

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements implementation meeting
01 November 2012 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting teleconference on 01 November 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-20121101-en.mp3>

on page
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

Attendees:
Jennifer Standiford - RrSG
Ray Fassett – Registry Stakeholder Group – Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) - Alternate

Apologies:
Angie Graves – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate
Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC Alternate
Ronald Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Primary
Alain Berranger – NPOC – Primary
Jonathan Robinson - Registries SG – Alternate
J. Scott Evans – IPC Primary

ICANN Staff:
Julie Hedlund
Julia Charvolen

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

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation Meeting call on the 1st of November.

On the call today we have Ray Fassett, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, James Bladel. We have apologies from Angie Graves, Scott Evans, Jonathan Robinson, Ronald Andruff, Avri Doria, Alain Berranger and Anne Aikman-Scalese.

From staff we have Julie Hedlund, and myself, Julia Charvolen. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Julie. And we are going to start with our agenda today. Okay is there any - a statement of interest, something to disclose? No I hear none.

Approval of the agenda; anything to amend, anything to add? Any comment? Nothing. Thank you.

So we have put the topic of chair and vice chair election for the SCI in front of the other topics. And I would like just to start with and to think about - that we think about, you know, how we can proceed with that.

But let me first state here since the - since we got new Council members we are also facing new membership on the SCI so in context of that. So for example Carlos Aguirre, he left the Council and he was the NCA - representing the NCAs on the SCI.

So I've initiated - I sent a message to the Council and to the NCAs, in particular, the new ones and the present ones, asking them for - thinking about a representation - a member of the NCAs.

I got a response from Jennifer that she is interested in taking part in the SCI. And I - well I'm just waiting for comments or maybe interest also from the other NCAs, you know, it's Thomas and Lanre. If not - if that is complete I would suggest that then Jennifer is going to join the SCI.

I also asked Mary how their functional shall be regarding the NCUC and the representation of the NCUC or the NCSG on the SCI. So I'm still waiting for feedback. So that's the status with regards to the membership of the SCI.

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I just want to note that James Bladel has his hand up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh yes, yes, please. James please.

James Bladel: Oh so I didn't want to interrupt but thank you, Wolf. This is James speaking for the transcript. And I was just concerned about just going back to one of your first statements I was concerned about going too far down the road for Item Number 4 and Item Number 5 on our agenda just because it seems as though clearly we shouldn't be holding any kind of elections with such as small group.

But also noting that most of the discussion on the deferral of motion's language which occurred between J. Scott and Avri, both of whom are not on the call, so it just - it seemed like we should perhaps start the agenda with Item Number 6. But I think that the conversation has kind of moved beyond my questions so I will lower my hand.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh that's a good suggestion, James, really. Well I would like to exclude anybody from that discussion. I was just wondering, also, how we should deal with that. I wouldn't take any decision today just kick off. But it's really - I appreciate your comment. And I think it's helpful. So if you have more people attending and taking part in that discussion.

So, well, if you accept (unintelligible) so then let's do that and follow your suggestion to start with this Number 6. And if others are going to join us later

on then we can step into the discussion of the - of Number 4 and 5 afterwards. Okay thanks.

So the topic under 6 is, okay, it's just Marika sent out the changes on the PDP manual with regard to suspension of a PDP. I think she send it out to the public comment. And maybe we can get some comment on that and update from Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, absolutely, Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. The comment period on the proposed modification of GNSO PDP Manual to address the suspension of a PDP based on the language recommended by the SCI.

That was opened on the 22nd of October. The initial comment period will close on the 12th of November. If there are comments then a reply period will open on the 13th of November and close on December 3. There currently are no comments in the forum at this point.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you. Did I understand it correctly that it's going to close at November 3?

Julie Hedlund: No, it will close - if there are comments then there'll be a reply comment period that will close on December 3.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh December 3, yes, okay.

Julie Hedlund: Right. So the initial comment period will close on the 12th of November so two weeks from this coming Monday. And then if there are comments then we will continue with a reply period to the 3rd of December. If there are no comments then it will close on the 12th of November.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay and then we can see what all we do with that and after that. Okay, thank you very much.

Julie Hedlund: You're welcome.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So this is just the update on this. So I wonder is there any question about that? No. And I wonder whether we could step into the Topic Number 7 with regards to raising an issue.

It is written here that it seems to be support for Option Number 1. That means maintaining the status quo. Status quo means as is described in the charter of the SCI that an issue could be raised through the Council so that means on the way through the Council so that means anybody who would like to raise an issue towards the SCI should find support on the Council - GNSO Council to do so.

I recall that Ron definitely opted for this option as well. I think, since we are just three, okay we can just exchange our opinion on that if there is anything to say - if there is any other view on that. And then we could talk about how to deal with it because, okay, we do not have much participation.

But my proposal would then be that we send it out to the SCI members for last round saying, okay, this seems to be the option. And please - and then please comment on that.

I remember it was - that it was asked for already at the last meeting and there was no further comment on that. And I would like just to get your opinion on that from - if that is the correct way to do that just again or if we could right now stop it and accept it as the Option Number 1. How do you feel? How do you see that? Is there any comment from you, Ray, or James?

Ray Fassett: I don't have any specific comment. This is Ray Fassett. I think what you're...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ray.

Ray Fassett: ...suggesting makes sense to me, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So that means...

James Bladel: This is James. I'm fine with that as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: You mean send it out again?

Ray Fassett: Yeah, this is Ray. Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay so...

Ray Fassett: Correct.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay then I'd like to ask Julie, could you do that for us?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Yes, I will definitely do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Just send it out and then it's the very last one. Let me say we should, yeah, we should put a deadline I would say to the next meeting, which probably shall take place after two weeks. And so that's the way how we're going to put it with that, yeah? Thank you.

Then we have Number 8, topic is - next topic is status update on working group survey. Marika sent - has sent out, again, the draft working group survey on that. And she was asking also - and we were asking about comments either with regards to understanding of the - of the survey itself or for any other - any further comment. And then to discuss how to lead with that.

If nobody else is going to start with that - so let me just briefly start with my comments. I find the questions are, well, they are covering, you know, the most items, I would say, from my point of view.

It's also good from my understanding, from my point of view, that we do not have too complex questions and not too many questions, just 13 questions. That is enough, well, to have, from my point of view.

And one thing what I am going to miss or what I have question is, for example, in the Number 4 and Number 5, maybe enough as well, there is the question about - with scaling so which one should be scaled between ineffective and highly effective from 1 to 7 or between poor and excellent.

I suppose were I ask the question whether we have others caught in between and how do we call them. Julie, do you know something about that?

Julie Hedlund: No, I don't. I'm looking here at it. And I don't know what the scores are between there. I think they should be fleshed out. I would imagine that we could easily assign them, you know, 1 is ineffective, 2 is, you know, slightly effective, 3 is...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think there is a standardized scale isn't there?

Julie Hedlund: You know, I mean, I think that we could easily devise that. And I should note, too, that a suggestion that Marika had was that we could conduct a trial of this survey by converting it into a Zoomerang survey and sending it to the IRTP Part C working group which most recently completed its work so it would probably be in a good position to comment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: And so that's a suggestion I can throw out for discussion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, okay, that's a good idea. But first we have to finish, well, whether we are satisfied with the question, with the formulation, whether we are going

to miss - we are missing something or anything else. So that was the immediate question which only came up to my mind.

That means if you agree then the question (unintelligible) so should be revised in that way to have these scale available that we just cross, you know, the scale you would like to cross, yeah? That's the only thing I have here in mind.

Oh I know - I see Jennifer is going to...

Jennifer Standiford: Yes. I'm sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Standiford: I'm sorry?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Is Jennifer on the phone?

Jennifer Standiford: Yes, I am here. Can you all hear me?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh hello, welcome to the SCI.

Jennifer Standiford: Hi. Sorry I was late.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah no problem, well, we were just - because as we are just three of us from the community that means - it's James Bladel, Ray Fassett, myself and now you. As we were thinking how we can deal with that. So - and from staff, well we have support but we were just thinking how we can deal with the agenda.

We decided, well, not to go into the more, let me say, the items which need more discussion since there would be higher participation required. So we

just went through the Number 6, update on public comments was just reported by Julie.

And then Number 7 raising an issue which means that we are - we agreed that Julie's going to send out, again, to the SCI members the question whether we are satisfied with Option Number 1. And now we are on the Item Number 8, status update on working group survey.

There has been some months ago already elaborated a questionnaire, a kind of survey, which we would like to use to ask existing working groups how they are satisfied with the existing working group procedures or with the - how is it called? Is it the working group guidelines, yeah. And that's what we are talking now about. So...

Jennifer Standiford: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Any additional comment, question from...

Ray Fassett: Hey, Wolf, this is Ray.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, Ray.

Ray Fassett: I did share the survey - I did share the survey with the Registries Stakeholder Group to get feedback.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I see.

Ray Fassett: And while there isn't any kind of consensus position the little bit of feedback I did get back is that it looks good.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. That's great so we are encouraged, well, to use it in that way.
Okay. James, did you have any chance, well, to look through - to go through?

James Bladel: I have not, I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay no problem. But, you know, this is a little bit of pending item since we - it was - every time it was deferred. So I would like to get it through as soon as possible. Do you think, James, just from - to get a personal view from your side, how is your feel about that? Is that - you like to go through and you like to go through with the Registrars as well?

James Bladel: Yeah, I would probably - once we get - whether it's in a document form or whether it's part of a Zoomerang survey I would probably circulate to the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

James Bladel: You know, keep in mind our stakeholder group is very large and diverse and not all of them participating at the same level so it is - we do tend to have to, I think, take more of a broadcast approach.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So that means so - that you would like to discuss it within your group and then come back with potential comments?

James Bladel: Is this for the draft survey or for the actual...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For the draft survey or should we...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...so just for my understanding...

James Bladel: For the draft survey I think that, you know, it's probably something that Jennifer and I can work on together...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Jennifer Standiford: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...once the draft is finalized and the live survey we would broadcast that to the...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

James Bladel: ...Registrar group...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. And do you agree that we have this - with a draft survey a kind of (unintelligible) just kind of also draft experience with the IRTP-B group asking them or would you like to discuss it in advance within the Registrar group?

James Bladel: Well I was the Chair of the IRTP-C working group...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

James Bladel: ...I think that you're referring to. And I would be happy to - either through myself or through Marika send that to the working group members...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

James Bladel: ...of IRTP-C. And I'm fine doing that as well. But not the draft, the live survey.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. Yes okay so that means - good. Okay that means that we leave it as it is at the time being with those comments which were made by myself and by Ray and would like to ask you, well, to go through and hopefully if you

have time until the next meeting come back with that and then we can finalize that to - from the draft to the final version of the survey. Is that okay?

Ray Fassett: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay thank you.

James Bladel: It looks like someone from staff has their hand raised as well?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Julie, yes really.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. No, I just wanted to say what I could do is accept the changes that are in this current version because I think they've been reviewed quite a bit but also add the - flesh out the scale that you had noted for Numbers 4 and 5 so that there are, you know, values associated with those numbers.

And so we'd have a - sort of a final draft so to speak that I could send around to the SCI members. And then, James, if you and Jennifer wanted to look at it from, you know, the Registrar Stakeholder Group point of view to see if you have any changes before we turn this into a Zoomerang survey.

And then, you know, we could ask - we could ask all SCI members to take one last look at it and maybe, Wolf-Ulrich, we could send a date for a response on this one as well for people to look at the draft and then if there are no further changes after that date we can turn it into a Zoomerang survey and people - we could send it to the IRTP Part C group to try out.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. That - thank you, Julie. Well I have a question to James. Can you estimate, well, the time you need for that and including, well, the commenting in your - the Registrar group just a...

James Bladel: You know, I would hesitate to speak for that entire group. But what I would recommend is that when we send that Zoomerang link out that we give them a very firm deadline of something like, you know, three or four days maximum...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

James Bladel: ...to take the survey. As far as reviewing the draft, I mean, I guess it really depends on how much time Jennifer can spare. But I can probably take a look at it between now and the end of the day tomorrow and if she can do the same and we have any feedback we can get that back to the group maybe by the end of this week.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Jennifer Standiford: I can do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay great.

Jennifer Standiford: As well - yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay great.

James Bladel: And so if the survey were finalized by this group let's say next week then, you know, we could put it with a - for the 3-5 day turnaround for Registrars. And really - and probably the same deadline for IRTP working group members as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

James Bladel: So I think anything more than that and then it just sort of goes into everybody's back burner and it never gets completed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, no, no it's very helpful. I think so, well. We take care of it and keep it in mind so that's a good process. So thank you.

I have a last question with regards to scaling, Julie. Just not only to fill the scales but the question for me is the number of scales. Well, I know scaling more, yes, less it's used in our environment with four scales. Here you have seven.

Just to note - maybe Marika has an answer to that or others here on the phone if - have an answer to that why we use seven; is that - I do not have any clue to that but just a question. Do you have any idea, Julie, or can you raise this question again with - is Marika...

Julie Hedlund: I'll ask Marika. And actually I think it was Ken Bour who maybe added these edits so perhaps I'll ask him if he had a sense of the scale. Because I don't know if he was looking at a standardized scale or if he was just being general saying oh could start at 1 and go to 7. You know, so I don't know if he had something specific in mind. Seven does seem a bit much. I would probably say something more like five. But...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. You know, what I mean is the following, you know, the question is - so we should also think about what can we do with the answers of these - to this survey. You know, for example if you get answers with the scaling so what does it mean? Then discussion starts, yeah, how do we see that? Is it good? Is it bad? Is it okay? Is it - but what does it mean and what are the consequences we are going to draw from that.

So that's - what I have in mind, you know. And therefore looking for a guidance for us later on, you know, from the others point of view that could help us. So in this regard so my opinion is, well, to have not too many scales. So this is just an opinion from my side but please, I would like to ask, well, to discuss that and then come up with an answer to that. Okay?

Good so thank you. So this is the status update on working group. We still have four participants from the community besides staff. So Avri couldn't join, Anne, could not yet join. So I wonder - so that's not - there doesn't seem to be enough, though, for stepping into this discussion about chair and vice chair election or deferral of motions.

What I would like - when I started with Number 4, chair and vice chair election, well, I just pointed out that we have new membership or will have new membership. We just - the only thing what was open, though, it has to be clarified from the NCUC who shall be the member in future. That is still open. And I've asked Mary to take care about that.

So, well, I'm asking if we can't go into more deeper discussion, which I understand, on Topic 4 and 5 right now, yeah, I would like to adjourn the meeting. If so how do you see that? Is - what is your feeling, your comment on that please? I would like just to get a few answers on that, James and Jennifer and Ray.

James Bladel: So James speaking here. I think that that's correct if you're motioning that we've done as much as we can do today with a limited team I think...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

James Bladel: ...I tend to agree.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Jennifer Standiford: I concur.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Jennifer as well. And Ray?

Ray Fassett: No, I think I disagree. I think we just - I think we should just talk about it anyway. I'm just kidding. That's a joke.

James Bladel: Oh.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fassett: I couldn't resist, I'm sorry.

James Bladel: I say, I don't do a very good impression of some of the absent members.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: ...you know, when we were on the, you know, in the old times - in the improvements working team, which you led, sometimes we also just three people, yeah?

Ray Fassett: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay but we had to talk about more at that time content wise just drafting and these things so there was no decision to be taken. So right now with regard to deferral of motions, well, we have to take it at the end a decision and with regards to chair and vice chair election we have also take some decision about processes. So...

Ray Fassett: Yeah, Wolf. Yeah, Ray Fassett for the record. Yes, I'm in complete agreement. Yeah, we need more participation...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fassett: ...talk about those types of issues so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay so I'm sorry about that. But on the other hand I understand. What about the next - the next meeting? So normally we have it on a two-week scale so the next one would be then what is that?

James Bladel: November 15.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Fifteenth of November. Yes, 15th of November. Is that okay? Oh well okay indeed around that time is okay because there's a Council call as well. But that is a different time, okay. Is that convenient to you?

Ray Fassett: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

James Bladel: That's fine. I do have a question.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes please.

James Bladel: So the question is if we are ready to begin chair and vice chair elections and we are struggling to gather participants - and I want to believe that it's because of the conflict with the IGF meeting and I know a number of folks are...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

James Bladel: ...in transit to that event. But just wanted to be clear do we need to establish that you, Wolf, and Avri are acting as interim chair and vice chair, the continuation, until we can - is there a deadline that we're working against or...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: No, no, no, there is no - we have a very, let me say, easy charter on that. So that means there is nothing.

James Bladel: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The charter just says there is some - there is a chair and a vice chair is to be nominated in the first meeting of the SCI. So nothing is said about follow-ups. So while Avri and myself came up with that we were of the opinion, okay, so it's - it's usual that after a certain time of period we are thinking about new chairs and vice chairs. So that's the reason why.

And then we did it for almost two years or so. So...

James Bladel: Okay well thank you. I mean, that was my concern was just that we were running up against a term limiting situation where...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No we don't.

James Bladel: ...we have to - but that's good to know. Thank you. That's very reassuring.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No we don't so there is no interim so I will stay as chair as long as no others - other one is elected, yeah? And Avri, herself, is the same, you know. So we are just talking about how to do that and when to do that. Yeah?

James Bladel: Yeah, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay then let's do that the next time. Well, I will send off message around so - and mention, well, okay poor participation and, okay, it was many apologies were sent in. And there was - stress the point that we should think about the election the next time and also the other things.

So therefore I thank you very much for your participation and wish you all the best. And then see you on November 15. Thank you.

Ray Fassett: Thanks, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thanks everyone.

Jennifer Standiford: Thank you.

END