to deal with that so it's just one element.

So I would like to - well I see that really we need specialized view on those items. And also I would agree we have to view on those items not only by - personally by ourselves but with our experience and with our conversation to our communities we have. So that's - that one I agree.

On the other hand I was asking myself whether - so sub teams should have such a formal, let me say, constitution that the other sub teams or the working teams had before, you know, they had a charter, they had their own email list and all these things around that. And then they were working and they came up at the end of the OSC to the steering committee and then there was something going forward and backwards.

So I'm asking myself whether we should deal in that way with the topics we have on the agenda or whether those topics could be solved or covered easier. It may be different regarding the different topics we are covering here. But, okay, maybe - this is just only my view on that but I would be - it would be great, well, to hear some more comments on that. As you, Ron, you know, again, please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. Yes, you bring up a perfect example. That working group that was in the process - it was in the - we reviewed all of the procedures for the GNSO Council. That went on for several months - probably the better part of a year if I'm not mistaken. And you were on it, I was on it, Avri was on it...

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...Ray Fassett I think was on it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes he was also...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Bottom line is that there's a number of us who are very knowledgeable about that topic. We debated for hours on end. And we had staff input that was quite significant. So when we come now to this one element of proxy voting here in this discussion there's very few of us that are privy to the depth of the dialogue that happened and how we arrived at the current procedures.

And it's coming back to us now that there's something not quite right about those procedures; that something needs to be fixed. I think it's important that the rest of the SCI understand that. What was the debate and dialogue about? What was the history of it? What, you know, how did we get here?

Because this is the absolute nub of it, you know, now we're seeing that as Avri said there are - you know, there's two ways that things could be changed but it's obvious that something is not quite right. And if a

coder was writing he would fix the bug. And I agree with the general logic.

But the point is we, who were a part of that working group, understand it. The rest of the group here have a - maybe have an idea of it but I'm sure that they don't have the depth of understanding that we have. So for example we had Ken Bauer who was working with us from staff on that particular element.

It may be wise for us to bring Ken Bour on to give a full kind of, you know, 10-minute overview as to what exactly was it; why did we go this way? What were the issues that we were dealing with and how did we, you know, find ourselves with this particular procedure?

So this is what I'm talking about. And that's what the working groups would do. The working groups would just step back a step and say okay so what is missing from this conversation? What would help the whole, the larger SCI, to understand the topic - the details of the topic so that we can debate how to find the solution.

So this is exactly the point that we really need to flesh this out for others. I would - I would guess people such as Angie and Alain and Jonathan and, you know, just looking at the list that I'm seeing on the Adobe Connect they have no idea what the debate was and what was going on there. And I think that it would be helpful for them to understand more about that background to be able to make those decisions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Okay, thank you, Ron, very much. And I see Alain especially is agreeing to that. And I - personally I fully agree so maybe, you know,

it's good that you're bringing up that point so - because I personally - since I was on - some of those teams before and working on that so maybe I'm - I have, you know, I'm of the thinking, well, the others may have the same knowledge as I have so - and I - and on the other they're missing this one.

Okay so that's good to hear. So that was for me, you know, the intention, for example and maybe you haven't seen that conversation with Julie just before that, you know, because I was asking Julie - she - if she would be prepared, well, to give an overview about the proxy voting and the - an explanation of that. And she prepared for that. So that was my - that was my intention for this point, you know, right now. Well and they come to talk about it.

I know, well, you have at first to create a common level of understanding of the topic itself and of the problems itself. And it's - it comes to me more and more that that did not - it happened satisfactorily until now. So that - it is fully agreeable from my point of - from my point of view.

The other thing is then the working method. So, you know, we have created these sub teams and we have tried, as a follow up from the last meeting, Marika sent out a message, well, asking with the updated list so far and asking for more interest or if there is something.

But, okay, there is no - there wasn't a reaction from anybody to that. So we are the persons right now. And we can also stop to discuss. Then I have seen from your email that it was my feeling that maybe that teams or the members of teams who are waiting to some - to initiate -

or to something which - how we should start on that and that is what I was meaning.

Maybe we should also, well, (unintelligible) ask for somebody leading that - those working teams. Just leading - giving initiation to - for that. So and I'm sorry, well, that - I have seen that for the group of the motion of deferrals in the last minutes. And then I was thinking okay I see our - and I'm happy that Ron and Angie are doing something here so let me ask them so no.

I fully understand that they've - maybe there's something more to be done in advance and let's discuss and talk about what we should do more, well, to initiate on the level of the teams, well, to initiate the work. Somebody there, well, would like to comment on that?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hi, this is Anne Aikman-Scalese with the IPC. I think that the idea of appointing a leader for each of the teams to coordinate with the rest of the members of the teams would be a good step forward. And I would like to voice support for the notion that information should be gathered and backgrounds should be gathered for each working team because I feel that it's true that we don't want to make shoot-from-the-hip recommendations to the GNSO.

I feel that if the purpose of the Standing Committee is to review improvements and implementation of improvements that it should be a more thorough review that's supported by information and data.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay thank you, thank you, Anne. And I see Ron and then Jonathan.

Ron Andruff: This is Ron. Thank you, Chair. I would suggest in furthering the idea of having someone kind of coordinate each group I would suggest that perhaps some staff, Marika or someone else, could send a list of the various emails - or let me put it another way - on each working team, on these small sub groups that we've developed - we have a list of who they are.

And perhaps Marika or someone else from staff could send that team, that sub group, a list of all the email addresses that are part of that group. And I think that once I have - because I personally don't have all of the email addresses of the various people I think that are in my group - once I have those then, you know, or anyone has those we can - it's very easy to send out a message saying okay, guys, you know, this is what we need to do.

The next meeting is on this and such a day. Let's gather up the material and let's, you know, try to gather thoughts in this little short list that we have amongst us and then we can submit that to the larger body of the SCI a week before the next meeting so that people will have the background and can digest it and talk a little bit internally with their own supporting group or organization that they're part of to get feedback on - from them on that topic.

And then when we all come to the table on that meeting day people have had, one, the benefit of having the background information and, two, they've had a chance to socialize it within their own group - working group - not, I'm sorry, working group - their own constituency or such like and get feedback from them so that when we have that conversation on the next meeting then we really have something of some substance.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thanks, Ron. Well, may I ask directly, Glen, maybe so whether is this possible to disclose those - not disclose but to (send) the emails directly to the members of those groups without putting them on the public list? And I understand the problem. Glen? Is Glen here?

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie. I think what we could do is Marika has compiled a list of the sub team members into a Word document. And what we could do is perhaps gather - put the email addresses on that document and put that onto the wiki. But I will have to consult with Glen because I think - I think it'd be all right if we put it on the wiki as opposed to sending it to the list.

If we sent it to the list then it would not be, you know, it would go public - it would be accessible publicly. But I think if we go and put it onto the wiki that the wiki is accessible only to the members of this group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay that will be helpful, yes.

Julie Hedlund: So I'll help - I'll work with Glen on that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Is there any more comments? No it's not Jonathan. Okay we could do that. So at first so that would be - okay that's - everybody of the - of those groups knows, well, who the emails then from the other members. On the other hand so what I think is necessary really and it's - seemed to be a great, for some people as well, to talk about the leading or the initiating people.

And I see Jonathan had a comment as well. Jonathan please.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Wolf. Really, I guess my comment is twofold. The first thing is that I very much am sympathetic to and positive about the kind of points that Ron's been making about if we are to make progress, I mean, we're about - we're about taking a set of GNSO procedures that were developed and improved with substantial effort.

And if we are to sort of stand on the shoulders of those that did that work by further improving them based on current experience we do need some background. So that - I think to that extent I'm strongly supportive of anything helping us do that.

The bit that I wasn't so clear on is I just wonder whether we're not a small enough group that splitting it into sub groups might make us potentially less effective. So I wouldn't mind if you and or Ron or anyone else could remind me of our key motivation for why we were splitting into sub groups.

Is it simply that we feel we've got a lot of work to get through and we need to break out into the sub groups? And so that's really both the statement of support for having good background information but a question as to whether we still think it's necessary to break off into these sub groups. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Jonathan. And, well, may I refer to Ron directly? Please, Ron - to that.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Jonathan. Yes, the logic was only to say that we're all busy people and it's evidenced by how many people are actually on the call

today because everyone - there's a lot of people at the regional meeting and this and that.

So therefore the logic of breaking into sub groups was simply to say let's have a few people gathered together to gather up that knowledge as much as they can and just bring that forward. So rather than put it on the shoulders of every SCI member to get fully briefed on their own on every topic break it up into smaller bite sized chunks that a few people can work on each element, bring that data together and put it forward.

I think that last call Avri - and I should be speaking with her on the call but unfortunately she's not with us today - said well I'm concerned about somebody taking the pen and writing this stuff up. And I think there was a - kind of a misunderstanding that this isn't about drafting anything; this is about just gathering information for the whole.

And clearly whichever sub group brings forward background knowledge on a specific issue and if some background knowledge is missing any other SCI can member can say and oh by the way add this to that list of information because this is also a fact.

So it's not like someone could purposely choose to exclude information for the larger group; everyone is entitled to go out and to do their own due diligence and come up with all of the facts around a new topic.

All I was trying to do was to expedite that by saying why don't we have three or four people work on this, three or four people work on that, three or four people work on that and they all bring the various information they have together. They then see where they've

duplicated information so they edit that out and they make one, you know, piece of paper to say here's the background on this topic as we understand it.

So it really was about expediting the process, making it as simple as it could be not a 5, 10, 20-page document but literally a one-pager; bullets, these are the issues that surround the topic, this is the reason that it appears it's back on our table and here's the issue that we might want to think about in terms of finding resolution.

In many ways that's what happened last week when we talked about the consent agenda. What happened was I went - I was ignorant about it so I approached Marika. She came back with the explanation. I asked some specific questions about that information.

Got to a point where I was relatively comfortable with it and felt knowledgeable about it. And I was prepared to address it, you know, this conversation when it came up in the next meeting. Well as it turned out we just took that - that work that she did and we gave it out to the group as a whole.

So all I'm saying is that exactly what I did with Marika independently on the consent agenda I'm suggesting that we have three or four people do that - gather that information together and bring it forward to the group for discussion.

So that was really the principal. I hope that clarifies it but happy to discuss it further.

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Yes, thank you, Ron. Jonathan, do you still have your hands up or is it from the last time? Okay thank you.

Well this is - well let's - I think we could start that way though because - okay what I understand it's also we have to have - to reach this level the same level of understanding each. So now the second thing what I understood from you, Ron, was to say, okay when that is achieved, that level, then we could start to discuss the items, the problems on the level of the SCI.

So if I'm not wrong, well, or if I'm wrong just correct me. So but that's what I understand. So the question is I would like also to have such a kind of mixture that - to saying okay we could discuss the problems or we could share, you know, views on the level of the SCI with regards to solving the problem.

But at first - so - and that was my approach as well and maybe I was too quick in that way. So that means we also need something not only which gives us knowledge but also which some proposal with regards to that - to solving that problem which should come from the working team or from the groups who have been dealing with that. So that's how I would understand the work.

Regarding your opinion or what you have been saying Jonathan was, you know, or the question do we really need sub teams? This is, you know, that's where I also have some difficulties with, you know, on the one hand I see, okay it's - the issues are not that heavy, not that big, you know, to deal with.

On the other hand I see okay it has to be discussed in a broader way and that needs some preparation and somebody should prepare for that. So that is the kind of mixture of how we should deal with those topics.

Just a brief question to Ron; Ron, do you see that as a really hard cut between, you know, preparing for the broader knowledge of the entire SCI and then the discussion of the problems itself? Or how would you see that to be worked on?

Ron Andruff: Well, Wolf, as I said at the top of the meeting, you know, when I explained the two tracts they're not - the two tracts cannot run parallel. You're doing one or you're doing the other. Either you're going out and gathering the knowledge...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...socializing that knowledge then discussing and finalizing. Or you're just going right at the conversation, socializing, discussing, debating, dialoguing, let each member inform themselves and coming to a solution.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: As I said at the top of the call I think this - the latter discussion, just going after it and coming up with a solution is flawed and it's flawed because we lack the detail of the knowledge. And I come back to this discussion about the proxy vote.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: If you, Julie, me, Avri, we spent hours and hours and hours and hours in that debate and dialogue. Well that was a lot of information that should be shared with the larger group before we tackle this proxy issue.

Now I don't - having said that I'm comfortable right now going after this proxy discussion. There are four elements there that I can discuss. But I don't think that my colleagues on this - on this committee can.

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Okay. Well may I refer to Anne? Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes this is Anne with IPC. And it seems to me that there's a parallel between two topics we're discussing. One is whether we need to have sub groups or not. And the other is whether we proceed to a broad discussion with everyone on the phone or whether these, you know, sub groups work and do information.

So I think that the approach taken depends first upon whether or not we agree on the sub groups doing the work and then coming back and reporting to the full group together. So that, you know, the procedure that we determine will determine whether we come at the subjects with enough information to discuss them intelligently.

So if for example on the last call we determined well we'll have these sub groups and they'll develop the information because everyone is really too busy to, you know, deal with all these topics all at the same time then that takes us down the road of having the sub group teams develop information in between calls and report back to the full SCI during the full SCI calls.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Anyway thank you very much. I think the - we could start that way. So what we need - well, what I understood is really then in each group somebody who would take the initiative so - doing that.

And if I refer to the membership list we have to the various teams so we have at the time being four teams. So we have a team for the deferral of motions; one for the proxy voting procedure, one for the update of GNSO Council voting results, table and another one is for the voting thresholds for delaying a PDP.

And we have - so if I look to the updated list - the membership list at least two people on each group which is maybe enough for the first - for the first round, well, to solicit information and to prepare for the explanation what is behind (unintelligible) what is the problems we have and then coming back to the SCI with that.

So I would like to - my proposal would be okay that from each group we have - we first nominate or try to nominate today one leading person who takes the initiative and then going forward with that. So would that be agreeable? I think there's no objection to that. Yes, thanks, Anne.

And then, yes, so then let's go through those groups. So the deferral of motions so we have six people on board: Ron, Angie, myself, Krista, Avri and Carlos on that. Who is - who would be the one, well, to take the lead? That's my question on that deferral of motions. Is that something for you, Ron? May I ask you directly?

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Because - I come back because it was in the minutes at the last meeting.

Ron Andruff: Right, good. I'm smiling and laughing a little bit with you, Wolf. Just because my name begins with A I'm at the top of the list. No all kidding aside I would like to recommend my good friend and colleague, Angie Graves to take the lead on this one if...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...there's agreement? Angie?

Angie Graves: Agree.

Ron Andruff: There you go.

Angie Graves: Yes, this is Angie. Yes.

Ron Andruff: Perfect.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh thank you very much, Angie. And well just to initiate and there will be on the list and discussion and - I think so. That's just we need an initiation for that.

So then for the proxy voting procedure - by the way I don't see Avri on that list also; she started - she initiated today with an email. I was very happy to see that. Maybe she's off of - she's welcome to meet that.

Well, I would take the - not the lead but the initiation if there is something with which we need, well, if that is necessary, well. But we can start on the grounds, well, Avri was starting this. But, well, I myself as I was a - also a member of that group before that so I could put together all the information which is necessary, well, to inform the overall SCI, well, about the problems. So that would be for the proxy voting. If you don't have something against?

Then we have the council...

Ron Andruff: Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: ...voting results table.

Ron Andruff: Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Ron Andruff: I'm sorry, it's Ron. I beg your pardon. You had asked if no one has anything against. I'm just wondering again just from a transparency point of view and the fact that you're the Chair of the SCI and you were on that working group if it might be better to have someone else just take the lead on that topic, maybe, and unfortunately Mary is not with us today but she would be - or Carlos would be probably the ideal one because they weren't part of that working group.

Just again looking at transparency issues and, you know, trying to make sure that we're addressing all of these things in an appropriate way. So that would just be a thought of, you know, a point of order that we might just want to have a look at.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks, Ron, well, to reminding me to that point. So sometimes I'm a little bit maybe - I'm thinking about just, well, to bring things forward.

Ron Andruff: You're a workhorse.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...not taking into consideration that. So that is - so I understand that fully. So and I would be happy so I will ask Mary or Carlos, well, well to do so. And I'm - I think we will find - okay well I've just lost the Adobe Connect. I'm sorry. Again there was some problem with my computer.

Okay anyway then the other - the next group was the group which I mentioned that was the group of the - Anne, where you are. And I think you have just sent or drafted a redline version of it didn't you?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, this is Anne. And I had completed only about three-quarters of the table. This is a relatively minor project I think that doesn't have a lot of policy implications it's just sort of a, you know, more of a drafting thing. Marika said she was very happy to have the additional clarifications based on the language found in the bylaws.

And so, I mean, I'm happy to lead this small group which I only offered to do this way because I too am rather new to this process and as a learning experience but I'm happy to lead this very small project which I think then, Wolf, you'll double check my proposals and Marika will double check them and against the bylaws. And that way we'll have, you know, hopefully...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...something everyone can agree to.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I see.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Recommend.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. Thank you for your offer to that. Thank you. And then the other group is with regard to voting thresholds. Who is on that list? I was just - on that group is Ron as well on it, Angie, Krista and Avri. So...

Ron Andruff: In lieu of the fact that Krista and Avri aren't on the call and I've already pressed Angie to take the lead I'll take the lead on this one, Chair.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay great. So thanks very much. So we have persons and we'll solve that within the proxy voting procedures group who deal with that. And so then it would be, let me say, our - the process would be, well, those groups come back and I think - well let's talk about the timing later on. But they will come back with this information - with debating information along those topics as well in a written or bullet form with that.

And if, you know, if they have the timing (unintelligible) already so they could come up with some proposal as well with regard, well, how to deal with that topic so...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...a solution of the issue as well. I see Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, Wolf, this is Anne with IPC. My question is whether any of the people that aren't currently assigned to a working group might desire to be assigned. In particular I remember Alain mentioning at the beginning of the call that he wanted to be in a learning process. And I can certainly relate to that. And I didn't know if there are others on the call that might - who aren't currently assigned to a working group that might want to be assigned to a working group?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, well, that's - Alain, please.

Alain Berranger: Can you hear me?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, we can.

Alain Berranger: Thank you. Thank you, Anne, for that suggestion. I've - I truly would be doing this group a disfavor by volunteering any further. I'm - my volunteering time is more than 100% booked mostly by ICANN. So although I would - I love new assignments I just have to deliver on my current assignments. NPOC is the newest constituency in ICANN. It's - it was very welcome - it's creation was very welcomed by ICANN Board and staff but it's still very fragile.

And it's - there's so much to do with granting up a new constituency that I would beg you to give me your understanding that really it's not by lack of interest or sense of duty it's really I'd have to refuse the proposal by just having I hope a good sense of reality.

So some of you on the call know my workload so I apologize for being a taker right now rather than a giver but in the end the, you know, I think it's a good way to learn is to participate in (planning) committee. Ideally I would take a - take on more work but sorry to say at this stage I cannot. Sorry to disappoint but I hope you - I have your understanding.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay thank you. Thank you, Alain, fully understood. But in any case, well, your comments or if you have also a specific comment on that are very welcome. Thank you very much.

Alain Berranger: Absolutely. Yes, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And I just saw on that chat that Ray is also keen and relatively taken on the - to the proxy voting working group and that is great thing because you are the one who knows all this stuff as well. So I'm just inclined, well, to ask for nominating you as leader of that group if you like? I'm just waiting for your agreement on the Adobe Connect, Ray. But anyway so we can talk about later that.

So good. So we have...

Ray Fassett: Sorry, Wolf, were you looking for something from me? This is Ray.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Ray. Well I was just inclined, well, to ask you whether you could lead that group?

Ray Fassett: I - you know, to tell you the truth I'd like to. I wouldn't have a problem with that. I was part of the (GCOT) of course, as you know, and we did,

as I heard Ron say, spend a lot of time on that. But right - I can't commit to that now - right now time wise.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fassett: I'm just being honest.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes okay, Ron, understand. So I will refer to Mary or Carlos and hope, well, one of them. Because, okay, as we have heard from Ron and I understand so that myself I should be a little bit refraining from that. But anyway so we will find a solution that. Thank you very much. Thank you in any case for your support on that.

Okay good so now the question is, well, when we start with that what is our time schedule for that? So what is your feeling I would like to ask you, well, to come up with just a short, let me say, output on the issues themselves.

So from my feeling - but I am - so now related to some of those items which I know very well. So for me it's easier, well, to come up or to help coming up relatively on short term with that. So I'm asking you, well, what's your feeling? Is it - could it be within one week or you need two weeks for that or what is (unintelligible)? Please, comment on that and that's you, Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. If we are going to hold to calls every two weeks or so, as we are now...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...and staff were to circulate the list of email addresses of the various sub groups to the sub groups so we could start the dialogue literally tomorrow or the next - or on Monday I wouldn't see that this should take more than a week to gather this information.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Ron Andruff: I mean, the logic here is really to just reach out and grab supporting information. So one of the places, for example, people could look would be to the working groups themselves. As you've said you were part of the proxy voting procedure. Ray is also - was part of that and Avri was part of that. And the three of you are both - or I'm sorry, all three of you are working in this proxy voting procedure discussion.

So you would know to go to Julie Hedlund or to our friend - I mentioned...

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Ken.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Ken - Ken Bour exactly - and to have them, you know, prepare a draft and bring that back to you and have a look at it, make sure it's all - says what it should say in terms of the full background and then you could submit it.

So I'm saying that I think that all of us in the various sub groups, you know, a week to 10 days is certainly plenty of time to go out and do this. This is not having to turn over rocks that have not been turned

over before it's just about going to the source where the information is, gathering the information and bringing it back to the larger SCI.

And maybe, you know, for that - from that point of view we can allow two weeks for that activity but the idea being one week before the call itself we would have received - all of us would have received all this information so we can digest it and then start to address it on the call.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: That would be my recommendation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. And any other comments? Any other feeling with regards to that? So it's - it may depend on the level of knowledge everybody has reached so far, you know, so - and then maybe of different feeling. But it's - I think we should start with that, you know.

And so on the other hand I wouldn't like all that - we all forget what we have done so far because we have some draft paper, you know, some commenting papers in the past. And I think Marika put all them to the related wikis. So if you refer to the wiki in some wikis you can find, well, those documented emails which have been exchanged on the various topics. So that would help. That's one thing - one background on that.

And then we will come back and all the groups next time with - or in between with a short paper on the - on the basics of the topics, the outline of the topics, the outlining of the different - the problems which may arise from those topics. And then this is a good - really good point how we can continue.

Let me just summarize - come back to the groups we have so that I'm clear on that. So we have the deferral of motion. So we - so the initiation is done by Angie, I understand. Proxy voting I will so - immediately and ask Carlos or Mary. The - count the voting results table, Anne, you are so kind, well, to take the lead. Voting thresholds is Ron. Yes, that's it.

So for the working group survey this is still in the - what we have for - as next topics, well, to talk about and to be prepared for that. But let's focus on those four items at first. And, well, if you don't mind we have almost - the one hour is almost over. And it - I think from the discussion today it wouldn't be the best, well, to go into one of the first points which are on the agenda right now. So unless you have the wish, well, to talk about one or the other.

Well, one question I have is - does - well anybody of you needs more, let me say support, on - to work - how to work on that, I mean, well, some contacts to staff or some more background on that or is it for you that in the diverse groups clear how to - how to pick up the issues and how to come up with a short summary next time?

Well there is no - at the time being. Well just let's start with that. So if you don't mind I would like to come to a close to that - of that meeting today. And the first thing would be and, Julie, I would like to ask, well, to take care about the - to - to send out the different email lists to the members. That's the basics they need, well, in order to start discussions on the lists.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, we'll either send it to each individual or I think we may be just can post it on the wiki if that is indeed not publicly accessible.
But we'll...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes but then, well, just to inform everybody on the list, well, then that is - that's - it will be on the wiki.

Julie Hedlund: That's exactly what I'll do. I'll work with Glen on that. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. Good. Anything else?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Just scheduling - excuse me, it's Anne speaking.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So I'm curious regarding the schedule for the next meeting...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, yes, great, no I'm sorry.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Only because I personally could do a call two weeks from today but the day after that then I'm out of the country for two weeks and so I wanted to ask about other people's schedules and what your intention was.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, okay. My intention was, well, to have one two weeks from now. That would be the 31 of May. Is that agreeable?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Glen de Saint G ry: Thirty-first of May, Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Pardon me?

Glen de Saint G ry: That is the 31st of May, Thursday, 31-May?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, same time.

Glen de Saint G ry: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much. And, well, good time; good-bye.

Anne Aikeman-Scalese: Thank you, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good-bye.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

END